

INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION OF ARTS IN TURKEY:
EMERGENCE OF PRIVATE ART MUSEUMS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

GÖZDE ÇERÇİOĞLU YÜCEL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe SAKTANBER
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Tuğba Tanyeri Erdemir
Co-Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata	(METU, ADM)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber	(METU, SOC)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Nedim Karakayalı	(Bilkent Uni., ADM)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil Aybars	(METU, SOC)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağatay Topal	(METU, SOC)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Gözde, Çerçioğlu Yücel

Signature :

ABSTRACT

INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION OF ARTS IN TURKEY: EMERGENCE OF PRIVATE ART MUSEUMS

Çerçioğlu Yücel, Gözde

Ph.D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Tuğba Tanyeri Erdemir

September 2014, 409 pages

This dissertation explores the emergence of private art museums in 2000's in İstanbul, by focusing on three pioneering cases: Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum (Sabancı Museum), İstanbul Museum of Modern Art (İstanbul Modern) and Pera Museum. The aim of this study is to trace the history of emergence of private museums in Turkey, and their construction as an organizational field (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). Inquiring how did private museums emerge in Turkey, this dissertation argues that these three private museums in Turkey emerged as an outcome of structuration processes driven by corporate interests of large conglomerates and personal interests of corporate philanthropists, and with the crucial support of precursory organizational form of philanthropic foundations founded by the respective actors.

Key words: private museum, large conglomerates, philanthropic foundations, organizational field

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE’DE SANATIN KURUMSAL DÖNÜŞÜMÜ: ÖZEL SANAT MÜZELERİNİN ORTAYA ÇIKIŞI

Çerçioğlu Yücel, Gözde

Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Tuğba Tanyeri Erdemir

Eylül 2014, 409 sayfa

Bu çalışma 2000’lerde, İstanbul’da kurulan, Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, İstanbul Modern Sanat Müzesi ve Pera Müzesi’ne odaklanmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, özel sanat müzelerinin ortaya çıkışının tarihine odaklanmak ve özel sanat müzelerinin bir organizasyonel alan (DiMaggio ve Powell 1983) olarak kurulmasını irdelemektir. Söz konusu üç müzenin nasıl ortaya çıktığına odaklanan çalışma, bu üç müzenin bir organizasyonel alan olarak kurgulanmasında, şirketlerin ve şirket hayırseverliğini sürdüren sermayedar bireylerin menfaatlerinin itici bir güç oluşturduğunu ve bu aktörler tarafından kurulan vakıfların öncü kurumlar olarak özel müze alanını yapılandırdığını iddia etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Özel müze, vakıf, holding şirketleri, organizasyonel alan

To My Mother Hatice Nazan Çerçioğlu and My Father Zeki Çerçioğlu

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber, whose expertise, understanding, and patience, added considerably to my graduate experience. I would like to express special thanks to my co-supervisor Dr. Tuğba Tanyeri Erdemir, whose generous support, guidance, motivation and encouragement kept me stay “focused”.

I would like to thank the other members of my committee, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşe İdil Aybars, Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağatay Topal and Assist. Prof. Dr. Nedim Karakayalı for their understanding and insightful comments.

I must also acknowledge my former advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aykan Erdemir for his initial guidance and enthusiasm. And I would like to thank, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayça Ergun Özbolat for her encouragement and support.

Very special thanks goes out to my husband Cemal Ökmen Yücel, without whose motivation and encouragement I would have felt lost in New York City during the course of writing up. He provided me with direction, support and became a patient mentor. I would like to thank my beloved friends, Ayça Topaloğlu Bozkurt, Ceren Gergeroğlu, Erzen Söğüt, İrem Ünsal Yılmaz and her amazing son Uzay Yılmaz, İpek (Top) Batur, Melih Bozkurt and Onur Öztürk for their continuous support, encouragement and motivation. I would like to thank my friends whom I worked together at the Graduate School of Social Sciences, METU. Particularly, my dearest friends Canan Neşe Karahasan, Esra Demirkol, Figen Uzar Özdemir and Caner Özdemir for their crucial guidance, support and encouragement and for our sociological debates, exchanges of knowledge and most importantly venting frustration during my graduate years. I wish to thank Esra Can and Kübra Oğuz for their generous support and friendship. Special thanks to Sündüs Aydın and Selma Şahindokuyucu for always making things happen!

I would also like to thank my family for the support they provided me through my entire life and in particular, I must acknowledge my father Zeki Çerçioğlu, my

mother Hatice Nazan erioęlu and my sister ulfem erioęlu, without whose patience for being distant in two cities, I would not have started graduate studies. I want to express my gratitude to my father and mother for their commitment to my education. Special thanks to my grandmother Huriye erioęlu whose love has embraced me through my life. I would like to acknowledge my late grandmother Perihan Iřıktekin whom I lost during the course of the writing up of this dissertation. She was full of inspiration with her sense of humor and powerful personality. Special thanks to Perihan and Selami Yücel for their support as my family in Ankara.

I would like to thank to my respondents for taking their time to share their views with me. I would also like to acknowledge Sabancı Museum, Sabancı Foundation, Vehbi Ko Foundation, Sadberk Hanım Museum, Elgiz Contemporary Art Museum, Arter, CerModern, for responding my interview requests.

I would like to thank the cities that contributed to this study by the heart-full of emotions they have given me: İstanbul, Ankara and New York City. Particularly, I would not have finished this thesis without the journeys between Ankara and İstanbul, which had provided insight vision and opportunity of extensive thinking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Research Question.....	5
1.2. Theoretical Framework	7
2. METHODS.....	26
2.1. Studying Three Pioneering Private Museums in Turkey.....	26
2.2. Methods of Data Collection in Conglomerates	29
2.3. Methods of Data Collection in Corporate Philanthropists.....	30
2.4. Methods of Data Collection in Philanthropic Foundations	31
2.5. Methods of Data Collection in State Institutions and Regulations and Laws	32
2.6. Methods of Data Collection in Sabancı Museum, İstanbul Modern and Pera Museum	32
2.7. Methods of Data Collection in Professionals	34
2.8. Data Analysis.....	35
3. MARKET EMBRACES ART AS COMMODITY and CAPITAL: ART and BUSINESS	40
3.1. Commodification of Art	40
3.2. Corporate involvement in the arts: corporate sponsorship	46
4. SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF ART MUSEUMS	59
4.1. Art Museums as Modern Institutions	61
4.2. Museums as Educational Institutions	65

4.3.	The Relationship between the State and the Museums	67
4.4.	Funding of Museums	81
4.4.1.	Individual Philanthropists and Cultural Capitalists	84
4.4.2.	Government.....	87
4.4.3.	Corporations.....	90
4.4.4.	Foundations	93
5.	INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF ARTS IN TURKEY ...	95
5.1.	The Peculiarities of the Field of Arts in Turkey	96
5.1.1.	The Ottoman Legacy.....	96
5.1.2.	Republican Turkey	100
5.2.	Legal Framework for the Emergence of Philanthropic Foundations.	117
5.3.	İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts	125
5.3.1.	Facilitating the Flourishing of Cultural Industries	132
5.3.2.	Cultural Policy Orientation	133
5.3.3.	Legitimization and Proliferation of Cultural and Artistic Sponsorship.....	135
5.3.4.	The origination of the idea of setting up a modern arts museum.....	139
5.3.5.	Critical Evaluation of Social Implications	139
6.	1980 AND ONWARDS: THE CONTEXT FOR THE EMERGENCE OF PRIVATE MUSEUMS	143
6.1.	Economic and Social Context.....	144
6.2.	Globalizing İstanbul.....	155
6.2.1.	The Significance of AKP	157
6.3.	Legal Framework Enabling Privatization in Culture.....	161
6.4.	The Rise of Private Entrepreneurship and Private Funding in the Field of Arts and Its Social Implications	168
6.4.1.	Private Initiatives in Arts	173
6.4.2.	Corporate Sponsorship of Arts.....	178
7.	THE ORIGINS of PRIVATE ART MUSEUMS: KOÇ, ECZACIBAŞI AND SABANCI FAMILY FOUNDATIONS.....	183
7.1.	Vehbi Koç-“The Father” of Private Sector.....	186
7.1.1.	Philanthropy as Symbolic Power	191

7.1.1.1.	Constitution of the Legal Infrastructure	195
7.1.1.2.	Initial Activities of the Vehbi Koç Foundation	198
7.1.2.	Vehbi Koç's Sadberk Hanım Museum	199
7.1.3.	Koç Family Members and the Field of Culture and Arts.....	212
7.2.	Sakıp Sabancı –The Social Man.....	216
7.2.1.	The Emergence of Sabancı Foundation	217
7.2.2.	Sakıp Sabancı and his Encounters in the Field of Arts.....	222
7.2.2.1.	Brief Notes about the Recent Situation	226
7.3.	Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı-The Cultivated Man.....	228
7.3.1.	Eczacıbaşı Holding	230
7.3.2.	Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, Philanthropy and Arts	232
8.	EMERGENCE OF THREE ART MUSEUMS IN İSTANBUL: SABANCI MUSEUM, İSTANBUL MUSEUM OF MODERN ART AND PERA MUSEUM	247
8.1.	Structuration and Professionalization.....	248
8.1.1.	Vehbi Koç Foundation.....	248
8.1.2.	İKSV	249
8.1.3.	Banks' Cultural and Artistic Institutions	250
8.2.	Establishment of Philanthropic Foundation Museum Model	251
8.2.1.	Missions and Strategies.....	263
8.2.2.	Edifice	278
8.2.3.	Organizational Structure	285
8.2.4.	Funding	293
9.	CONCLUSION	298
	REFERENCES.....	311
	APPENDICES	
A.	LIST OF TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS-SABANCI MUSEUM.....	349
B.	LIST OF TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS-İSTANBUL MODERN.....	358
C.	LIST OF TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS-PERA MUSEUM.....	377
D.	CURRICULUM VITAE	386
E.	TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	389
F.	TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	409

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

İKSV	Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts
AKP	Justice and Development Party
CHP	Republican People's Party
DP	Democrat Party

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation explores the emergence of private museums in Istanbul in the 21st century by focusing on three pioneering cases: Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum (Sabancı Museum); İstanbul Museum of Modern Art (İstanbul Modern); and Pera Museum. The aim of this study is to trace the history of the emergence of private museums in Turkey, and their constitution as an organizational field (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). The importance of inquiring the emergence of private art museums is revealing the mechanisms of institutionalization of private sector in the field of arts. I argue that the organizational field of private museums is underwritten by market-driven rationality, conglomerates' interest of integration with the global capital, and competition over possessing the field. Large conglomerates, which have been crucial in the economic and business activity in Turkey, have transported the competitive character of the market to an extended field: private museums. In this respect, the organizational models of the museums inherited the reflections of these aspirations and interests. The large conglomerates have utilized the institutional structures of philanthropic foundations, and legal and professional infrastructure for realizing their interests in the organizational field of private museums. The emergence of private museums in Turkey is significant for two reasons. First, private museums serve for the dissemination of the interest in arts and culture to instrumentalize it as a business opportunity among the corporations and corporate identities, thus increase the extent of private intervention in the arts and culture. Second, the private museums, serve as institutional manifestations of corporate actors' interest to be recognized as élites in society.

These three museums are referred to as “private museums” because of their institutional stance. They are categorically different from “state museums”, exclusively founded and governed by the state. Private museums operate under the

control of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Under the framework of respective regulation, a multitude of actors, namely ministries, public institutions, real and juridical persons, and foundations can form collections and establish private museums to actualize their aims. The particular three museums on which I will focus in this study are philanthropic foundation museums. They serve as prominent examples within the last decade that have shaped cultural and artistic life in the city of İstanbul. The philanthropic foundations associated with the private museums are founded by corporate philanthropists. This makes the emergence of these museums crucial by revealing the relationship between the organizational form of private museums, corporate philanthropists, and philanthropic foundations as part of the construction of an organizational field (DiMaggio 1991). As recently flourishing institutions, private museums are considered to be the organizational facets of social transformation that Turkey has experienced in the post 1980's.

If a person walked down the eclectic, colorful, and vivid atmosphere of İstiklal Street in Beyoğlu, İstanbul in the late 1990s, he/she would come across crowds, shops with colorful display windows, restaurants, cafés, street vendors, art platforms, and art galleries. He/she would see Garanti Platform, Akbank Sanat, Yapı Kredi Kazım Taşkent Art Gallery, Ziraat Bank Art Gallery, and İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (İKSV) festivals' posters and flags. One could even suggest that most of the art galleries and art platforms on İstiklal Street were the initiatives of the prominent banks in Turkey. Born and raised in İstanbul, I have observed the change in the city, and its artistic and cultural centers during the course of the 1990s and 2000's. Over the last two decades, increasingly, İstanbul has become the major focus of art and cultural initiatives. With its increasing number of art platforms and art galleries, it has also become the center of auction houses, host of international art fairs, and inextricable node of the discourse on arts and culture (Keyder 1993; Aksoy & Robins 1997; Aksoy 2008 and 2012; Yardımcı 2007). Meanwhile, the cultural policies have been oriented towards restructuring the city space, rediscovering its rich cultural potential, and emphasizing its potential for tourism (Aksoy 2008 and 2012). The integration of

global art and cultural networks to the city has been proliferated by events such as International İstanbul Biennial, Contemporary İstanbul International Art Fair, and other international art, music, and cinema festivals organized by various institutions. Among these institutions, the philanthropic foundation, İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, has been the prominent institution in organizing festivals and disseminating art and cultural events in İstanbul and has been an “authority” to be consulted (Yardımcı 2007). In the 1990’s and onwards, the private initiatives in arts were oriented towards contemporary arts and in the 2000’s this new orientation had become more explicit. New initiatives had been taken in this direction and preexisting private art centers and platforms focused more on contemporary arts. The interest in arts and culture had expanded among the private domestic companies and particularly among the prominent family holding companies. Large conglomerates which included numerous manufacturing and distribution companies, banks and other services firms (Pamuk 2007, p.15) had appeared as the leading actors in taking initiatives in arts and culture through their companies’ sponsorship programs and philanthropic foundations’ initiatives in establishing art and cultural centers. In the meantime, in the 2000’s, private museums that focused on art were being established by well-known corporate actors and their affiliated institutions. Corporate philanthropists and companies had started to pronounce their interest in establishing private museums (Artun & Baransel 2011). Among these, Sabancı Museum (2002), İstanbul Modern (2004), and Pera Museum (2005) have been actualized. These three museums are affiliated with the prominent family holding companies: Sabancı Holding; Eczacıbaşı Holding; and Koç Holding, respectively. They have started to appear in media with their founders, collections, exhibitions, and activities. The private museums’ presence has been enhanced by promotional campaigns that use the city space for advertising, media coverage of opening ceremonies of exhibitions, gala receptions, museum director’s guided tours by television programs’ on culture and life style, interviews of corporate philanthropists appearing in newspapers’ culture and economy pages, and magazines. Private museums have been incorporated to the portfolios of businessmen and corporations as “showcases” of their undertakings,

and as concrete institutional manifestations for justifying that they were “socially responsible” individuals and corporations.

On the one hand, İstanbul has been the center of important developmental and other considerable changes in the field of culture and arts, with the impact of the expansion of interest on culture and art as a medium to integrate the city to the global market. On the other, during the course of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) rule, art and culture had become one of the major axes of tension and polarization with regard to cultural policies oriented towards closing and restructuring state art and cultural institutions (Aksoy & Şeyben 2014). This was prompted by the government’s aim of privatization and intervention on well-established centers and the artworks. Some of the notable occasions that triggered public discussions and the conflict between the AKP and its opponents, artists, the central government, and particularly the Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, include the closing of Atatürk Cultural Center in 2008 (Aksoy 2009), Erdoğan’s calling of the sculpture in Kars, Monument to Humanity, a “freak”(Tanyeri-Erdemir 2011), closing of the Emek Movie Theater¹ in 2013, the ongoing debate on the closure of state cultural institutions, and the establishment of *Türkiye Sanat Kurulu* (Turkey Arts Council-TÜSAK).

It is noted by Aksoy & Şeyben (2014, p.5) that:

[T]he arts and cultural life sponsored by the privately funded non-state actors do not even figure in this calculation despite the fact that they have been so active in introducing the Turkish public to contemporary art forms, and for producing popular cultural offering. With its International Art Biennial, Design Biennial and numerous music and performing arts festivals (jazz, film, theatre, dance, etc.), İstanbul commands an impressive and increasing international interest. Even though this vibrant contemporary art scene may be good for İstanbul’s global image, it does not seem to fulfill conservatives’ expectations in terms of cultural identity and lifestyle.

¹ Emek Sineması was one of the popular cultural sites of Beyoğlu. The movietheater was also important for being one of the main venues for hosting International Film Festival organized by İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts. It was located in a building which was constructed in 1924 and was demolished in 2013, despite the strong opposition and protests, because of a Project designed to construct a shopping mall on the building’s estate.

In this context, the AKP government's stance towards state cultural institutions cannot be reduced solely to privatization aims; rather it is considered to be articulated within their conservative desires. As stated by Aksoy & Şeyben (2014, p.7):

When the Prime Minister declares that the 'state is withdrawing from the theatre scene' and that the theatre will be 'private, independent and free', it seems to be underpinned by this wrath against what is perceived as the arrogance of secular elitism and by the determination to put an end to decades of cultural humiliation. What he expresses is the conservative desire to be rid of a particular form of Turkish cultural identity that has flourished under conditions of state subsidy and protection. His stance would seem to be a clear indication of the AKP government's resolve to put an end to Kemalism as the underlying principle of the state's cultural project.

As the above quotation demonstrates, if one considers the issue of institutionalization of arts in Turkey, he/she should engage the complicated history of Turkey's encounters with Western forms of art, Western art and cultural institutions, and complexity of their public articulation. This engagement cannot be divorced from the social transformation that modern Turkey has encountered, its ruptures and notable moments. Therefore, studying the emergence of private museums as particular organizational forms not only focuses on specific moments in history; rather it is a critical inquiry of the social dynamics, political, economic, and cultural changes and actors underwritten in its emergence as a recent organizational field.

1.1. Research Question

My main research question is: How did the private art museums emerge in Turkey? My central aim is to explain the flourishing of private museums as organizational forms. Then I formulated four sub-questions to address this central aim.

The first of these questions is: Who and what are the agencies involved in the processes of making these private museums? Considering the recent cases of private museums as initiatives of privately funded non-state actors, I hypothesize that the major actors involved in the processes are family holding companies, to

put it another way, large conglomerates and families behind them, and the corporate philanthropists from these families. Although private museums are clearly associated with the private capital, I presuppose that the state is still an important agency in the process of the emergence of private museums by means of government institutions, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and other relevant state institutions.

The second sub-question is: What are the roles of the key actors in the emergence of private museums? I hypothesize that corporate philanthropists act in relation with their corporate and personal interests, aspirations, and missions. Respectively, they intervene in the field of culture and arts to actualize these guiding motives. I hypothesize that their personal and corporate aims and aspirations are reflected in the meanings, functions, and social missions of these private museums. Thus, the major hypothesis is: the greater the private museums' association with the corporate actors, the greater the extent that private museums resemble corporations in their organizational structure. I further consider the state as an active agency in the emergence of private museums. The main assumption behind this is the consideration of the state's role in framing and shaping economic and cultural policies.

The third sub-question that I formulated in relation to the first and the second sub-questions is: What is the relationship between the state and business? I assume that there is a relationship between the state and the business that encourages the proliferation of large conglomerates in Turkey, and this consecutively facilitates the private sector's intervention in the field of culture and arts and thus emergence of private museums.

The fourth sub-question is about the mechanisms that play roles in the emergence of museums: What are the mechanisms to establish private museums? The prominent cases I focus on are referred to as philanthropic foundation museums. I assume that philanthropic foundations as organizational forms are the precursors of private museums. They are the main mechanisms that are instrumental at different phases of the emergence of private museums. Philanthropic foundations

are the central agencies that offer the pivotal financial, professional, and organizational support for the constitution of an infrastructure that is necessary for the establishment of private museums, thus, the central agency in the structuring processes of private museums as an organizational field.

Given the expansion of interest and enthusiasm of the multitude of actors to contribute to İstanbul's cultural and artistic sphere, I find the inquiry on the role of the city promising. Consecutively, my fifth sub-question is: What is the particularity of İstanbul for the emergence of private museums and their founders? I assume that, İstanbul, with its rich cultural heritage and potential, is a valuable instrument for domestic capital to integrate to the world-market and international capital. Alongside the prominent philanthropic foundation, İKSV's, festivals, International Biennial, city's major art and cultural events sponsored by the companies, and art and cultural centers initiated by banks, private museums form a vivid cultural atmosphere in İstanbul. İstanbul has become the center of competition among actors to dominate the cultural sphere by their initiatives, sponsorship programs, and most importantly with their private museums. Private museums represent and serve as the institutional manifestations of the power struggle among the large conglomerates.

1.2. Theoretical Framework

I consider private museums as concrete organizations that need to be explored in their own right. I am inspired by DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) work "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields". DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p.148) conceptualize organizational fields as:

[T]hose organizations that in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products.

DiMaggio and Powell (ibid) argue that the "structure of an organizational field cannot be determined a priori but must be defined on the basis of empirical investigation. That is to say, we cannot take the institutional definition or

structuration for granted. DiMaggio and Powell (ibid) describe the process of structuration as follows:

The process of institutional definition, or “structuration,” consists of four parts: an increase in the extent of interaction among organizations in the field; the emergence of sharply defined interorganizational structures of domination and patterns of coalition; an increase in the information load with which organizations in a field must contend; and development of a mutual awareness among participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise.

I want to emphasize that I consider the private art museums as an organizational field. For the purposes of this thesis, a major work is Paul DiMaggio’s (1991) article “Constructing an Organizational Field as a Professional Project: U.S. Art Museums, 1920-1940”. In this study he argues (p.267) that:

[T]o understand the institutionalization of organizational forms, we must first understand the institutionalization and structuring of organizational fields. Where institutional processes have the greatest impact on organizational change, such fields are not simply investigators' aggregative constructs, but are meaningful to participants and include specialized organizations that constrain, regulate, organize, and represent at the level of the field itself.

Focusing on the moments of structuring in the particular organizational field, U.S. Art Museums, he highlights three aspects of institutionalization which had not received ample attention until then: first, models of diffusion; second, tensions within the institutionalization process; and third, the role of professionals and professionalization. On these grounds, DiMaggio (1991, p.268) suggests that in the case of U.S. art museums, there is a “substantial discord about key aspects of museum form and function as well as the emergence of a national infrastructure—at which professional organizations supported by philanthropic foundations are at the core—committed to speeding and shaping the diffusion process”. The second argument stated by DiMaggio (ibid) is: “[T]he diffusion process not only legitimated the museum as an organizational form, but at the same time legitimated conflict over the interpretation of the museum's mission.” DiMaggio (1991, p.269) addresses the importance of a design of a study which enables us to combine both the study of established organizational fields and professionalization whereby the attention is directed towards both the historical perspective and “the influence of professionalizing occupations on interorganizational relations”.

Although DiMaggio based his study on the case of U.S. Art Museums, his work's scope is clearly not limited to U.S. society. In light of these aspects and design models offered for studying organizational fields, I will approach the private art museums governed by the philanthropic foundations and corporate philanthropists in Turkey. While tracing the history of their emergence, I will consider the process of their institutional definition and pay special attention to the inclusion of "specialized organizations that constrain, regulate, organize, and represent at the level of the field itself" (DiMaggio 1991, p.267).

I hypothesize that the major specialized organizations that constrain, regulate, organize, and represent at the level of the field of private museums are the philanthropic foundations in Turkey. Consecutively, Çizakça's (2000) work, *A History of Philanthropic Foundations: The Islamic World From the Seventh Century to the Present*, constitutes the main source of information for the institutional history of philanthropic foundations in modern Turkey and forms the legal framework of my discussion.

Relatively scant attention has been given to the subjects of art, museums, and corporate sponsorship of the arts. On the one hand, the scholarly attention given to the subject of arts and culture remains relatively limited, and additionally, the field of culture and arts has been left to be debated in the newspapers, periodicals, and TV programs, only by a limited number of key figures. The emergence of TV programs designed to present mainly cultural and artistic calendars of İstanbul in news channels appear to be filling in the gap. Discussions have been shaped by the immediate responses given to the certain incidents that triggered public attention and opposition. The emergent themes have been the lack of vision in the cultural policies of the respective government, failures of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in the protection of cultural heritage, and governing the field. On the other hand, İKSV, banks and philanthropic foundations contributed to the literature by publications on arts, artists and cultural policies, and publications of catalogs of art collections and exhibitions. Nonetheless, with the effect of recent developments in the field of arts, centered in İstanbul, there is a recently emerging literature. The studies that focus on İstanbul and the social implications of cultural

policies in the city level (Aksoy 2008 and 2012; Bartu 1999; Bora 1999; Göktürk, Soysal & Türeli 2010; Karaca 2010; Keyder 1993 and 1999; Stokes 1999; Yardımcı 2005 and 2007) provided relevant information on the relationship between the growing interest in arts and culture, and cultural industries in İstanbul. The studies that focused on cultural policies constituted the other strand in the literature that addressed arts (Ada & İnce 2009, Aksoy & Şeyben 2014; Birkiye 2009). Corporate sponsorship of arts recently gained recognition (eds Arapoğlu, Elçik & Kösemen 2014) and the economic contribution of sponsorship for businesses was addressed (Sakarya & Büyükarıslan 2010). Journals contributed to the literature on art and theory (Sanat ve Kuram 1998), and on contemporary art (ed. Kosova & Aslan 2012). Sociology, arts, and social theory have been addressed by few scholars (Akay 1999; Nalbantoglu 2000 and 2007). Some studies addressed the relationship between modernism and nation building (Bozdoğan 2002, Stokes 1992, Karaca 2010). Yardımcı (2007) developed a critical stance and discussed the social implications of private initiatives in arts and culture, by focusing on festivals organized by İKSV. Şeni (2000) indirectly addressed the arts by focusing on the Camondo Family based in İstanbul, and their philanthropic activities.

Ali Artun appeared as the major art historian that contributed to the literature on museums (2006a, 2006b and 2008). Recently, there have been publications focusing on the private museums in İstanbul from the perspective of elite formation (Albayrak 2011), İstanbul in the time of private museums (Şeni 2010), the presence of corporate identities in the case of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art (Aydınalp & Gökçe 2012), the contribution of museums to İstanbul's city image (Altınbaşak & Yalçın 2010), and private museums in relation to the urban regeneration project (Polo 2013). Because the three cases that I focus on in this study form the pioneering examples, and they have survived in the last decade, they constitute the main center of scholarly attention. This dissertation contributes to the literature by the empirical study of the history of the emergence of these three specific cases, emphasis laid on the structuring processes that construct them

as an organizational field, rather than taking their institutional definition for granted.

The analysis that I offer in this dissertation is based on the combination of documentary and archival study, and semi-structured expert interviews with the professionals in the private museums. Daily newspapers, official websites of the affiliated conglomerates, philanthropic foundations, private museums, sponsor companies, autobiographies and biographies of the founders of the conglomerates, biographical information on corporate philanthropists and museum professionals, published interviews of museum professionals, founding corporate philanthropists and chairmen of the board of directors, press releases of museums and their exhibitions, news regarding the acquisition of artworks by affiliated individuals and corporations, museums' catalogs and publications, and relevant laws and regulations form the major resources of information. In addition, I conducted semi-structured expert interviews between 2012 and 2014 with the respective museums' administrative staff (museum directors/managers, chief curator, incoming exhibition coordinator), the Director of Sabancı Foundation, Manager of Sadberk Hanım Museum² in İstanbul, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, and the sponsorship Director of CerModern³ in Ankara. Moreover, field research in three private museums contributed to the empirical data collection. I will discuss my methods in detail in Chapter 2.

² Sadberk Hanım Museum is officially the first private museum established in Turkey in 1980, İstanbul, by Vehbi Koç Foundation and by the initiatives of Vehbi Koç. The museum had been directed by Sevgi Gönül (daughter of Vehbi Koç and Member of the Board of Koç Holding companies)until her death in 2003.

³ CerModern was founded in Ankara in 2010 by the support of TÜRSAB (Association of Turkish Travel Agencies) as a modern arts center.

In advanced capitalist societies, globally spread auction houses, commerce of artworks and acquisitions, and sponsorship of arts by the corporations are widespread observable facts. In Chapter 3, I discuss the commodity character of the artworks and the corporate sponsorship of arts. In advanced capitalist societies, culture has become a commodity (Harvey 2002), but still there is a widespread belief that cultural products have a special character which separates them from ordinary commodities produced in manufacturing factories. The main reason behind this widespread differentiation is the articulation of a symbolic value in addition to the commercial value of the works of art. According to Bourdieu (1985), a cultural product, particularly an artwork, is a symbolic good. As Bourdieu (*ibid*) suggests, the artists and intellectuals are freed from the demands of the external sources of legitimacy, such as the church or the aristocracy, and have gained autonomy. Nevertheless, paradoxically this autonomy constituted the condition of artists' submission to the laws of the market. According to Velthuis (2005), prices of the artworks are far from being abstract numbers; rather they convey various meanings for trading partners. They have symbolic meanings for collectors and dealers, and the price not only indicates the quality of the artwork, but also the identity of the collectors who buy the artwork, and can be symbols of social status. On these grounds, I focus on the literature on corporate sponsorship of arts and its association with corporations' interests. In the post 1980's, this phenomenon has become consistent and widespread in relation to the ethos of neoliberalization. Previous literature has shown that corporate sponsorship of arts is considered to be a way of directly promoting a companies' economic and communication goals, whereby the art and cultural events are utilized to raise public awareness in line with the companies' interests in image building and reaching the target group (Kössner 1996; Martorella 1996). Furthermore, Martorella (1996, p.6) emphasized that corporations' practices of collecting or publicizing art provide the opportunity for public recognition and prestige, while the articulation of the collector, with the factors external to artistic community such as the marketplace, define the levels of taste and connoisseurship and encourage certain styles to emerge and proliferate. The worldwide dissemination of the trend of supporting contemporary art forms can be understood on these

grounds. Bourdieu's (1984) conception of culture as power, and concepts of cultural capital, economic capital, and social distinction have been instrumental for studying the social implications of corporate sponsorship of arts in a critical way. Wu (1998) studied the rise of the phenomenon in the post 1980's in cases within the United States and Britain, and suggested that business élites used their corporate positions and transformed their economic capital for cultural capital for their own personal purposes to advance their social status, simultaneously acting in the corporate interest, while participating in arts sponsorship. In this respect, I provide examples of corporate sponsorship in different countries for a comparative presentation.

In Chapter 4, I discuss the social significance of art museums, by focusing on their relationship with modernity, their social function of education, their relationship with the state, and their access to funding. Much research on the relationship between museums and modernity, and their social importance has been done (Prior 2002; Sherman & Rogoff; Macdonal & Fyfe 1996). Museums are viewed as "the intricate amalgam of historical structures and narratives, practices and strategies of display, and the concerns and imperatives of various governing ideologies" (Sherman & Rogoff 1994, p. ix). The previous literature has been devoted to reveal the concealed historical structures and narratives that underlie museums. I review the literature that explains the flourishing of museums in the 19th century, the construction of the education claims of museums and its relationship with civilization, and their relationship with the nation-state formation. In due course, I discuss the emergence of the idea of museums in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century in relation to the interaction with the Western examples. Shaw (2003, p.18) suggests that: "As the need for the Ottoman state to reinvent itself along nationalist lines emerged over the course of the late nineteenth century, museums that could represent new communal identities began to serve as templates for developing modes of Ottoman nationalism". There were artistic practices and visual arts that had long existed in the Ottoman Empire in the form of calligraphy, miniature, abstract ornamentation, ceramic tiles, and representations of flowers that were used for decorative purposes for the interiors of architectural structures.

However, the forms that contravene with the religious depiction of people were absent, despite some exceptions such as the sultans' cabinets and the incoming European artists where these prohibitions were altered (Faroqhi 2005). Particularly, the 19th century witnessed the modernization in artistic practices and techniques used for visual arts. One of the important features of the development of strategies in the Ottoman state to modernize artistic practices was the series of encounters with the "West". France, in particular, provided the grounds for Ottomans' international encounters, hosting Ottoman ambassadors and disciples to study modern techniques in arts and to learn Western forms of painting and sculpting in reputed French art academies of the time (Artun 2007). The artists that returned to the country constituted both the professions and institutions of art through their roles as artists, educators, and administrators, and adopted not only the modern techniques of art on their canvases, but also "translated" the institutional structures of the West (Artun 2007, p.280). Pioneering arts institutions were established in the Ottoman Empire, such as the Imperial Museum, established in 1869, and First School of Fine Arts (*Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi*), which was established in 1882. Osman Hamdi Bey⁴, as a statesman and a returnee from France, was the key figure who played a crucial role in the structuring of the field by directing the museum and School of Fine Arts, and leading the pioneering excavation projects in the Ottoman Empire (Shaw 2003).

Museums, in advanced capitalist societies increasingly become dependent on external funding and this puts them in a challenging position. The key corporate philanthropists I focus on in this dissertation are influenced by American and

⁴ Osman Hamdi Bey, lived between 1842-1910; he was a statesman and one of the first students sent abroad –to Paris in 1857- by the Ottoman Empire to have a law education. However, his interest in culture and arts lead him to study painting and archeology which made him "the person" who is associated with the establishment of museum in Turkey later on. This association stems from many initiatives taken by him. After his return from Paris, he worked as a civil servant in various positions, and participated in the World Exposition in Vienna as the first commissar (İstanbul Archeology Museums Official Webpage, Osman Hamdi Bey, 2013, Available at: http://www.istanbularkeoloji.gov.tr/osman_hamdi_bey_eng). This World Exposition affected the history of Westernization in the Ottoman Empire as well as the establishment of modern institutions through the interaction formed (Shaw 2003).

European examples when they establish their philanthropic foundations and programs on the basis of arts. Therefore, I focus on the literature that emerged in the United States and Europe in section 4.4. on the funding of museums. Zukin (1989, p.100-101) emphasizes the influence of the patrons of modern art (Nelson Rockefeller, Jacob Javits and John Lindsay) who were at the same time Republicans and associated with big corporate and philanthropic contributors in the late 1950's and 1960's. Zukin revealed that, in addition to these key figures, the Ford Foundation, its programs on the arts and humanities, and its connections with other foundations had an impact on state policy towards the arts, and in 1965, the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities was established. The literature in the United States on the funding of art museums focuses on individual philanthropists and cultural capitalists, governments, corporations and foundations as major funding actors.

In Chapter 5, I directly focus on the institutional and legal framework of arts in Turkey. This chapter constitutes the major context and reveals the specific characteristics of the field. I suggest that the structuration processes involved in the formation of private art museums as an organizational field cannot be divorced from the former actors who played pivotal roles as definers, providers, and supporters of visual arts. Consecutively, I first provide the historical trajectory of institutionalization of arts in Turkey by particularly focusing on the change of intervening actors. Second, I discuss the restoration of the philanthropic foundations in Republican Turkey, and the change in the legal framework in 1967 that constituted philanthropic foundations as new institutional actors in civil society. This legal framework later enabled philanthropic foundations to be the crucial agencies in forming programs on art and taking art and cultural initiatives, thus, has constituted them as central agencies that play pivotal roles in supporting the infrastructure for private museums. I elaborate on the example of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts which was founded in 1973 under the new legislation on philanthropic foundations by the leadership of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, and consider it a precursor organization which has been instrumental in the process

of the structuring of private museums by providing the infrastructure required for their emergence.

The Ottoman Dynasty was the only patron of the arts by commissioning works from the Western artists, holding a collection of arts and curiosities, and sending artists to Europe for training in the arts. Additionally, it was the major agency in establishing pioneering arts institutions until the proclamation of the Turkish Republic. The modern Turkish Republic was formed with the radical break from the Ottoman past (Timur 1987) and this rupture was articulated with revolutions and an explicit focus on Westernization, modernization, secularism and nationalism (Ahmad 1993; Berkes 1965; Kasaba & Bozdoğan 1997; Mardin 1994; Timur 1993; Zürcher 1993). Consecutively, the focus on modernizing arts and culture had been expanded in the Republican Era. It was, under Republican People's Party rule, characterized by the cultural policy orientation towards disseminating Western art forms, and the Turkish state appeared to be a patron of arts (Önsal 2006; Üstünipek 1998). The state's patronage in arts had been consolidated through establishing new institutions that conformed to the aims of modernization and dissemination of Westernization and nationalism, supporting artists by acquiring their works of art, and organizing state exhibitions. Ankara, as the new capital of modern Turkey was highlighted by the state as the center of revolutionary cultural policies and its institutions, center for the new nation state, and art and cultural activities. The steps toward building infrastructure were taken during this period. For example, the Ministry of Education was established, which focused on both education and culture, and the establishment of new museums. Both ruling elites and the Ministry of Education appeared as major consumers of artwork in that period. State Painting and Sculpture Museum was founded in 1937 and State Exhibitions of Painting and Sculpture was initiated in 1939. The patronage of state in the field of arts and culture had started to shift towards a recession during the course of Democrat Party governments (Kasalı 2010, Önsal 2006). Nevertheless, there had been initiatives such as enhancing cultural relations with the United States of America, France, and Britain, passing bills on protecting works of art, increasing the budget of public museums for their provision of

exhibitionary complexes and opening exhibitions, and agreeing on increasing sources of revenue for the museums (Kasalı 2010). Given the absence of mediating organizations such as galleries and actors such as dealers, and the recession in a state that played a crucial role in supporting the arts, it was not possible to talk about an art market in Turkey until the 1970's (Üstünipek 1998). Collections first started to be established by state banks during the Republican Era. Private galleries that first emerged in the 1950's (Önsal 2006) gave way to the expansion of interest in arts among the commercial banks, future private initiatives in the forms of galleries and auction houses, and growth of an art market in the following years. Meanwhile, economic developments, and the establishment of family holding companies in accordance, have facilitated the emergence of new individual actors as consumers of the art market. Philanthropic foundations, established by the founders of these holding companies, have been articulated.

Legislation on philanthropic foundations in 1967 meant the 'survival' and 'restoration' of the "waqf system" in modern Turkey that had long existed in the Islamic world (Çizakça 2000). It further provides the major legal framework that sets the infrastructure for participation of corporate philanthropists in social issues and enables them to pursue their personal and corporate interests. The importance of this legislation for the subject of this thesis is multi layered: First, it introduced the possibility for corporations to find their own philanthropic foundations and opportunity to receive tax-exemption. Second, the impact of businessman Vehbi Koç in the constitution of this legislation and its approval was crucial. Vehbi Koç is one of the key subjects on whom I focus, as being the founder of Koç Holding and Vehbi Koç Foundation, and being directly affiliated with the establishment of the first philanthropic foundation museum and offering the essential visioning. Third, Vehbi Koç Foundation had become a template organization whose model was recreated by other businessmen.

Alongside Vehbi Koç Foundation, İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (İKSV) is a philanthropic foundation which is directly affiliated with the private museums. It is an initiative led by Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, who is a crucial figure in legitimizing the corporate support of arts and the role of philanthropic foundations

in taking art and cultural initiatives. Furthermore, İKSV is the central organization which offers necessary support in the steps of the structuring of private museums, by providing the infrastructure. İKSV is known for its roles in enhancing professionalization and proliferating cultural industries, its cultural policy orientation which paves the way for interaction among the professionals and various organizations, legitimizing and proliferating cultural and artistic sponsorship, and setting the ground for the idea of establishing a private modern art museum to originate. It is also directly affiliated with the establishment of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art, which makes it more important. İKSV contributed to both the professionalization and structuration of the organizational field of private museums. However, it is important to note that, on the one hand, the festivals organized by İKSV are vulnerable to private intervention and this is, according to Yardımcı (2007, p.5-6), leading them to “abstain from politically marginal projects, turning them into a ‘safe’ parade of international cultural forms ranging from entertainment to soft-core politics”. On the other hand, as Yardımcı (2007) suggests, festivals gate communities, and increasing privatization of culture directs attention to the possibility of social exclusion.

In Chapter 6, I discuss the 1980’s and onwards for developing the conditions for the proliferation of private entrepreneurship and private investments in the arts. First, I discuss the economic liberalization and its social implications, and its relevance with the rise of private entrepreneurship and private investments in the arts. Second, I concentrate on İstanbul as the major setting of the private museums, and explore the social, political and economic dynamics that constitute İstanbul as the center of culture and arts in the post 1980’s. I put special emphasis on AKP and explore the roots of its cultural policy orientation of global-city project and branding in İstanbul. Third, I discuss the changes in the regulations and laws which enable and proliferate the private initiatives in the arts. On these grounds, I outline the recent private initiatives in art and culture and their characteristics.

Turkey has encountered remarkable changes in the political, economic and cultural spheres following the Military coup in 1980. First, I review the literature on economic liberalization and Turkey’s encounters with neoliberalization (Acar

2002; Boratav 2004; Cizre & Yeldan 2005; Ertuğrul & Selçuk 2001; Heper & Keyman 1998; Kalaycıoğlu 2002; Kazgan 2004; Öniş 2004 and 2007 and 2009; Özatay 2000; Sayarı 1996; Pamuk 2014; Patton 2006). Previous research on economic liberalization and Turkey's complicated encounter with neoliberalism documented that 1980's economic policies and the key political figure, Turgut Özal, had an impact on the restructuring of the economy in a neoliberal direction. Structural reforms in the direction of liberalizing the financial markets, opening the economy to the international market, privatization, setting the market rules, appreciation of entrepreneurial activity, strengthening of the private sector and the hegemony of the neoliberal ideology, and the difficult experiences of integration with the international financial markets characterized the post 1980's. Turkey has experienced serious economic crises which had important impacts on the economy and society. Particularly the 2001 crisis had serious consequences and crisis gave way to economic long-term structural reforms. The post 1980's resulted in processes of fragmentation and polarization in society and this has had implications on social identities and their public articulation, and studying cultural preferences, meanings, and cultural consumption gained importance (Kandiyoti 2002). State power has not been reduced, as suggested by the hegemonic view of neoliberalism. On the contrary, the state has maintained its power in different mechanisms. One important reflection of this is the state-business relations in the Turkish context, whereby state institutions are considered important in influencing the social positions of businessmen (Buğra 1994). I suggest that the relationship between the businessmen and the state can be traced to the functioning of cultural and artistic establishments that were formed in association with the businessmen and conglomerates they have founded. I also suggest that the orientation towards transnationalization observed in large conglomerates with respect to the macroeconomic changes (Öniş 2009) have been reflected in their initiatives in culture and arts, and private museums in this respect serve for the international recognition of the conglomerates associated with them. Pamuk (2014, p.292) suggested that capital groups and new holding companies that are conservative and akin to AKP have become prominent during the course of AKP rule, whereby the relationship between the political power and capital groups have been expanded. I

suggest that the recent rise of interest towards art and culture among these groups is associated with this particularity.

The analytical turn towards globalization in Turkey has been reflected in the increased focus on İstanbul as the locus of attention (Keyder & Öncü 1993; Aksoy & Robins 1994; Keyder 1999; Aksoy 2008 and 2012; Göktürk, Soysal & Türeli 2010). In recent years, the research on İstanbul has become popular and concentrated on the project of globalizing İstanbul and making it an internationally competitive city, and its ramifications. One of the offshoots of an increased focus on İstanbul in this respect, is turning the city into a center of culture, arts and tourism (Aksoy 2008 and 2012), whereby corporate philanthropists compete to initiate their own art and cultural centers. Although Recep Tayyip Erdoğan distanced himself from the global city project as the candidate of conservative and Islamist Welfare Party during the course of municipal elections, soon after he became the mayor of the city, he came to an understanding with the Turkish bourgeoisie, focused on the city as a business opportunity, and internalized the global city project (Bora 1999). Yet, the addition of an alternative signification conforms with the Islamist discourse and neoliberal ideology (ibid). When Tayyip Erdoğan established the AKP in 2002 and came to power as the Prime Minister, İstanbul had become the center of AKP's operation guided with the mission of globalization and prevalence of neoliberal values in the party (Aksoy 2012). The vision of İstanbul "as a city that is globalised and gentrified, providing orderly and cleaned-up public spaces and residential quarters, with an attractive public image, world-class services and goods" was brought by the two elite groups, secular professionals and Islamic-oriented, which had been polarized until recently (Aksoy 2008, p.80). Most importantly, as Aksoy (ibid) argues, the opening of the cultural field is "underwritten by the gentrified class-base of the neoliberal regime".

On these grounds, I discuss the legal framework enabling privatization of culture under the AKP rule and evaluate on the characteristics of Law No: 5225 "Law of Incentive for Culture Investments and Enterprises" enacted in 2004, amending Decree Having Force of Law No:178 and Some Other Laws, Circular in 2005, and the tax incentives introduced by these amendments. I also elaborate on the

recent amendments in 2006 on Regulation on Private Museums and Supervision. I suggest that these laws and regulations constitute the legal framework that enhance the lucrative character of arts sponsorship and support in culture and arts through remarkable tax incentives for art and cultural investments and enterprises. Following DiMaggio's (1991, p.268) argument on "models of diffusion", I suggest that Regulation on Private Museums and Their Supervision forms the national infrastructure for the diffusion and spreading of private museums and frames the organizational model. While these regulatory changes constitute a major strand in the cultural policy orientation towards privatization in AKP rule, withdrawal of the state from the role of provision of culture and arts has been observed in AKP's stance toward state cultural institutions (Aksoy & Şeyben 2014).

Reviewing the major private initiatives and enterprises in arts and culture in the post 1980's, I outline the prominent characteristics of the field, which are: orientation towards contemporary arts among the private actors who support arts; the prominence of banks as agents participating in arts sponsorship and establishing institutions focused on contemporary arts; expansion of interest in establishing private museums; competition of large conglomerates in the field; focus on internalization; and instrumentalising İstanbul as a means towards this end. These characteristics demonstrate an expansion of interest on arts and DiMaggio's (1991, p.273) statement for the U.S. case, production of experts as an effect of the expansion of interest, is relevant for the case of Turkey. Particularly, banks' initiatives facilitate the production of experts and professions in Turkey. Elaborating on examples, I suggest that recently corporate sponsorship of the arts has been professionalized, yet the impact of executive managers on the decisions given for art sponsorship is an important aspect to consider. While sponsorship is legitimized as part of "social responsibility" and as an act of "socially aware companies", private museums embrace the sponsorship. Consecutively, I argue that the infrastructure constituted for the proliferation and legitimization of sponsorship by the precursory establishments, such as İKSV, and banks' art and cultural centers, has been embraced by the private museums and has been incorporated into their organizational models.

In Chapter 7, I focus on three key businessmen, namely Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. I suggest that these three crucial businessmen played major roles in the two key aspects of structuring processes: “an increase in the extent of interaction among organizations”; and the “development of a mutual awareness among participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise” (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, p.148). They facilitated both in the field of philanthropic foundations, and thus, supported the structuring of the private museums in the long run. These three businessmen are directly related to the three private museums that I focus on in this study. The review of their autobiographies and biographies reveals that they are engaged in common enterprises under the framework of philanthropic foundations; thus their extent of interaction is not limited to their business enterprises and they are personally connected. While Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı portray “self-made men” (Buğra 1994, p.77) and “appear to be exceptions among the businessmen who, in general, form a well educated group”, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı portrays a well-educated businessman raised in an urban-rooted family. The differences in their social backgrounds have been reflected in their experiences with arts and culture. While, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’s family socialization, upbringing and educational attainment form the basis for his relatively more organic relationship with arts, Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı appreciated arts in later parts of their lives, following the enhancement of their economic and social capital. Bourdieu’s (1984) forms of capital are theoretically relevant for understanding the class-based differences in educational attainment and exposure to the arts and culture, and in life-styles among these three businessmen.

Vehbi Koç was the key figure behind the constitution of 1967 legislation on philanthropic foundations and the establishment of Vehbi Koç Foundation (1969). The philanthropic foundations in the United States formed the main source of inspiration for Vehbi Koç to set up a philanthropic foundation in Turkey. Sakıp Sabancı was influenced by this and adopted not only from the organizational model of a family holding company first established by Vehbi Koç in 1963, but also the organizational model of the Vehbi Koç Foundation, and established Hacı

Ömer Sabancı Foundation (Sabancı Foundation) in 1974. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was the leading businessman in the establishment of İKSV and he was also influenced by the examples abroad. His exposure to the arts in his early socialization and education in reputed schools provided him the basis for a taste in the arts, and he experienced festivals in Europe. He, thus, intended to form a philanthropic foundation in European lines in Turkey. He also established Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation in 1978. These three businessmen were the co-founders of Turkish Industry and Business Association (TÜSİAD) together with other businessmen, and this enhanced the extent of interaction among the businessmen and organizations. The idea of setting a museum first emerged in Vehbi Koç and he established Sadberk Hanım Museum in 1980 under the framework of Vehbi Koç Foundation, dedicating a museum to his wife and her collections. The emergent themes of institutionalization, permanence and family are all represented in the Sadberk Hanım Museum. Sakıp Sabancı oriented towards arts and collecting works by the effect of art consultants and art dealers in his social entourage. The competition among the Koç and Sabancı Holding was also reflected in the field of arts (Buğra 1994, p.185). Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's role is not only limited to the establishment of İKSV, which has contributed to both professionalization and structuration of the field, but also he personally committed to justify corporate supports in arts as part of the “socially responsible” entrepreneurial activity.

In Chapter 8, I examine three cases of private art museums: Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum (Sabancı Museum); İstanbul Museum of Modern Art (İstanbul Modern); and Pera Museum. The shared particularity of these three museums is that they are philanthropic foundation museums. Reviewing their history of founding, I examine the establishment of philanthropic foundation museum models in Turkey in these three pioneering cases. The analysis that I offer in this chapter is based on the analytical categories of missions, edifice, organizational structure, and funding. I argue that prior agencies, particularly Vehbi Koç Foundation, İKSV, and banks, offered the pivotal support for the structuration of private museums as an organizational field by being central for setting the legal infrastructure and consolidation of professionalization. Sabancı

Museum was founded by the Sabancı Family under the framework of Sabancı University which is an affiliate of Sabancı Foundation, thus associated with Sabancı Holding. İstanbul Modern⁵ was founded by Bülent Eczacıbaşı, Oya Eczacıbaşı, and Ethem Sancak, with Eczacıbaşı Holding as the major founder. Pera Museum was founded by Suna, İnan, and İpek Kırar under the framework of Suna and İnan Kırar Foundation. Suna Kırar is the daughter of Vehbi Koç and the Kırar Family is related with Koç Holding. The private museum model has been developed in association with the philanthropic foundations affiliated with the large conglomerates. Furthermore, the corporate philanthropists that are engaged both with respective large conglomerates and philanthropic foundations constitute the main resource of private museums. Following DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) argument on institutional isomorphism, I suggest that these characteristics facilitate isomorphic processes in the organizations of private museums, which refer to a resemblance between the organizational structures of large conglomerates, philanthropic foundations and private museums. This is reflected in the missions conveyed by private museums, their administrative organization and funding structure. The physical structure (building) in private museums constitute an axis of institutionalization, in which the relationship between the state and business interfere with the convergence or divergence of interest between the parties. While Sabancı Museum and Pera Museum own their building, which renders an advantageous position, İstanbul Modern operates in a building loaned by the local and central government. This jeopardizes the permanence of the institution and makes it vulnerable to government's stance. A difference in the

⁵ The Museum was firstly established under the institutional structure of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (İKSİ) which had been established in 1973 by Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, the founder of Eczacıbaşı Holding. However, İstanbul Museum of Modern Art abolished its institutional interconnection in 2005 and founded İstanbul Modern Arts Foundation in 2006 as an autonomous institution just for the Museum with the justification of growing faster. Nevertheless, the separation has prompted rumors that call attention to disagreement between two members of the same Family, namely Şakir Eczacıbaşı then Chairman of İKSİ and Chairman of Eczacıbaşı Group Bülent Eczacıbaşı. For more information: http://www.zaman.com.tr/sehir_istanbul-modern-kultur-sanat-vakfi-yla-yollarini-ayirdi_236369.html and http://www.zaman.com.tr/cuma_istanbul-modern-sanat-vakfi-kuruldu_299799.html, Accessed on August 15, 2014.

concentration in terms of collection is observed in these three museums. While Sabancı Museum concentrates on Turkish and Islamic Art, İstanbul Modern focuses on contemporary art and Pera Museum concentrates on orientalist art. These differences in concentration claim to be the major justification of the non-competitive character of the private museums. However, I suggest that despite their differences in concentration, the competition among these families has reflected in the very existence of private museums. Furthermore, shared missions of exhibition, education, and globalizing İstanbul yields a competition between the private museums, whereby İstanbul is the shared focus to gain international recognition and acclaim.

In Chapter 9, I conclude by suggesting that the foundation of these three museums has been laid with the corporate interests of the large conglomerates, interest of integration with the global capital, of leaving a concrete institutional mark in İstanbul, which has been instrumental in the process of integration with the global markets, and of being a part of the international capital. In this process, the competing big family holding companies which have been crucial in the economic sphere of the country have transported to the extended area of competition: the organizational field of private museums. In this respect, the organizational models of the museums, inherited the reflections of these aspirations and interests. The large conglomerates have utilized the institutional structures of philanthropic foundations and legal and professional infrastructure they have provided for realizing their interests in the organizational field of private museums. All these characteristics arguably have differentiated private museums in Turkey from their counterparts established on the grounds of artistic connoisseurship and with the influence of *élite's* artistic tastes. Therefore, the emergence of private museums in Turkey can be explained, in reference to the corporate interests guiding their emergence along with the personal interests of the corporate founders to be recognized as *élites* in society, in parallel with the examples in Western societies, which therefore manifests their conspicuous consumption in arts.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

The broad research question of this study is: How did the private art museums emerge in Turkey? Considering my central aim to explain the flourishing of private museums as organizational forms, I conducted documentary and archival research and semi-structured expert in-depth interviews.

2.1. Studying Three Pioneering Private Museums in Turkey

One of the conceptual tools of this research is *organizational field* described by DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p.148) as the “organizations that in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products”. Following this description I consider the private museums as an organizational field and following DiMaggio’s work on U.S. art museums, I concentrate on their construction as an organizational field in Turkey.

DiMaggio (1991, p.267-268) suggests that organizational fields “are meaningful to participants and include special organizations that constrain, regulate, organize and represent at the level of the field itself”. Based on this argument I have outlined the major participants and special organizations which might have been crucial in the structuration of the field in Turkey.

First of my sub questions is related with the agencies involved in the forming of private museums. The three private museums, Sabancı Museum, İstanbul Modern and Pera Museum that I focus in this study have been founded in 2000’s as initiatives of the private capital. They have been regarded as first as *özel müze* (private museum), second as a *vakıf müzesi* (philanthropic foundation museum). This guided me to think about the “private” part of the museum and hypothesized that these should be related with the large conglomerates (Sabancı Holding, Eczacıbaşı Holding and Koç Holding respectively) widely recognized by public as founders of these three museums. Other than conglomerates, the individuals

associated with these (and the individual capital owners-businessmen- associated with these conglomerates (who are at the same time family members and assumed higher managerial positions in the conglomerates and affiliated holding companies) appear as crucial participants of the field. Since the museums are recognized as philanthropic foundation museums the second important agency is the philanthropic foundations. Çizakça (2000, p.1) describes the *waqf* (*vakıf* in modern Turkish) as philanthropic foundation and the main definition of the *waqf* institution in the Islamic civilization is “a privately owned property, *corpus*, is endowed for a charitable purpose in perpetuity and the revenue generated is spent for this purpose”. Therefore, I focus on the philanthropic foundations as well and explored the ways that they interfere with the emergence of private museums.

State and business relations put forward by Buğra (1994) is important for suggesting state a role in the case of establishment of private museums. Buğra (1994, p.4-5) suggests that: “The overwhelming significance of the state in determining the course of business life appears as a key determinant of the character of business activity in Turkey. (...) Turkish businessmen see the state as the major source of their difficulties. They also know, however, that it is to the state that they owe not only their wealth, but also their position in society.” Since these museums are initiated by the businessmen who are the key participants of the business life in Turkey, I assumed that state is part of the process and explored how it is associated with the regulation and organization of private museums.

Furthermore, DiMaggio (1991) suggested that professionals were crucial in the moments of structuration of an organizational field, U.S. art museums. Following this, I suggested that professionals hired by private museums’ might have roles in the structuring of the field. Therefore, I focused on museum managers as well.

For understanding the emergence and organization of private museums, I also directly focused on the history of these three private museums. I conducted archival research.

I offer to develop a qualitative approach for studying the participants of the organizational field of private museums to understand the meanings and interests associated to the institution of private museums. The empirical data collected through documentary and archival research in this study has been subject to interpretative analysis. Social action is the primary focus of an interpretative sociology and hermeneutics (Weber, 1981). Hermeneutics refer to the in-depth inquiry into the text and reading the textual material while relating it to the whole, which can reveal deeper meanings. While the “researcher conducts the “reading” to discover meaning embedded within text. Each reader brings his or her subjective experience to a text (Neuman 2006, p.87-88). In this study I applied this method. While working with the texts and various documents, I lay emphasis on discovering the meanings embedded in the texts and documents, therefore the narratives, the inheritance of actors’ personal reasons, perceptions and aspirations, and the social context of the texts and documents have been produced.

I also hold on to the idea that social life is based on social interactions and socially constructed meanings, as put forward by the interpretative social scientists. When I study the data collected, I pay attention to who actually speaks; what do they hold as relevant; how do they define what they are doing in general and arts and private museums in particular, how do they explain and justify what they are doing, in what contexts they produce the meanings of their actions, and what kinds of meanings they assign to the contexts.

It is also important to note that my intellectual reasoning is embedded in reflexive sociology developed by Bourdieu (Swartz 1997) which argued that social science must be reflexive, it must study and criticize itself, which is necessarily political, and the goal of the social scientific research is uncovering and demystifying ordinary events (Neuman 2006, p.95). Moreover, I have a critical position, regarding the relationship between the private museums and capital owners. I am also concerned with the reproduction of social hierarchies and domination through cultural and symbolic practices such as collecting art works for example or supporting museums with donating artworks. I think in this respect Bourdieu’s sociology offers methodological insights since it “represents a bold attempt to

find a middle road that transcends the classic idealism/materialism bipolarity by proposing a materialist yet nonreductive account of cultural life” (Swartz 1997, p.7) which enables us to consider individuals’ or groups’ practices in relation to production of hierarchies and domination in modern societies.

2.2. Methods of Data Collection in Conglomerates

First, I focused on collecting data on Koç Holding, Sabancı Holding and Eczacıbaşı holding companies. Consecutively, I conducted online documentary and archival research on official websites of respective holding companies. Broad interest on the private initiatives in the field of culture and arts and particular attention towards the three affiliated conglomerates’ art and cultural initiatives in the field, and the major actors behind them guided my focus.

I particularly researched sites on their history to gain information on the establishment and historical development of the conglomerates, the actors behind their establishment and their major areas of activity. The founders of the conglomerates Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı appeared as crucial figures.

I conducted research on the institutional profile of the respective conglomerates to get acquainted with their organizational structure, administrative units, and executives. I particularly focused on the founders and their presentation by the conglomerates. I collected data on the art and cultural initiatives of the respective conglomerates by focusing on the section on “social responsibility” in their official websites and particularly “culture and arts” sections of social responsibility projects.

I concentrated on banks’ sponsorship programs because banks appeared as sponsors of temporary exhibitions, education programs of the private museums. They also appear as crucial in the field of culture and arts by participating in arts sponsorship. Therefore I conducted an online archival research in Garanti Bank, Akbank and Yapı Kredi Bank and focused on their programs of culture and arts and initiatives.

Respective large conglomerates include numerous manufacturing, distributing companies. Both Sabancı Holding and Koç Holding have banks and other service firms. Therefore, I also conducted a research on the affiliates of the conglomerates to find out the companies participating in arts sponsorship and their initiatives in arts and culture. Among those companies I particularly concentrated on Yapı Kredi Bank affiliated with Koç Holding, and Akbank affiliated with Sabancı Holding to collect data on their art and cultural initiatives.

2.3. Methods of Data Collection in Corporate Philanthropists

It is crucial to note that recollections especially are of great importance for this research. I used recollections not only in the form of interviews as mentioned above but also in the form of autobiographies. In this respect, I have benefitted from the autobiographies authored by Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and Şakir Eczacıbaşı. I also collected data from biographies written for Vehbi Koç and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. Besides chapters and sections on these businessmen's biographical information (family, city of birth, educational attainment, career orientation) I particularly focused on "charity work", "arts", "philanthropic foundation", and how they were told by the respective individuals. Autobiographies provided valuable contribution by providing information on the history of their exposure to arts, perceptions of them on arts and philanthropy, and how they started collecting practices, and how and in what contexts the idea of setting up a private museum had emerged. The narratives in the autobiographies also reveal how the philanthropic activities are justified.

The actors that engaged with museums: corporate philanthropists, museum professionals, respective family's members constitute another focus of my interest. Consecutively I searched for the interviews given by Güler Sabancı (Sabancı Museum), Oya and Bülent Eczacıbaşı (İstanbul Modern) Suna and İnan Kırarç (Pera Museum).

2.4. Methods of Data Collection in Philanthropic Foundations

I conducted research on the philanthropic foundations related with the respective conglomerates: Vehbi Koç Foundation, Sabancı Foundation, Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation, İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, İstanbul Modern Arts Foundation, Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation.

I collected documents regarding their history, founders, their activities and initiatives, particularly on culture and arts. I collected empirical data through official websites of respective institutions, Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey for finding information on their official establishment; I reviewed the publications of the respective foundations, newspapers for information on their activities and their representation.

İKSV has been a prominent institution in the field of culture and arts. Particularly İKSV's publication *İ-KA-SE-VE* by Baliç and Ermiş (2013) that presented 40 years of the history of the foundation has been an important source of information for this study. The book includes narratives of 370 persons collected through interviews and archival research. The chapters of the book is organized by years from 1973 (establishment of İKSV) to 2012. It provided information on the relationship between the İKSV and Eczacıbaşı Family and family members, the relationship between İKSV and arts sponsorship, the relationship between İKSV and culture industries, relationship between the state and İKSV, and institutionalization process of a particular organization which is associated with the broader social, economic and political context. I also collected data from conducting online archival research from the official website of İKSV.

Relevant chapters and sections of the autobiographies and biographies of Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and, Şakir Eczacıbaşı are also important sources of information for the history of the philanthropic foundations and important moments of their institutionalization. In addition, I conducted a semi-structured in-depth interview with the General Manager of Sakıp Sabancı Foundation in 2014, İstanbul. The questions of the interview were structured

around the themes of activities, organization of the foundation, museums and funding.

2.5. Methods of Data Collection in State Institutions and Regulations and Laws

I conducted online documentary and archival research on the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, particularly the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums. I conducted an expert interview with the Department Head of the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums in 2013, Ankara. I reviewed the literature on cultural policies, particularly on the Republican Era, Democrat Party Era and AKP Era which are conceived as important periods in the history of modern Turkey.

I further consider state as an active agency in the emergence of private museums. The main assumption behind this is the consideration of state's role in framing and shaping economic and cultural policies. Consecutively, I collected documents on legislation and regulations on philanthropic foundations, incentives for private enterprises and support in arts, tax policies and private museums. Official Gazette of the Turkish Republic, General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Revenue Administration have been the main sources of information. I traced the amendments by collecting information from the Official Gazette of the Turkish Republic. Particularly for the AKP Era, I collected information on TÜSAK draft bill, controversial issues of closure of Atatürk Cultural Center, closure of state and municipality theaters from newspapers.

2.6. Methods of Data Collection in Sabancı Museum, İstanbul Modern and Pera Museum

Second sub-question that is relevant with the broader research question is about the roles of the actors in the emergence of private museums. I hypothesized that corporate philanthropists, act in relation with their corporate and personal interests,

aspirations and missions. Correspondingly, I read the autobiographies of crucial businessmen who are associated with the corporations and philanthropic foundations.

I collected documents on three private museums. I conducted online documentary and archival research on private museums. I collected data from the official websites of museums, searched for their history of establishment, past and current exhibitions, collections, administrative structure, education programs, sponsorship programs, museum and exhibition sponsors, press releases (ex: exhibition openings, awards, receptions, international partnerships). I also searched for the newspaper and magazine articles for the establishment of museums, temporary exhibitions organized by museums, acquisitions for museums. Moreover, exhibition catalogs, brochures, posters of exhibitions, and tickets have been collected.

Visits to the museums and participant observation contributed to the understanding of the portrayal of the private museums. In this respect some of the exhibitions I have seen include: Turkey by Magnum (2007), Andreas Gursky (2007), What, How & For Whom (11th İstanbul Biennial) 2009, Hussein Chalayan:1994-2010 (2010), Paradise Lost (2011), Untitled (12th İstanbul Biennial) 2012, Modernity? Perspectives from France and Turkey (2013) exhibited at the İstanbul Modern; Picasso in İstanbul (2005-2006), Master Sculptor Rodin in İstanbul (2006), Salvador Dali: A Surrealist in İstanbul (2008-2009), While a Country in Changing (2011-permanent exhibition), SSM Arts of the Book and Calligraphy Collection (permanent exhibition), Rembrant and His Contemporaries- The Golden Age of Dutch Art (2012), Turkish Painting from the Ottoman Reformation to the Republic (2014) and Sakıp Sabancı by Kutluğ Ataman (2014) exhibited at Sakıp Sabancı Museum; İstanbul: The City of Dreams, Portraits from the Empire (2005-2008), Frida Kahlo and Diego Rivera (2011) exhibited in Pera Museum. Observation in the private museums provided an understanding of the use of the physical space as a combination of permanent collection space, temporary exhibition space and administrative unit. It also contributed to the understanding of the integration of

commercial sites into the private museums such as restaurants and book and design stores. The observation of the private museums also provided a familiarity with the major public of the private museums, their commercial activities and organization of visiting practices and services offered for visitors.

In addition to the documents and observations in the respective museums, the data collected via semi-structured expert interviews. I have conducted interviews with the Chief Operating Officer and Chief Curator of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art in 2013, Incoming Exhibitions Manager of Sabancı Museum in 2013, İstanbul. In addition to these interviews, I have also conducted expert interviews with the CerModern's Sponsorship Director in 2012 in Ankara, Elgiz Museum's Director and her Assistant in 2013, İstanbul, Director of Sadberk Hanım Museum in 2014, İstanbul. These expert interviews provided additional insights on organizational models, which I believe provided a comparative perspective, regarding the structuration of the field of private museums. Particularly the interview that I conducted at the CerModern provided insight regarding the differences between İstanbul and Ankara. Specifically, the emphasis on the difficult experiences in finding external financial support for the temporary exhibitions directed my attention towards the center-periphery issue in the private support for the arts.

In-depth interviews with the museum professionals are structured around the themes of private museums' establishment history, missions, exhibitions and activities and funding structure.

2.7. Methods of Data Collection in Professionals

The recent organizations of private museums have been supported by the professionals that were engaged in various precursory organizations. Therefore universities, philanthropic foundations, banks' institutional initiatives in culture and arts and public institutions provide the source of professionals. First, I collected data on the managers of the respective three museums, the curators of the temporary exhibitions through online archival research on Sabancı Museum, İstanbul Modern and Pera Museum. Then I collected biographical data on Emin

Mahir Balcıoğlu (Sabancı Museum founding director), Nazan Ölçer (Sabancı Museum Manager), Levent Çalıkoğlu (İstanbul Modern Director), Özalp Birol (Pera Museum Director) from the institutions they have been affiliated and from professional databases. I also searched for interviews given to newspapers and magazines by these professionals.

I want to emphasize that, autobiographies and biographies of businessmen, the publications of the private museums and philanthropic foundations, most of the press releases of the conglomerates, private museums, newspapers (Hürriyet, Cumhuriyet, Radikal, Tercüman, Zaman, Yeni Şafak and so on), legal documents (regulations, laws, circular) are published in Turkish. I translated the quotations that are taken from these resources.

2.8. Data Analysis

Systematizing the empirical data collected was a challenging experience that continued throughout the research. I verified the sequence of events and steps of the emergence of the private museums in order to support my causal arguments. In this respect, I developed an analysis which includes descriptive details as well as theoretical analysis.

I developed explanations and generalizations which are close to empirical data collected, and relevant with the political, economic and social context, and institutional setting explored throughout the research. In this respect the outcomes of this research is grounded in concrete details. The purpose is to present a coherent picture of the emergence of the private museums by organizing specific details of the process.

I used narrative analysis as part of my research. I view the narratives presented in the recollections and press releases particularly important for telling the story of museums and their stance in the public. While presenting chronologically linked chain of events associated with private museums, I consider the narratives as an expression of lived events, and as a form in which various actors construct their social identities and locate themselves in the broader social, economic and politic

contexts. However, it is important to note that the difficulty that lies in reading and inquiring narratives is the self-reflection aspect. I sometimes felt that I am part of the narratives that other social actors have built. Nonetheless, what I attempted to do is capturing their ordinary lived experiences and the meanings they have associated with them. In this respect, as an individual social actor often times I felt my personal biography and life-style are part of the format that is presented here. In this respect my subjectivity is included as a storyteller, through the story I have built around the cases I have been inquiring. Often, I have felt that my emotions towards the companies, the private museums and philanthropic foundations, my reflection on their activities and exhibitions, personal experiences through visiting museums are part of the story that I have told.

In this respect, some of the occasions are especially important to reflect upon. Two of them occurred during my conversations with an art historian and an academic in her office. While I was explaining her, my point of departure and my focus on private art museums, she replied: “What will you do studying the private museums? Museums are our fields of study. If you are a sociologist go and study the television programs. Grab the gallery catalog over there (meaning her bookcase and indicating with her finger, I took from the shelf and brought). Look at it! It’s a gallery. Our private museums have could not even be galleries as such.” When I told her that I intended to speak with museums’ staff, she replied: “What will they tell you? They are just officers. What will the Chairs do to you [referring to staff of museums], you know? They throw you out of work just because they did not like the way you walk”. This occasion on one hand, guided me think of the configuration of possessions of intellectual fields and the intellectuals’ mechanisms of generating distinction. On the other rejuvenated my perceptions on the hierarchical structures within the private art museums which are based on the existing social inequalities and reproduction of them. Development of my ideas on the issue of hierarchies, and the respective position of capital owners in these hierarchies was once more supported with another occasion. Our interview with the chief curator, which I had waited about two more hours than my appointment

outside, ended in the middle without a hesitation of my respondent due to the arrival of the Chairman of the affiliated corporation.

Another occasion guided me to think about the museums' physical structure (building) more carefully. During the course of my visit, to one of the first private art spaces initiated by a corporation, located next to the headquarters of corporations in İstanbul. On a weekday, the institution calling itself as a private museum concentrating on contemporary arts was not occupied with visitors. I was the only one inside to see the exhibition. I had conversations with the museums' few number of staff and one of them showed me the floor and said: "Do you see the marks on the floor?" I replied "Yes" since I saw some black marks as if a vehicle passed. She explained that the place was used as an automobile gallery for a company before it had become an exhibition space. When I wondered about the positioning of a painting on the wall, which seemed to me placed a bit high, she explained that the same painting was placed in the staircase of the residential house of the owners of the museum before. That was why they preferred to see it 'that way' in their museum as well. These cases directed my attention towards the physical structure required for the private museum to be established. Moreover, these occasions guided me to explore the 'owners', their relationship with their art and cultural initiatives, and the reflection of their interests in the practice of establishing private museums.

Bringing the data collected in data analysis has been a challenging experience guided mostly by the theoretical framework put forward by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), DiMaggio (1991). When I concentrate directly on three cases of this study, I incorporated the effect of precursory institutions that offered crucial support for the structuring of an organizational field: private museums in Turkey. Therefore I concentrated on the dimensions at which the philanthropic foundations and banks' provided the infrastructure that support the institutionalization of the private museums.

I concentrated on the missions, organizational structure, funding structure and physical structure (building) of the three private museums and attempted to reveal

interconnectedness between the precursory organizations and the private museum's organizational model.

In addition to the precursors of private museums, the broader setting of the post 1980's was guiding for analyzing the interconnectedness between the philanthropic foundations established by conglomerates and/or corporate philanthropists and the private museums. Particularly, globalizing İstanbul (Aksoy 2012) and the studies on "globalization and İstanbul" were guiding for exploring the convergence of the missions of all participants involved in the structuring processes. Globalizing İstanbul, and thus integrating with the global markets, served as cement combining various agencies outlined above.

Furthermore, as DiMaggio and Powell (1983) suggested that "[o]nce a set of organizations emerges as a field, a paradox arises: rational actors make their organizations increasingly similar as they try to change them" and they outline various hypotheses on the impact of factors on *isomorphic change*. This argument and hypotheses put forward was guiding and I elaborate on the similarities between different sets of organizations: conglomerates, philanthropic foundations and private museums.

Studying the emergence of one organizational field, the private museums, in Turkey is a complicated task. Various actors and agencies are engaged in the field. I focused on large conglomerates, corporate philanthropists, philanthropic foundations, state and professionals as participants of the field. I used combination of different methods of documentary and archival research and expert in-depth interviews in data collection. Archival research allowed deeper focus and offered the possibility of exploring the emergence of the field over time. One of my major concerns was to reveal the meanings attributed by the individuals and large conglomerates to the arts, museums and philanthropic activities. I offered an interpretative analysis for the empirical data collected on particularly there conglomerates in Turkey, namely Koç, Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı, three crucial figures Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, respective families' members as corporate philanthropists through documentary and archival research.

My second broad aim was to reveal the relationship between the private museums and various participants of the field-large conglomerates, corporate philanthropists, state and professionals. In this respect, extensive focus on three private museums by collecting data via documentary and archival research and expert in-depth interviews supported my inquiry on construction of private museums in Turkey as an organizational field.

CHAPTER 3

MARKET EMBRACES ART AS COMMODITY and CAPITAL:

ART and BUSINESS

The economics of culture and arts developed a literature since 1960s. Baumol and Bowen's (1966) work *Performing Arts, The Economic Dilemma*, has been regarded as one of the primary works which uses an economic perspective and focuses on art as an area of economic study. Although cumulating literature on economics of art and culture digs in productivity, demand and supply relationship, the contribution of arts to the economy, the structure of the art market, return rates on investments in art works, artists' labor market, the economic role of culture industries more than the sociological investigation on the actors in this "business", it build a productive ground to study the individual and corporate actors by emphasizing the rising importance of the arts as a crucial sector in the world economy. Nonetheless, the literature developed in the 1990s and 2000s on the economic organization in the arts, sheds light on the neoiberal economy and the neo-liberal understanding of culture and arts. The development of the phenomenon in the USA and UK, Reagen and Thatcher effect on the markets and ongoing reforms in the budget cuts and taxes, privatization in different domains as well as culture politics in this line of thought, once more stressed the role of corporations and corporate actors in shaping the market; as well as culture.

3.1. Commodification of Art

It is undeniable that culture has become a commodity of some sort as Harvey (2002) suggests, yet there is still a widespread belief that there are cultural products and events have something special which separates them from ordinary commodities which are produced in the factories and subjects of consumption. Considering the visual artworks, in advanced capitalist societies, this situation is glaring in which the exchange value of the paintings becoming even more clearly distinguished by the developments regarding the growth of the commercial trade of the artworks. The twenty-first century practices of the trade in arts cannot be

divorced from the lucrative sales, increasing significance of international art fairs, the auction houses which have expanded their areas of activities world-wide, and most importantly from the broad range of existing and potential collectors of art. For example, auction houses Sotheby's and Christie's⁶ hold their major sales of contemporary art twice a year in New York, in May and November, and three times a year in London in February, June and October respectively and together they control the 98 percent of the global auction market for the art (Thornton, 2008, p.5). There are variety of issues to consider regarding the commerce of arts such as the institutions and actors involved in the process, the factors that are effective in the determination of the prices of the artworks, the economics of culture and arts in contribution to the economy and how commercial activities regarding the artworks are interrelated with the classification in arts and so on. As Bourdieu argues (1985, p.16) besides being a commodity associated with a commercial value, a cultural object, such as an artwork is also a symbolic good, which has a specifically cultural value and although symbolic goods cultural value and commercial value remain relatively independent, "the economic sanction may come to reinforce their cultural consecration". The special characteristic according to Harvey (2002, p.94) is what makes these products "cultural" and although the boundaries between these two types of products is increasingly "porous" the analytical separation between two types of products has been maintained on the grounds of understanding cultural products as authentic, existing on the "higher plane of human creativity and meaning".

The development of the perception of an artwork as an "object" and transformation of it into a material good to an object of commerce is two important features of process of selling and purchasing of an artwork have been two

⁶ Sotheby's is a transnational corporation which was originally established in 1744 in London Britain and now have an headquarter in New York City. It is one of the world largest brokers of fine art and decorative arts, jewelry, real estate and collectibles. The company operates auction, finance and art dealer services. Christie's is a fine arts auction house and currently it is the world's largest by its sales. It has two headquarters in London and in Rockefeller Plazara in New York City. Both of the companies are holding companies and have multiple offices around the world. For a detailed analysis on how auctions work: Ashenfelter, O. (1989). How auctions work for wine and art. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 23-36.

important characteristics of the emergence of commercial activities regarding the fine arts. While in Middle Ages, intellectual and artistic life was dominated by external sources of legitimacy such as the church and aristocracy, emerging within the Renaissance and throughout the classical age, artists and intellectuals have become autonomous, which Bourdieu (1985) refers as “autonomization” of the artists and intellectuals. Artists, freed from the demands and subordination of religious or political interests could produce in their own sphere, with their choice of form and style, however paradoxically this autonomization, the end of dependence on a patron or collector, the end of dependence on direct commissions, is only a “formal liberty” for the artists “it constitutes no more than the condition of their submission to the laws of the market of symbolic goods, that is, to a form of demand which necessarily lags behind the supply of the commodity (in this case, the work of art). “They are reminded of this demand through the sales figures and other forms of pressure, explicit or diffuse, exercised by publishers, theatre managers, art-dealers” (ibid, p.16).

The consideration of work of art as an object is also an important aspect of the development of a critical analysis of the particular works of art. According to Williams (cited in Durham and Kellner 2001, p.141) all forms of critical theory are theories of consumption which have been concerned with the “understanding an object in such a way that it can be profitably or correctly be consumed” and he argues that following the earliest stage of consumption theory developed on the notion of taste, emerged the more elevated notion of sensibility in which the critical activity and the practice of reading and consuming the works of art has been regarded as a function of it, and later with the of New Criticism “the language of the work of art as object” became more overt. Williams further argued that this have had important theoretical consequences in which the social conditions of production were neglected and believed to be secondary and the habit of regarding work of art as an object and reducing it to its components came to be prevalent (ibid). As an alternative view, Williams offers the discovery of the practice and then its conditions:

The relationship between the making of a work of art and its reception is always active, and subject to conventions, which in themselves are forms of (changing) social organization and relationship, and this is radically different from the production and consumption of an object. It is indeed an activity and a practice, and in its accessible forms, although it may in some arts have the character of a singular object, it is still only accessible through active perception and interpretation (...) What this can show us here about the practice of analysis is that we have to break from the common procedure of isolating the object and then discovering its components. On the contrary we have to discover the nature of practice and then its conditions (1980, inside Durham and Kellner 2001, p.142).

Williams' emphasis on the nature of practice can be regarded as an attempt to rejuvenate Marxist cultural tradition and offering a new point of departure than beginning with consumption. Nevertheless, focusing on factors such as determination of the price of the works of art, for example, can provide potential incorporation of the relations and practices involved in the provision of cultural goods into the market with the symbolic interests shared between the actors who determine the prices and the actors who consume the cultural goods. In this respect Velthuis' (2005) work *Talking Prices* can be regarded as a recent attempt. The association of an artwork with a numerical value is the moment where the logic of economics and arts interfere with each other. One can observe extremely high prices associated with certain art objects while some others cannot even enter the market or use the mechanisms to appear in galleries or art exhibitions. The question how the prices of the artworks are set and how the business and arts interfere and what kinds of meanings prices of artworks convey has been an area of inquiry. As the literature on sociology of arts suggest, "aesthetic, artistic, or cultural values are socially constructed: the value of an artwork does not reside in the work itself, but is, under conditions of uncertainty, produced and constantly reproduced by artists, intermediaries, and audiences, subject to numerous conventions and cultural codes of art worlds" (Velhuis 2005, p.160). According to Velthuis (2005) prices are far from being abstract numbers, rather they convey various meanings for trading partners in which they have symbolic meanings for collectors and dealers, in which the price not only indicate the quality of the artwork but also the identity of the collectors who buy the artworks and can be symbols of status.

In addition to the symbolic meanings associated with the practices of arts consumption, recently, the studies on art directed towards the exploration of the dynamics of the art market in which the organization of the artworld within art galleries, art auctions (Ashenfelter 1989; Mei and Moses 2002; Throsby 1994; Pesando 1993) besides the art fairs, the prizes given by the corporations and the art biennales have been given special attention. Research has shown that not only the consumption of art works is stratified but also the artworld, in which different actors such as artist, dealer, curator, critic, collector and auction-house expert either directly involved in the commercial activity on a regular basis or not reside in “symbolic economy” which is structured around hierarchies and class differences (Thornton, 2008).

In United States, the growth of the art market is also associated with the attribution of a commercial character to the works of art and the blurring distinction between the art galleries as commercial sites and museums, besides the increasing number of new museums in New York and the art galleries in the 1930s that fostered the individuality and autonomy of the artists:

From a marketing point of view, the establishment of museums of modern art not only certified the aesthetic worth of contemporary artists but also helped to drive up the commercial value of their work. This blurred the original distinction between art museums and art galleries (Zukin, 1989, p.87).

Furthermore, art dealers as new actors who mediate between the bourgeoisie and the artists facilitated the growth of an art market and most importantly affected the conception of museum in line with the market:

Art dealers also provided a service for collectors. They sold taste, status, and expertise as well as art. By showing a small number of works in the privacy of a “gallery”, the dealer evoked the high culture of an aristocratic private collection and the erudition of a museum within the familiar commercial milieu of a shop (Zukin 1989, p.85).

From 1965 and onwards, state supported art jobs multiplied. Government grants rose and it became a “multi million dollar industry.” “Demand built up to make art an integral part of “public spaces” (Zukin 1989, p.97). As Zukin suggests, artists of the 1960s were different then those of the nineteenth century artist of Paris with respect to their financial status. Since in contrast to Paris’ artists of the time,

1960s' artists were brought into white-collar labor force furthermore, "The growing similarity between artistic and other white-collar careers also brought the "artistic vision" closer to an ordinary middle-class world view (ibid).

They saw the same world that the middle class saw: a "continuous past" made by rapid social and technological change, the passing of industrialism and the devaluation of industrial work, and a mass production of art objects and cultural standards. In these conditions, art no longer either contradicted or negated the value of social existence, especially the life of the middle class. Instead, art found its function in representing the existence and its implicit existential *angst*. Far from "shocking the bourgeoisie," art became the aesthetic vision of the bourgeoisie (p.97).

Arts-and-crafts movement of the 1970s also manifests "how deeply art has been incorporated into many middle-class patterns of consumption" (Zukin 1989, p.98). Consumption practices of the fine art works, is not only limited with the purchase of originals by those who can afford to buy and collect, rather it has expanded to the industrial reproductions of fine art works such as fine art prints for example, and to supplementary industrial products such as reprinted mugs, keychains, clothing and so on produced for commercial purposes. Besides the commerce of fine art works mediated through the institution of private art galleries, auction houses and art fairs and the art dealers, in advanced capitalist societies, in addition to the mass-production of popular commercial art such as music videos, photography, animation, computer art, DVD's, films and so on with the progress in communication technologies and techniques in production within the culture industry, fine art works have also become the subjects of international trade and commerce. So it can be suggested that Adorno and Horkheimer's conception of culture industry have embraced the fine arts as well by popularization of some works through industrial production.

The unification of art and market, as two distinct yet harmonized categories not only transformed the understanding of art as commodity but also added an artistic perception to the commodities. In other words it is even argued that commodities are regarded as art works and investment (Mei & Moses, 2002) and there's a significant articulation of art works with the design, fashion and other mediums such as advertising.

Art has been associated with the notion of financial investment with the rising prices of the works of art, and distribution of art works within an international world market. In a context where the boundaries of nations, the politics, and the boundaries of the speculative markets blurred, the definition and the political aspect of arts dissolved, the institutionalization and social organization of arts gained importance. In a world where a piece of magazine advertorial can also be regarded as a work of art or multiply produced works such as plastic sculptures sell amounting to millions of dollars, the above mentioned characteristics of art, as unique and produced in line with the notions of beauty and aesthetics have been transformed. Conceptualization of art in our age, strongly dominated with the entitling of contemporary art which is highly associated with the above mentioned mediums as design and fashion. Besides this conceptualization, the construction of the social history of art has also been affected from this domination.

3.2. Corporate involvement in the arts: corporate sponsorship

The support of the arts by the wealthy individuals is an ancient phenomenon. Gaius Cilnius Maecenas, lived between 70 and 8 BC in the Roman Empire and known to be the counselor of the first Emperor of the Rome Caesar Augustus, and has also been referred as the person to explain the arts patronage due to his patronage of poets of the period Virgil and Horace (Encyclopedia Britannica, Gaius Maecenas). The name Maecenas has become a byword for a wealth, generous and enlightened patron of the arts and an eponym for the patronage in arts. (Wikipedia Gaius Cilnius Maecenas). The word Maecenas in English refers to “a generous patron especially of literature or art” (Webster English Dictionary Maecenas). In Turkish the word *mesenlik* has been used to refer to arts patronage (Şeni 2009; Aydemir 2012; Kösemen 2012). Although the use of the term dates back to early 16th century (Webster English Dictionary) and mainly regarded as a type of financial support given to the artists in the medieval and Renaissance period and patrons such as Medici of Florence has been studied in detail, especially by the art historians, the peculiarities and the reasons behind the financial support given to the arts by the wealthy has been changed in time. In modern capitalist societies, the financial support given to the arts, arts institutions,

cultural activities should be studied in reference to the supporting actors involved in the process and their reasons in pursuing not only by referring to the production of art, the distribution and consumption of it but also how these all are connected to the functioning of advanced capitalist societies and the production of social classes. In this respect, in an era in which the corporations appear as important actors not only in the economic sphere but also in social and cultural spheres, the relationship between how they produce and shape a relationship between the arts carry importance.

The coupling of art and business appears contradictory if the social role and the critical function of art works are considered. The reason behind this contradiction stems from the stance of business by definition which is “the activity of making, buying, or selling goods, or providing services in exchange of money” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2014) which often treats the arts objects as goods which are purchased either for investment, exchange or for to meet needs such as office decoration as discussed in the above section, which puts the critical function of art in question because of the blurring difference between the artworks and the business and commerce (Velthuis 2005). Most important however is the symbolic meanings of prices of art work on the market. As Velthuis (2007) argues prices of the artworks on the market, which are determined by variety of factors including contemporary art galleries, dealers mean more than the quality of the artwork to those who purchase artworks for their collections and other purposes, such as symbol of status, prestige in contemporary societies. The ways that corporations intervenes the sphere of the arts-its production, dissemination and consumption- is not limited with building either individual or corporate collections of work of art; rather, it includes ways of financially supporting the artists, production process of the artworks, exhibition of the artworks and cultural events. However, just like the purchase of the artwork embodies symbolic meanings, the issue of financial support given to the arts, whether in the forms of artist grants, awards or sponsorship of arts and cultural events and programs through sponsoring institutions working in the field, by corporations carry social symbolic meanings for corporations and corporate actors involved in the process. In this section I

specifically focus on the literature on the corporate sponsorship of arts and outline the themes and social significance of the phenomenon.

Dictionary meaning of the term sponsorship is described as “the financial support and general guidance for an undertaking”, while sponsor “is a person or an organization that pays for or plans and carries out a project or activity” (Thesaurus Dictionary). Inherent in the meanings of sponsorship and sponsor, the act of supporting an undertaking financially, an event/activity/project, a person or an organization need to be discussed in relation to the social context and frameworks that make it possible for establishing sponsorship as a socially recognized and legitimated phenomenon. Furthermore, the social positions of the corporations and especially the corporate actors, the sponsors, should be the subjects of critical discussion for revealing the dynamics of power relations in contemporary societies.

Although the types of sponsorship may vary from sports to entertainment, my main focus is the culture and arts sponsorship and its implications and consequences. In this section, the purpose is to lay out the history of the emergence of culture and arts sponsorship and how it embraces the contemporary understanding of arts and how it is organized in the most significant cases of USA and UK with respect to broader dynamics of corporate culture and neo-liberalism. Furthermore, I present a brief account on the history of the emergence of culture and arts sponsorship in Turkey, and the literature on the phenomenon and its peculiarities and deficiencies.

I use the term sponsorship as a form of financial support given to cultural events such as festivals, museum exhibitions or performing arts and funding the related expenses of exhibitions such as the transportation, technical equipment, press and so on either partly or fully by corporations in which the company’s support given is promoted and advertised as Martorella (1996, p.7) defines the term. Furthermore, current corporate sponsorship of arts is considered as a way of directly promoting the companies’ economic and communication goals in which the arts events are utilized to raise public awareness in line with companies’

interests in image building and reaching the target group (Kössner 1996, p.104). Even the terms such as “promotion” and “advertising” denotes to a corporate economic benefit to a certain extent, the issue cannot be studied by limiting it to this aspect. The literature developed in the field of business and arts addressed the issues regarding the reasons of the corporate interest in arts, the economic, political and social conditions that facilitate corporate involvement in arts, corporations preferences in the styles of arts, artists, the role of the decision makers in the process of corporate support and the corporations’ justification mechanisms of their support in arts towards their stockholders and their communities, and most importantly the implications of corporate sponsorship in arts which can be understood in relation to social reproduction and power relations in contemporary societies.

In this respect, I argue that first, the corporate sponsorship of arts and cultural programs (sponsoring of cultural events such as music, cinema festivals, concerts from popular rock concerts to classical symphony orchestra concerts, historic restorations) should be studied from a critical sociological perspective in which sponsorship phenomenon regarded as in relation to the corporate cultural politics which define and shape culture in global societies and legitimize corporate interests in cultural, social, economic and political spheres as well as exposing corporate stake in institutional and communal discourses and values (Rectanus 2002). Second, it is very important to approach the emergence and legitimization of corporate sponsorship of arts and culture as a form of “corporate intervention” (Wu, 2005) in the spheres of culture and arts, by considering the interrelationship between the rise of the phenomenon, the rise of business and the changing cultural policies of the respective countries studied.

The studies of the cases of United States and Britain in literature are especially important in the establishment of a field for those who intend to study corporate involvement in arts, the social importance of business and arts relationship and the social consequences of the respective relationship. Corporate arts sponsorship and broadly speaking, the relationship between the business and the arts have been vastly studied in the case of United States where corporate sponsorship of the arts

and corporate patronage have long been significant. In United States, corporate philanthropy was considered as a postwar phenomenon which have gained significance since the post 1960s, and “has been formalized by the increasing number of corporate foundations” (Martorella 1996, p.6-7) where the corporate support in arts have been encouraged by government by both legitimizing the arts as a form of civic support and providing tax incentives and initiatives such as the establishment of National Endowment for the Arts in 1965. The issue had gained significance in the case of United Kingdom since the 1980s and onwards and both the peculiarities of corporate collectors and the consequences of corporate intervention in arts have been studied (Wu 1996).

Valuable contributions to the literature dealing with the phenomenon appeared in late 1980s and onwards (Martorella 1990; Andersen 1991; Alexander 1996a and 1996b; Rectanus 2002; Wu 2005; Wyszomirski & Clubb 1989; Schuster 1985; Useem and Kutner 1986; Useem 1989; O’Hagan & Harvey 2000).

Wu (2005, p.16-17) focusing on the cases of United States and Britain, argues that the corporate intervention in arts and culture is a consistent and widespread phenomenon since the 1980s; through building art collections; having their own curators and arts departments, exhibiting their collections in both their respective countries and abroad by using their economic power; transforming their art galleries and art museums as vehicles of public-relations; establishing art galleries within the corporate organizations; establishing branches of public museums, modern corporations not only compete among each other through these mediums but also have taken over the already established social status and social functions of cultural institutions. Most important emphasis of Wu’s (ibid) analysis which explains the causes of the “harnessing of the power of corporate capital” and corporate sponsorship of arts, is the close association of corporate “intervention” in culture and arts with the changes in the policies in public art funding, in which free market policies of the 1980s and onwards and “the ethos of the Reagan and Thatcher decade” advocating the doctrine of free enterprise. Consecutively, by exploring the policies of Reagan and Thatcher in cultural sphere, and by referring to the discursive formulation of ‘public’ and ‘private’ and focusing on the art

museums and galleries, she conceptualizes the post 1980 period as “privatizing culture” due to the association of policies developed in respective cases, in the respective period such as tax advantages or for example projects initiated for providing cash incentives for those businessmen undertaking arts sponsorship, which paved the way through the intervention of private capital and corporations in the spheres of arts and culture.

Furthermore, like the purchase of the artworks by collectors who are from the business world and representatives of corporate culture, the corporate sponsorship of arts and cultural programs not only involve the corporations as actors behind the process but also in certain cases the actors such as company founders, chief executive officers, board directors who are closely associated with the companies, although through their affiliated corporations. Wu’s (2005, p.7) perspective builds upon two important concepts of Bourdieu (1984): cultural capital and social distinction in which, contemporary arts was conceptualized as part of the system of values and tastes and understood in the broader structure of the political, economic and social formations and regarded as a form of hegemonic ideology and its transmission from generation to generation serves for preserving and reproducing the “dominant position of the dominant class”.

She expands the use of Bourdieu’s (1984) concept of cultural capital. Wu (1998, p. 33) uses the concept while she evaluates on the corporate sponsorship of arts and the roles of *élites*:

By participating in arts sponsorship, these *élites* are using their corporate positions to advance their personal interest and social status. Slightly modifying Bourdieu’s theory, one could argue that these business *élites* are transforming the economic capital of the corporations that they oversee into cultural capital for their own personal purposes, while simultaneously acting in the corporate interest.

According to Wu (2005, p.22-23) although her study focuses on corporations, an implicit study of the corporate sponsorship of arts should include the corporate elites-board directors, general managers, big shareholders- in professional corporations, whose decisions not only determine the intervention of corporations in arts (Useem & Kutner, 1986) but also their effect in the arts intervention should

be understood in relation to their ambitions related with their social status and social class positions which can be considered as a medium for “social distinction”. In this respect, the study of corporate sponsorship in the cases of United States and Britain especially, is in strong dialogue with the literature developed on the issue of corporate elites and power (Useem & Kutner 1986; Useem 1978 and 1980; Zeitlin 1989; Philip Stanworth & Anthony Giddens 1974) in respective societies, and the significance of cultural goods in social structure and how they function as status symbols for those who consume them (DiMaggio 1991).

Another important issue to consider regarding corporate sponsorship is the relationship between the private funding of the arts and the art styles. Martorella (1990) studied the arts as part of corporate organizations. Martorella analyzes the incorporation of visual arts by the corporations and dwells upon the issues of corporate art patronage, the relationship between styles and mediums collected and the structure of the organization, by focusing on 234 art collections from variety of American companies in USA. Martorella (1990, p.4) focuses on the art chosen to be displayed in the office environment, or “found in interior lobbies” and defined “corporate art” as a notion referring to the inclusion of arts in the corporate organization rather than referring to an aesthetic category. Martorella (1990, p.5) regards the art collected by corporations as a social product in which the production of the art work is related with the liking of the corporate actors such as managers, chief executive offices, corporate personnel, consultants and dealers and whereby the selection of the works of art is based on corporate policies. Martorella (1990, p.5-6) states that “corporation as patron has come to be a significant consumer of contemporary and regional American art” in USA. As Martorella argues, “[e]ither as collector or publicist, the corporation in buying and exhibiting art realizes opportunities to gain public recognition and prestige. Art collections serve corporations well as expressions to both their public and rivals”. Moreover, “Patronage includes factors external to the artistic community. The marketplace, together with the collector, defines levels of taste and

connoisseurship; these in turn encourage certain styles to emerge and proliferate” (ibid).

In this respect Martorella (1990, p.182) defines corporate art as a metaphor for technological society whereby the styles of the works of art collected by corporations “devoid of the human form, and this subjectless art imparts the idea that real people are no longer in control or at the center of things”. The most important thing underlined here is how this kind of art, in which human beings has no relevance, is related with the legitimization of the “value system based on rationality and the principles of technological society” through the visual representation of postmodern society and how the corporate patron has been served by this art style:

Corporate selection of both important works of art and mass-produced works confirming to the requirements of the interior design come to symbolize a particular view of the individual and the nature of the society and become the basis for a corporate taste culture. The imagery contained within all art displayed in the workplace functions to disseminate and reinforce corporate ideology which, in emphasizing color, form, and design, taken collectively deprives art of its aesthetic, historical and political significance (Martorella 1990, p.180).

Works of art displayed in corridors, cafeterias, and lobbies lose their importance as aesthetic objects, taking their meaning from the immediate milieu. Consequently, the function they serve within the workplace redefines them, and they are seen as “décor (ibid.

It is important to note that, although relatively received more attention in United States and Britain in relation to the effect of large corporations and the significance of business activity in the respective countries, the issue of corporate sponsorship of arts is a world-wide recognized area of social speculation in the 1990s and onwards. An international account on the issue of sponsorship was provided by an edited volume (Martorella 1996) in which studies North and South American countries (USA, Canada, Brazil, Argentina), European countries (Britain, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Greece) and Asia and Pacific countries (Australia and Japan) were publicized.

Kenyon (1996, p.33-45) studied the corporate involvement in the arts in Canada, by focusing on more than twenty three leading arts institutions in the country

applying network analysis and content analyses. Kenyon (ibid) underlined the importance of the direct participation of the elites in the affairs in the high cultural institutions through trusteeship and patronage rather than the consumer activity in arts, and the social networks among corporate entities induced by arts organizations and found out that “high culture facilitates both class consolidation and elite integration” and consecutively serves to reproduce the prevailing power structure in the contemporary society. In this respect both the high-status museums and performing arts companies in Canada appeared as important institutions playing a role in the social reproduction of the prevailing power structure.

Argued by Gonçabate and Hajduk (1996, p.48) the origins of business support to the arts and culture in Argentina can be traced back to 1950s and 1960s and to the emergence of DiTella Institute which expanded its cultural activities during the period. The characteristics of business support in Argentina underlined by them are important in the sense that they resemble peculiarities in Turkey which shall be discussed in the following chapters. Especially as Gonçabate and Hajduk’s (ibid) focus of 1980s nonprofit organizations in Argentina reveals, “many important businesses, including banks and industrial groups, created their own foundations. Through them, they developed cultural programs, and some were able to achieve a high level of recognition”. Furthermore, Gonçabate and Hajduk (ibid) mentioned the Antorchas Foundation which was established by a wealthy industrialist which had become the prominent institution to provide scholarships to artists and subsidies to institutions and cultural projects. Nevertheless, during the 1980s the long-term policy for sustaining business and arts relationship was lacking in Argentina and mostly the support given to the arts had been in the form of the individual participation and financing, which was seen in the governance of cultural institutions’ initiatives by “traditional patterns of behavior and the expectations of the elite circles” which claimed to be reinforcing the social prestige of the ones participating in the events through their personal ties with the cultural institutions (ibid).

Businesses wish to associate with those institutions whose image is already legitimate and prestigious within society, and those that consequently provide greater diffusion and visibility. The personal contacts of the executives with

the directors of the organizations continue to be one of the reasons for their support, as are personal dedication and the work done by these institutions (Gonçabate and Hajduk 1996, p.52).

The formation of the industrial and commercial patronage in culture in Brazil was studied by Duran (1996). It is interesting to see that in the case of Brazil, the study of historical conditions under which the entrepreneurial class has been formed and the situation in 1990s in the country revealed that the pace for arts patronage has been set by the immigrants that came to Brazil from poorer regions of Europe and Asia who have gained economic and political power in the country. By focusing on the city of São Paulo in the period following the Second World War (1947-1951) Duran (1996, p.66-67) suggested that compared to United States and other developed countries businessmen in Brazil have shown only a weak propensity toward patronage in arts and in the period following 1980s “various prerequisites have been satisfied for an increasing presence in the sponsorship of culture”. One of the most important aspects of his study is the connection between the personalities from powerful families and the initiatives taken in the sphere of arts and culture. The examples are the case of the São Paulo Museum of Art established in 1947 by Chateaubriand who was the owner of newspaper, radio network and nationwide weekly magazine and benefitted by the money lent by politicians in the 1920s and big businessmen’s loans and donation and the founding of the São Paulo Museum of Modern Art in 1948 and the imitation of International Biennial for Plastic Arts in 1951 among other initiatives such as the establishment of a cinema company and a professional theater company by industrialist Francisco Matarazzo Sobrinho, from the most important family of immigrant origin Matarazzos, known as Ciccillo.

The recognition of corporate sponsorship of arts in Europe paved the way for networks to promote sponsoring of arts and cultural events in the European community. In 1991, European Commission and private sector funded CEREC, European arts sponsorship association was founded in response to the calls from the European Parliament for the promotion of business support for the arts (Vanhaerbeke 1996, p.84). As suggested by Vanhaerbeke (ibid) CEREC, comprising ten national associations and having access to more than one thousand

businesses, focused on the coordination of activities of its national member associations, provided information on European Commission matters which have a bearing on sponsorship, counseled arts organizations in forming firm relations with sponsors, encouraging business community in Europe for sponsoring arts by highlighting the similarities. Nevertheless, the differences among nations in terms of state regulations and forms of corporate intervention in arts are still important.

While in Austria, the independent association of companies, The Austrian Business Committee for the Arts (ABCA) founded in 1987 and has been recognized as the trend setter for its early recognition of the importance of arts sponsorship in Austria and giving way to sponsoring arts by the businesses by initiating art-sponsorship award titled as the *Maecenas* in 1989 (Kössner 1996). The role of foundations' in supporting arts in Germany has been underlined as an important shift in the late 1980s, considering the traditional perception which has viewed the state as responsible for the financing of the arts (Glasmacher & Strachwitz 1996). Glasmacher & Strachwitz (1996, p.114-16) focuses on The Dresdner Bank Arts Foundations and Hypo-Kulturstiftung as two cases from Germany. Glasmacher & Strachwitz (ibid) discuss the role of art foundations established by corporations and connote the "corporate foundations" term. According to them, the term has been used to refer to these foundations is misleading because are two main groups of foundations established by corporations; first there are foundations which are established by the owners of the private companies, depending upon the individual will. Second there are those which are established by the corporate body as a part of corporate communication strategy, which better deserve the term corporate foundations. Nevertheless, whether established by the individual will and interest in the arts of companies' executives integrated motives of the or an integrated part of the companies' communication or public relations strategies, the motives and interests behind the establishment of these institutions need to be considered.

Motives of corporate arts support are distinguished in four groups in Kirchberg's (1996) study on Potsdam, Germany; which are: social responsibility, image improvement, corporate identity improvement, personal interest of the chief

executive officer. Kirchberg (ibid) argues that while corporate social responsibility for the local community and corporate image and identity improvement appeared as salient motives in supporting arts in Potsdam, personal interest of the chairman and tax incentives appeared as less important factors for arts support.

Corporate support for the arts was recognized as a thriving phenomenon in the post 1980 period in Japan (Kyogikai 1996; Kawasaki 1996). As suggested by Kawasaki (1996, p.201) before the 1980s there had no legal or tax incentives in Japan and consecutively there were limited number of wealthy individuals who supported arts. They mainly have constructed and have managed their own museums; by the recognition of the need to make a contribution to the Japanese society, enterprises started to support arts and in 1990, The Association for the Corporate Support for the Arts was established.

It is important to note that although there are differences with respect to the ways of business intervention in arts, what is common in both cases is the tendency towards supporting contemporary arts. Wu (1996, p. 91) explains the reason behind this choice very briefly: “The appeal of contemporary art, however, lies in the mythological cult of artistic personality and the strong association between avant-garde art and innovation within the paradigm of modernism that has provided the business world with a valuable tool to project the image of itself as a progressive and innovative corporate force”.

Art’s role in business cannot be understood only with regard to the marketing and image making benefits that businesses gain from supporting the arts. Rather, AS Wu (1996) suggests the symbolic values of the cultural goods for the consumers should be considered. The high-profile status symbol that artworks embody is the important aspect to be considered where cultural goods, “are consumed for what they say about their consumers and themselves and to others, as inputs into the production of social relations and identities” (DiMaggio 1982, p.133 cited in Wu 1996, p.97).

The art museum provides a crucial site as an institutional formation for exploring the social conditions of cultural consumption and how individuals in society acquire cultural capital through differentiated ways of relating themselves with it. In this respect, I will explore the social significance of art museums in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF ART MUSEUMS

Nineteenth century is not only important for the transformation of the conception of art but also for the institutionalization of it. The art museums, in this respect are crucial institutions in which the conceptions and social roles of art have been manifested. The exploration of art museums is directly associated with the conceptualization of museums in modern societies. Museum, by definition refer to “an institution devoted to the procurement, care, study and display of objects of lasting interest or value; *also*: a place where objects are exhibited”⁷ (Theasarus Dictionary). As the definition refers museum is both an institution and a place for exhibiting objects of interest and value; which generate a necessity of exploring the social relations, practices and the social conditions it has been produced.

This chapter examines the major issues regarding the art museums, as the leading institutions emerged as a representation of the rationale of the modern world and played crucial role in forming modern nations and social identities by their roles in education and forming exhibitionary spaces.

In the advanced capitalist societies museums have remained to be reputable institutions and have been the organizations that gathered various actors and professions. The main aim of this chapter is to present a brief account on the relationship between the modernity and emergence of museums as institutions accompanying the claims of modernity, the relationship of the museums with the nation states, the ownership and control structure of art museums in the advanced capitalist societies in which art museum appear as a type of organization which

⁷ The Latin and Greek origins of the word are important here to mention. Latin *Museum* stands for the place for learned occupation, while the Greek origin is from *Mouseion* referring to the *Muses*. In Greek mythology, Muses are the goddesses of inspiration for literature and arts. While being the source of knowledge in Greek mythology, Muses are also the source of music, literature, poetry with their inspiration giving character.

heavily rely on external funding especially in the neoliberal era. Consecutively, the relevance of the funders, mainly the individual philanthropists, corporations, state institutions and government and foundations are discussed in this chapter through the exploration of cases of museums in United States' and United Kingdom, in which the majority of the literature on museums emerged.

This chapter seeks to develop a theoretical framework by reviewing the literature on museums and is in line with the argument that art museums are not only key institutions that institutionalize art, define and legitimize the artistic canons, but also crucial institutional organizations that constitute *organizational fields* (DiMaggio 1991) in which agents struggle in pursuit of their interests.

The literature on the museums, focus on different aspects of the museums such as the emergence and formation of museums museums' role in the making of modern culture (Bennett 1988 and 1995; Prior 2002; Duncan & Wallach 1980), the representation of the nation state in the museums and citizenship (Brubaker 1992; Duncan 1994), museums in the global era and their transforming identities (Macdonald 2012, Macdonald & Fyfe 1998) museums and social distinction (Bourdieu, Darbel & Schnapper 1991), museums and memory (Crane 2000), museum culture and construction of discourses in relation to power and knowledge (Sherman & Rogoff 1994; Hooper-Greenhill 1992), museums as education institutions (Hooper-Greenhill 1999) and funding of museums (Alexander 1996a and 1996b and 1996c; Dauber 1993; DiMaggio 1982a and 1982b and 1986a and 1986b; Meyer 1979; Netzer 1978; Useem 1987; Useem & Kutner 1986) and museums as organizational structures (Zolberg 1974; DiMaggio 1991).

Here, I conceptualize museum in general terms as historically and socially embedded space. My aim is to form a background for the study while trying to understand the dynamics of its constitution and institutional structure in the context of Turkey. This chapter seeks to reveal the building blocks of our discussion on the role of social classes and nation-state in the emergence of art museums as institutional forms.

The social history of the museums as modern institutions is broad subject of study. Some of the major guiding questions on museums are: How does the emergence of the museum and modernity are associated; how do museums function in the making of a modern culture; in what ways museums and the making of modern culture are associated; what is the importance of the exhibition space in museums in relation to social subjectivities; and in what ways the state is related to the museums. Consecutively, section 4.1. based on the existing literature, and is an attempt to present some of the critical arguments that is prevalent in the sociology of museums considering their relation with the history and modernity. Section 4.2 gives a brief account about the relationship between the museums and education. Section 4.3. discusses the interrelation between the notion of nation-state and the museum and focus on the critical issues raised regarding the specific relationship between the emergence of the two distinct yet interrelated phenomenon. Section 4.4. addresses the major issues regarding the actors involved in the funding of the museums and provides a presentation of the major discussions regarding the stance of art museums in the era of neoliberalisation in which the peculiarities of advanced capitalism such as the global competition, privatization and museums' dependency on external funding and marketing characterize the new functions of the museums in which they adopt roles of entertainment and build mechanisms to attract more visitors and facilitate cultural tourism.

4.1. Art Museums as Modern Institutions

Museums are considered as the vital institutions in the formation of powerful ideologies, categories and identities, perpetuating dominant national myths or providing cultural cement for socio-political order (Prior 2002; Sherman & Rogoff 1994). Theorizing the institutional character of museums as well as the museological space which is historically and socially embedded are complicated tasks since it requires the task of both outlining the characteristics of museological space and the nature of this embedding (MacDonald & Fyfe 1996).

Sherman & Rogoff (1994) develop a critical enquiry on museums, distinguishing themselves from the point of departure which considered museums as sites of architecture, of exhibition, of national or cultural narratives or of pedagogical and political projects. Museums are viewed as “the intricate amalgam of historical structures and narratives, practices and strategies of display, and the concerns and imperatives of various governing ideologies” (Sherman & Rogoff 1994, p. ix). The process of unmasking these discourses inherited in the very existence of the museums provides a basis for Sherman & Rogoff’s critical inquiry. The emphasis of the perspective asserts significant importance to the history of the museums while emphasizing the attempt of museums in concealment of this history by their enterprise. That is to say while the concept of museum emerges as a field of interplay between the social histories of collecting, classifying, displaying and entertaining it also stands as a legitimization of these social histories (Sherman & Rogoff 1994, p.x). Influenced by Foucault’s (1972) *Archeology of Knowledge* and his linguistic model to thematize the relations between the epistemic structures, disciplinary boundaries, the construction of internally coherent discourses and the play of power relations, Sherman & Rogoff, concentrate specifically on institution of the museums to explore the concepts museums embody which form the basis of their institutional practice and politics. Following the respective scholars, the concept of museum involves and embraces the notions of categorization and classifications of objects/artworks according to the notions such as the nation, an epoch/ a period in history, style, genre and so on; a context which can be understood broadly as a community; a public or an audience which it claims to serve. It is an acting institution, an organ since it serves to an audience by displaying the works of art. Yet, this activity itself, including those counted above are not free of discursive practices hence the power relations in the society. They present and represent a rationale of modernity and as Sherman and Rogoff would agree, conceal this making of the history. Therefore modernity, or in other words construction of a “modern” institution itself serves for a way of legitimizing the very existence of such an institution as well as legitimize what is understood by the “modern”.

The consideration of museum as an institutional structure that produces meanings is a prevalent topic in the museum studies. In addition to more recent edited volume, Sherman & Rogoff's *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles* (1994), Carol Duncan and Alan Wallach's (1980) essay "Universal Survey Museum", Eilean Hooper-Greenhill's (1992) *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge* can be counted as major works in this respect.

Hooper-Greenhill (1992) argues that museums are no longer built as "nationalistic temple of culture" as the British Museum once have recognized and in the present times almost everything can be transformed into a museum such as prisons, castles, warehouses and so on. Besides the changing nature of the experience in museum that converge with the experience in amusement sites, Hooper-Greenhill (1992) argues that the knowledge is offered by the museums as a commodity in which the ways of seeing is altered by the production of knowledge. Influenced by Foucault's work *The Order of Things*, Hooper-Greenhill according to Rice (2003, p.83) "sets out to interrogate how the museum's ways of classifying and displaying objects exclude some ways of knowing while presenting others as "common sensical". Furthermore, Rice (ibid) argues that "Hooper-Greenhill celebrates that aspect of Foucault's work that shows how the origin of what we take to be rational "as bearer of truth is rooted in domination and subjugation, and is constituted by relationship of forces and powers".

Duncan & Wallach's (1980) argue that museums share fundamental characteristics with traditional ceremonial monuments such as churches, shrines and certain type of palaces; museums embody and make the idea of the state, and just like other ceremonial monuments museums are ritual places where their function is mainly ideological. According to Duncan & Wallach's (1980, p.450) museum is a "complex architectural phenomenon that selects and organize works of art in a sequence of spaces. This totality of art and architectural form organizes the visitor's experience as a script organizes a performance. Individuals respond in different ways according to their education, culture and class".

Bourdieu, Darbel & Schnapper's (1991) work *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and Their Public* is based on the surveys with the visitors of European museums, and argue that the cultivated taste in arts, which has been the integral part of the social conditions of the museum practices is not innate rather it is a socially inculcated disposition which is distributed unevenly based on the class, sex and cultural background and education. As emphasized by Duncan & Wallach (1980, p.457) although the museum has been based on the idea that it belongs to the nation and therefore to all citizens, supporting the advancing of the illusion of a classless society, it "prompts the visitor to identify with an elite culture at the same time it spells out his place in the social hierarchy".

Rather than focusing on the actual reception of visitors, Duncan and Wallach (1980, p.450-451) emphasize the role of museum in prompting the ritual experience:

We are not suggesting that museum visitors think of their experience as a ritual process. Rather the museum itself –the installations, the lay out of rooms, the sequence of collections- creates an experience that resembles traditional religious experiences. By performing the ritual of walking through the museum, the visitor is prompted to enact and thereby to internalize the values and beliefs written into the architectural script. Here, works of art play the same role as in traditional ceremonial monuments.

Rice (2003, p.83-84) criticizes the analyses which "posit the museum not only as monolithic "bad guy", an instrument of so-called dominant culture, but also a "bad guy" who hides his tracks by obfuscating the nature of practices in which he engages" and further asks the question whether the public, which has been assumed by these analyses, to be receiving the concealed yet naturalized concepts of knowledge forced by the museums, is really that receptive. Rice (2003, p.77) as a museum professional, looks at the narratives of representation regarding both the institution and experience aspect of museums and argues that, there is a slippage between theory and practice which results in "illusory museum" or "series of illusory museum"s. I partly agree with her claims considering the ignorance of the power of visitor's reception in some critical studies nevertheless, I agree that knowledge is at least mediated by the presentation and display within the museum's environment. In this respect I find Hooper-Greenhill's (1992, p.1)

example important to make my claim explicit. Referring to the “new ethos of corporate involvement in museums” Hooper-Greenhill (ibid) gives the example of an advertisement appeared on 8 September 1990 in The Independent’s color supplement which was given by the sponsor of the Monet Exhibition at the Royal Academy in the autumn of 1990. The two of the the headlines are: “Discover how one man’s vision can change the way you look at the world.”; “Digital Equipment Corporation and its employees are proud to sponsor the exhibition that brings together, for the first time, the series paintings of Claude Monet” which is a “proclamation about how knowing can alter seing” (ibid). The interconnectedness of the ways in which the works of art are displayed with the formation of a certain kind of viewing experience is also significant for the analysis of whose claims are involved in the making of this specific display.

4.2. Museums as Educational Institutions

The consideration of museums as educational institutions and evaluating education as one of the major ways of justifying museums has been a prevalent issue regarding the social role of museums. The science museums have been referred as the sites of education and learning science (Chobot & Chobot 1990; Falk & Dierking 2000; Semper 2008). Regarding the role of art museums in education, the studies refer to their emergence and The French Revolution as an important rupture in the emergence of the museum as an apparatus of education through providing the conditions for its development (Hooper-Greenhill 1992, p.173; McClellan 1994). The education claim of the art museums is regarded as part of the wider recognition of civilization and claims over civilization (Duncan 1995).

The museum was established to ‘raise’ the level of the public understanding, to ‘elevate’ the spirit of its visitors, and to refine and ‘uplift’ the common taste. There was no ambiguity in this. Museums were created and maintained by the high for the low, by the couth for the uncouth, by the washed for the unwashed, by those who knew for those who didn’t but needed to know and who would come to learn. The museum was established to ‘do’; what was to be ‘done’ was the public. The museum was a place of inculcation (Weil 2007, p.32).

This remarkable conceptualization of the museum by Weil, leads to question the relationship between the education of public through museums and the construction of subjectivity. The museum generates two areas of speculation considering its disciplinary role: first, the art object which “is psychologized as an individual creativity and agency” and the “museum goer” who has been “produced as a subject of Enlightenment and a citizen of the nation state” (Lui 2005, p.218). While the museology of the nineteenth century temporalized the Enlightenment thinking, the museum restructured the orders of knowledge and became a “medium that organized art objects to be apprehended by the new discipline known as art history” (Ernst 2000, p.20 cited in Lui 2005, p.219). Lui (2005, p.219) refers to Lorente’s (1998 cited in Lui) work *Cathedrals of Urban Modernity: The First Museums of Contemporary Art (1800-1930)* which studied the relationship between museums and modern subjectivity and argued that during the course of nineteenth century “contemporary art museums were established by elites eager to legitimize their own modernity by promoting the work of living artists” where the model of Parisian Museum of Living Artists taken forward in the case of Great Britain by the fund of private philanthropy (ibid). Furthermore, as Lorente (cited in Lui 2005, p.219) argued that the social history of the emergence of contemporary art museums in the nineteenth century “is deeply implicated in the aspirations of the nineteenth-century nouveaux riches for social respectability”.

In this respect the museum goer, the subject, not only learns his/her subjectivity as a citizen of nation-state but also have become the subject of legitimization of the monarchy and capital while developing a sense of urbanity and citizenry.

Museum patriarchs hoped that in their acts of cultural philanthropy the “discretable origins” of an immense fortune based on the brutal exploitation of the working classes and the colonies could be either rewritten or forgotten. In both the British and French cases, the new museum of contemporary art played a crucial role in legitimizing monarch and capital while producing a new sense of urbanity and promoting an image of citizenship within the nineteenth century city and the state (Lui 2005, p.20).

Nonetheless, in the twenty first century, the situation is much more complicated regarding the changing definitions of museums and their respective roles. Weil (2007, p.33) proposes a perspective which views the relationship between the

museum and the public as a revolutionary process by referring to the changing of the relative positions of the museum and the public. Weil (ibid) suggests that there is a “revolutionary” transformation in the relative position of the museum and the public, in which museum’s mastery role has transformed by the superiority of the public and whereby museum has become the one to serve for the public. While referring to the example of The Museum of Fine Arts in Boston and its one of the first trustees’ description of the museum’s offerings to the public, he points out that in addition to the museums capacity of elevating the taste in public, they have the intention of providing enjoyment and entertainment for working classes. One of the reasons that set the change in motion in Weil’s terminology was money (Weil 2007, p.36) where money refers here to the sources of support that museums are in need. According to Weil (2007, p.36) in United States, the museums dependence on government support is higher compared to other art institutions therefore compared to their past which were characterized by the contributions of trustees, “whatever arrogance the museum may have once displayed toward the public has long since been converted to deference”. I do not totally agree with Weil’s point considering the Turkish case, whereby the role of trustees is prominent. Now I will discuss the relationship between the museums and the state.

4.3. The Relationship between the State and the Museums

This section deals with the question of how the state, as a political agent, related with the institution of an art museum. Eventhough my major concern should be the corporate funding of arts, the political and financial relationship between the state and art museums should not be overlooked. Regarding this state-museum relationship I will be focusing on the formation of the idea of the nation state as a legitimizing ground for the art museum to be founded; and state funding on arts and its effect on the funding structure of art museums; and finally the relationship between the idea of the nation state, demand of arts and the public sphere that appreciates art and/or educated by the museums. These could serve us to discuss the existing relationship between the state and other power agents such as the urban elites, art dealers, non-profit organizations-foundations- and corporations.

The French Revolution, which marked the birth of the nation-state era in Western Europe, has been referred as one of the fundamental developments constituting the social conditions for the emergence of public museums (Bazin 1967; Wittlin 1949; Hooper-Greenhill 1992; Bennett 1990; Duncan 1995).

The importance of the French Revolution cannot be divorced from the intimate linkage between the emergence of the nation-state, the public, and the public museum in the late eighteenth century. According to Macdonald (2003, p.2-3) the French Revolution of 1789 has been regarded as a key moment not only as the revolution of the people to replace the aristocratic order with a more democratic conception of a collectivity of equals but also with regard to making of what was aristocratic and private “of the people” by opening up formerly princely collections as symbolic assertion of the new ideals of ‘égalité, fraternité et liberté. And “[t]his was a moment for ‘culturing’ the public: for bringing ‘culture’, in the sense of ‘high culture’, to the masses and, more importantly, for attempting to constitute a public. That is, it was also a symbolic attempt to generate a ‘public’ - a self-identifying collectivity in which members would have equal rights, a sense of loyalty to one another, and freedom from previous tyrannies and exclusions” (ibid).

Hooper-Greenhill (1992, p.167) emphasizes the development of a new museological program facilitated by the Revolution:

The French Revolution led to the emergence of the conditions of a new museological programme which radically transformed the collecting practices and subject positions. In the place of intensely personal, private collections housed in the palaces of princes and the homes of the scholars, public collections in spaces open to the whole population were established.

Although there had been plans to create a museum in Louvre and efforts to transform the royal collection into a more useful resource during the ancient regime, Louvre Museum, could only emerged as a radically new institution not until the Revolution (Hooper-Greenhill 1992, p. 172). Transformation of the Louvre became urgent with the Revolution and the Louvre was declared as a museum, in a series of decrees in 1792 and 1793 which stated that the new state nationalized the King’s property, appropriated his collections (ibid). According to

Duncan & Wallach (1980, p.454) “[t]his declaration dramatically made visible the reality of the new Republican state. What has been the King’s right by now was now decreed the property of the nation”.

It is argued by Duncan & Wallach (p.452) that the Louvre, National Galleries in London and Washington and the Metropolitan Museum of New York are examples of the “universal survey museum” which present broad range of art history, which are “indispensible ornaments of any great city” and “identified with the idea of public art museum”. These museums not only reorganized the collection but also the experience of art whereby, the work of art now represented as a moment in art history (Duncan & Wallach 1980, p. 455-457). According to Duncan & Wallach (ibid) the public art collection refers to the redefinition of the visitor as the citizen, and a shareholder in the state; and the museum symbolically constitute this conception and has been attributed a crucial role in securing state power through the calling of visitors to identify with the values of the state and lending credibility to the “belief that state exists at the summit of mankind’s highest attainments”. Duncan and Wallach (1980, p.457) state that:

Art can be used to realize the transcendent values the state claims to embody. It can make good the state’s claim to be the guardian of civilization. It lends credibility to the belief that state exists at the summit of mankind’s highest attainments. In the museum, the visitor is not called upon to identify with the state *per se* but with its highest values. The visitor inherits this spiritual wealth but only on condition that he lay claim to it in the museum. Thus the museum is the site of a symbolic transaction between the visitor and the state. In exchange for the state’s spiritual wealth, the individual intensifies his attachment to the state. Hence the museum’s hegemonic function, the crucial role it can play in the experience of citizenship.

However, the emergence of such conceptions and institutions cannot be divorced from the broader relationship between the power and knowledge. As Bennett (1988, p.73) argues, The history of the emergence of the public art museums have been in association with the wider range of other institutions such as the natural history museums, dioramas and panoramas, national and later international exhibitions, arcades and department stores “which served as linked sites for the development and circulation of new disciplines (history,biology,arthistory,anthropology) and their discursive formations

(thepast,evolution,aesthetics,man) as well as for the development of new technologies of vision”. Bennett (ibid) elaborates on Foucault’s notion of institutional articulations of power and knowledge relations and institutions of confinement and questions whether museums can be regarded as confinement sites of the discipline of art history as conceptualized by Douglas Crimp (1985). Bennett (1988, p73) suggests that objects closed in the *studiolo* of the princes or “made accessible only to the limited gaze of high society in the *cabinets des curieux* of the aristocracy” of the 18th century were opened to public in the 19th century with the emergence of the idea of opening the museum to the public. Bennett (1988, p.73) concludes that museums are institutions of exhibition and not confinement:

Museums may have enclosed objects within walls, but the nineteenth century saw their doors opened to the general public-witnesses whose presence was just as essential to a display of power as had been that of the people before the spectacle of punishment in the eighteenth century. Institutions, then, not of confinement but of exhibition, forming a complex of disciplinary and power relations whose development might more fruitfully be juxtaposed to, rather than aligned with, the formation of Foucault's 'carceral archipelago'.

The point on the exhibition complex is associated with the comprising of citizenry. Bennet (1988, p.76) views the exhibition complex as a response to the problem of order but as a new way of disciplining society which he refers as “winning hearts and minds as well as disciplining and the training of bodies” in which set of new cultural technologies were “concerned to organize a voluntarily self-regulating citizenry”. Consecutively, Bennett (1988, p.78-79) suggests that there was a tendency for society itself to be rendered as a spectacle such as the rendering the cities visible for public inspection; there was an increasing involvement of the state in the provision of such spectacle and “exhibitionary complex provided a context for the permanent display of power/knowledge”. In this respect, as Bennett (ibid) states, museums in addition to galleries and exhibitions “played a pivotal role in the formation of the modern state and are fundamental to its conception as, among other things, a set of educative and civilizing agencies. Since the late nineteenth century, they have been ranked highly in the funding priorities of all developed nation-states and have proved remarkably

influential cultural technologies in the degree to which they have recruited the interest and participation of their citizenries”.

Furthermore, in addition to use of arts through the institutions of museums as a means of enhancing state power, the issue can be regarded in relation to the public sphere. Judith Kapferer (2008) analyses the relationship between the state power and the arts. Kapferer refers to Habermas (1992 cited in Kapferer 2008, p.2) and states that the genesis of the public sphere is historically accompanied by the development of arts as a modern phenomenon. Habermas’ work, focusing on the structural transformation of the public sphere, theorizes the development of bourgeois public sphere in the 18th and 19th centuries in which arts and culture provide the dynamic of public debate. Besides the patronage in arts, sheltering of the artists provided a suitable basis and environment for the genesis of public sphere by facilitating the artists to find possibilities to flourish (ibid).

Zukin (1989, p. 84-85), presents the nineteenth century with the increasing number of citizens who had the education to appreciate arts, widely accepted art forms which made up nation’s cultural identity and where this cultural heritage became “the stock-in trade” of public museums and displayed by the professional staff according to Art and Progress. Zukin (ibid) argues that in 19th century, therefore, the private museums of Renaissance and Enlightenment patrons of the arts and sciences were transformed under the aegis of the state, into national collections.

Zolberg (1992, p.140-145) in her review of the book *Worthy Monuments: Art Museums and the Politics of Culture in Nineteenth Century France* written by Sherman (1989) summarizes Sherman’s views regarding the France museums. I find these arguments as an expansion for critical thinking on the relationship between the state and the museums. Furthermore, I think the arguments presented below provide insights for understanding the role of elites in the formation of museums. Zolberg (1992, P.14-144) summarizes the major arguments presented by Sherman (1989): (1) The museums emerged in the intersection of cultural bureaucracy, arts professions, culture industries and markets (Sherman, p.9 and Zolberg, p.140). (2) The museums cannot be regarded solely by focusing on their

reflection of class relations, political transformation and ideological debates. Rather, these should be viewed as building blocks and raw materials of museums just as the art works and their monumental spaces in which the actual class politics and ideology are inscribed (ibid). (3) Urban centers are important with their own peculiar economic and cultural character by serving a clientele of localities to the state (Zolberg 1992, p.141). (4) “Large cities with ambitious elites, aware the artistic culture has symbolic significance with material consequences were the ones that State agencies choose to deal with whereas small ones with limited resources were increasingly excluded” (Sherman 1989, p.93 cited in Zolberg 1992, p.141-142). (5) The analysis of the local notables in France revealed that local notables organize around associations as “Friends of the Art” and sponsored the exhibitions of living artists by taking the Paris *salon* as the model and formed membership lotteries in which the prizes are the artworks besides donating the works they bought to the local museums (Zolberg 1992, p.143) (6) During the course of mid nineteenth century, “having grasped the material advantages that museums could bring to their city” a museum building mania had been existed to attract tourists (Zolberg 1992, p.143-144). In addition, the railroad boom contributed to the local industries and museums had become more important touristic attractions regarding the development and the highway (ibid)

Having been discussed the importance of France, here I want to introduce the 19th century Ottoman Empire’s encounters with the visual arts and museums as modern institutions. The narratives on the history of visual arts and the emergence of Turkish painters focus on the late Ottoman Empire for the roots of the emergence of Turkish painting, drawing and sculpture. Compared to the Western countries which have had extensive history in painting, drawing and sculpture and had mechanisms and institutions that are associated with the patronage of arts, the Western forms of art were absent in Ottoman Empire. What was understood as “arts” in the Ottoman Empire is crucial to begin with for presenting the changing social conditions, which have on one hand transformed the meanings attributed to the arts during the late nineteenth century and onwards and its respective institutionalization. And on the other, these reveal the peculiarity of the arts in the

modernization of the Empire and later in the Republican Turkey. In the history of Ottoman painting, attention was given to the forms of representation which did not contravene with the religious prohibition against depicting people and animals (Faroghi 2005). These forms were calligraphy, abstract ornamentation, illustration of plants and flowers, ceramic tiles and miniature. Nevertheless, it is also important to note that in the context of the courts of the sultans there were cases that this prohibition was eroded and limited (ibid). For example Fatih Sultan Mehmet was the first Emperor who let himself to be painted by Italian Renaissance painter Gentile Bellini in 1480 which was now exhibited in the Victoria and Albert Museum in the National Gallery Collection (The National Gallery The Sultan Mehmet II). The actual efforts to learn and apply the Western forms and techniques of painting which contain visual representation of depicting people and animals and perspective was in conjunction with the modernization attempts of the Ottoman Empire in the 18th and 19th centuries. While there had been significant changes in the perception of the external world in the Ottoman Empire with respect to the developments such as the failure in the 1683 Battle of Vienna that resulted in the Treaty of Karlowitz (Berkes 2002) these changes were resulted in the sending of the delegates to abroad to discover the secrets of civilization. These attempts were first directed towards the learning of the ways of developing the military by focusing on the techniques of education of the West and France was the first country to be approached (Artun 2002, p.17). However, these encounters through the representatives have resulted in considerable developments for the production, education and conception of visual arts. Although the encounters with the West have had crucial impact on the history of the visual arts in Turkey Artun (2002) criticizes the depiction of narratives about the history of Turkish art which begins the history with those painters that come back from European art schools since she argues that the case should be evaluated in the broader scope of civilizing missions of France in the 19th century, which Ottomans and later the leaders of the Turkish Republic have internalized.

Most of the art historians who turned their attention to the historical development of visual arts refer to the late nineteenth century Ottoman Empire and their efforts

were directed towards finding reasons to explain why Turkey lag behind the Western countries in the field of visual arts. The history of the visual arts in Turkey predominantly have been shaped by the discussions of modernity which is based on the assumption that Turkey has been a latecomer in the modernization and the reasons behind this situation should be investigated within the structures of the Ottoman Empire. As Artun (2007, p.13) presented, the mainstream history of art in Turkey reconstructed along the dichotomies of modern vs traditional, universal vs national, Turkey vs Ottoman and moreover she refers to a statement by Hüseyin Gezer, a prominent figure that set the grounds for history of arts in Turkey: “Lagging behind the civilization results in lagging behind in the arts. Or, lagging behind in the arts, gives birth to lagging behind in civilization” (appeared in Artun, 2007, p.13). This statement yielded twofold assumptions which grounded the discussion on the visual arts in Turkey: first it associates a direct correlation between civilization and arts, second; the statement is premised on the assumption that there is backwardness in civilization compared to the civilized societies based on the cultural factors and particularly the arts. Furthermore, these assumptions necessitate a solution towards the problem which has been found in Europe and encounters with the European countries’ arts institutions in this respect. These contextualize the arts as well as the study of it in an ideological ground.

In her detailed study on the Ottoman and Republican students of arts in the Academié Julian in France, Artun (2007) presents how the students that were sent to Academié Julian by the Ottoman Empire and later by the Turkish Republic have changed the cultural and artistic scenery of the country through various initiatives including the establishment of artists’ associations such as Association of Ottoman Painters, Independent Painters and Sculptors Association in which the European visits have been depicted as the dawn of the Turkish visual arts by the mainstream narratives of the art history. Artun’s (2007, p.275-282) main argument however is that those diplomatic delegates were sent to France were expected to become the witnesses of civilization and they had become higher in rank when they returned as it was the case for the delegates of art who followed them. Moreover, those artists trained in Europe not only were expected to fulfill the responsibilities of becoming

managers, teachers, organizers of the first exhibitions, to become the first collectors and to become the head of the fine arts departments in the newly established institutions, by the time of their arrival, but also they were expected to become the first Eastern representatives of the Western styles in Europe. Artun views this as a process of “translation”, that is to say, rather than recording their originalities the narratives that build the history of Turkish art credited the translation of Western forms as the dawn of Turkish art and those artists that returned from extensive training were expected to become the representatives of Western forms in the country through “translating” the forms to their own culture which have reproduced the hierarchical conception of civilization and disregard the originality.

The modernization project of the Ottoman and its legacy in Republican leaders can be understood in relation to the France’s civilizing mission, which became the official ideology of France and became prevalent in the aftermath of the constitution of The French Third Republic in 1870. In this ideological construction, on one hand the societies are placed in an order of hierarchy with respect to the competition over civilization and France lead the way (p.15) and on the other, the claim of France on the mastery over the visual arts, which had been under dominance of Italy since the Renaissance, had become sharp with the French Revolution and art had become one of the major mediums of France’s civilizing mission (p.46). According to Artun (2007, p.14) the “prescription” of practicing Europe’s painting and sculpture in order Republican Turkey to have a say in the field of arts have been repeated over and over from the times that the Ottoman Empire put its endeavor of modernization design into action until now.

What I want to draw attention is the institutionalization of arts in the Late Ottoman Empire. In the field of arts modernization attempts in the artistic canon had already begun in the 19th century. Interaction with the “West” can still be counted as one of the primary dynamics in the history of Turkey’s art institutions and arts institutionalizing. Consequently, I will discuss some major issues regarding the early establishments. As discussed above, the modernization attempts in arts were characterized with the orientation towards Western art. While traditional art forms

such as minniature, calligraphy had started to connote “traditional” and “Eastern” forms canvas painting, perspective, and depiction of human portraits and figures resembled the “modern” and “Western” and most of the time these notions used interchangeably. Having been in a hierarchical relationship and evaluating itself as subordinate with respect to “civilization”, the Ottoman encounter with the West, especially with France which had powerful claims over the culture and arts and already established institutions in the 19th century, were of great significance since it opened a way through a challenging experience of modernization of institutions in the Ottoman Empire. The mission of modernization in the Ottoman Empire, reflected in institutionalization in many fields including the army, military education and especially in the establishment of the schools and which can be regarded in association with the efforts of applying preceding Western institutional models to enhance modernization. Especially Sultan Mahmud II period was important considering his enthusiasm in adopting the European innovation in many areas. This shift has continued during the reign of Sultan Abdülmecid and Abdülaziz. In this respect, Sultan Abdülaziz’s trip to Europe in 1867 in reply to an invitation to attend the opening of Ottoman Pavillion in the World Fair, can be counted as the breaking point to get in touch with his contemporaries in Europe. The period following this trip is associated with the foundation of many institutions that transformed the social and cultural life and daily encounters of the elites of the time in the Ottoman Empire (Artun, Art in Turkey: A Sociological Perspective class discussions, Fall 2012).

Tanzimat (1839) and Islahat (1856) were two important turning points in the history of the Ottoman Empire with respect to modernization. Not only the state institutions were reorganized, laws were updated with respect to the “needs” of civilized societies but also they had considerable impact on the culture together with the acceptance of education as a medium of modernization according to Western model.

Some of the pioneering institutions that serve in the field of education include Mühendishane-i Berri Hümayun (Imperial School of Naval Engineering) which was established in the period of Sultan III in 1773 and specialized on technical

training in the field of naval engineering, Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi (School of Fine Arts) which was established in 1882, Imperial Museum and Mekteb-i Erkân-ı Harbiye (School of War).

Ironically the first Turkish painters that had shape the artworld in the late Ottoman Empire are called asker ressamı (Soldier Painters). Not only were the elites of the society but also they had a symbolic relationship with the power elite.

Establishment of the arts academy and its graduates have given way to the artistic movements which have also affected the artistic spheres of the early periods of Turkish Republic. For example, the graduates of the Academy, established the first artistic academy “The Ottoman Painters Society” in 1908 and published the first artistic magazine “*Osmanlı Ressamlar Cemiyeti Mecmuası- Nasir-i efkâr*” (Ottoman Painter's Society Magazine-Promoter of ideas) which was supported by Crown Prince Abdülmecid and opened exhibitions under the heading of “Galatasaray Exhibitions” which were organized under the institution of Galatasaray Lyceum which took place between 1916 and 1952 regularly (Önsal, 2006, p.51-52).

Shaw (2003, p.19) emphasizes the affiliation between the dynamism and change during the course of late nineteenth century and early twentieth century and the stance of museums as newly emerging institutions. As Shaw (2003, p.19) suggests, Tanzimat, “Orderings”, not only marked the period of “great dynamism and newfound will to address the complex problems of an increasingly wieldy state with outdated systems of governance” but also it “produced new relations between the state and the populace that were expressed in a variety of new institutions, including the museum”.

Shaw (2003, p.1) in her work *Possessors and Possessed Museums, Archeology, and the Visualisation of History in the Late Ottoman Empire* suggests that:

While numerous authors have of late considered the development and functioning of the museum in the Euro-American sphere, relatively few have expanded their investigations to ask in depth how these institutions emerged in the rest of the world.

I will present Shaw's main argument regarding the development of the idea of a museum in the late Ottoman Empire, influenced by Europe. Shaw (ibid) suggests that the idea of the museum was "metamorphosed" when it "was forced to contend with different sets of political and cultural imperatives that informed the choices of possession and the rigors of display". The case of the Ottoman Empire can be perceived in this regard and "[a]s the need for the Ottoman state to reinvent itself along nationalist lines emerged over the course of the late nineteenth century, museums that could represent new communal identities began to serve as templates for developing modes of Ottoman nationalism" (Shaw 2003, p.18).

The Museum was conceptualized in Shaw's study (2003, p.2) and examined as an expression of the models of national mythmaking produced by Ottoman elites interested in constructing themselves as the "guardians of ethnicity and in thereby fashioning a national identity". Furthermore, according to Shaw (p.95) the museum served in many aspects; first through its displays it provided instruction on the idea of the historical progress, second, it was built to provide that information, and most importantly "it was charged with counteracting European usurpation of material culture that was beginning to be seen as rightly Ottoman".

Not only did the museum function as an ideological bridge between European and Ottoman heritage, under Osman Hamdi it also served as a battleground for possession of the physical elements of that heritage. The antiquities legislation of the Ottoman Empire developed as a dialectic negotiation between the writing of the law and a series of subsequent infringements that resulted in more detailed versions in 1884 and 1906. Each successive law not only addressed the deficiencies of its predecessor, it also reflected new values that had become associated with antiquities in the interim (Shaw 2003, p.108).

Osman Hamdi Bey's conception of the museum was clearly associated with its social role of education. Nevertheless, he was in disappointment according to Shaw (2003, p.124). Osman Hamdi's painting *The Tortoise Trainer*, represents his frustrating experiences with the export of antiquities which belied his high hopes for the role of the museum as an educational institution for the Ottoman public (ibid). Shaw (ibid) interprets the painting, as Osman Hamdi's self depiction as a frustrated educator:

He stands near the upper-story window of an Ottoman public building, body bowet, watching his pupils eat the leaves he has fed them. In one hand, he holds a flute with which to instruct them. Around his neck hangs a leather prong with which to punish them. Unfortunately, his pupils lack ears with which to hear his flute and have hard shells protecting them from any leather whip. Although this painting bears no explicit references to the museum, it may serve as an allegorical reference to Osman Hamdi's role as an educator in Ottoman society. He has the tools with which to teach, but the pupils available to him are not capable of receiving his instruction.

Elites in the Ottoman Empire, definitely played a part in the making of symbolic meaning of museums in the Ottoman Empire. *Tanzimat*, paved the way for opening channels of communication between the Ottoman government and its populace. Shaw (2003, p.21) gives the example of the publication of an official government newspaper in 1831, published in Ottoman and French *Takvim-i Vaka-i* the (Calendar of Events) as being a medium of transmission between the Ottoman elite and the government. (Shaw 2003, p.21)

Ali Artun (2010) suggested that in addition to the efforts of first manager of Müze-i Hümayun (Imperial Museum) Edwards Goold, and second manager German Philipp Dethier and French archeologists Albert Dumant who prepared the first catalog for the museum in transforming the Ottoman dynasty's cabinets of curiosities into modern museum, Osman Hamdi's brother Halil Edhem's initiatives were crucial in museumification. Artun (2010) suggests that the efforts in museumification of the collections established in Dolmabahçe and Yıldız Palaces which articulated the zoological and botanical collections with the fine arts collections in a complex, had received scant attention. Alongside these developments, the exhibitions opened in İstanbul in the mid 19th century, formation of Pera Salon and sprouting of art market that centered in Pera contributed to museumification. Artun (2010) suggests that Halil Edhem's difference was his commitment and efforts in building a modern national museum which incorporates academy, museum and fine arts collection in a modern understanding. Furthermore, according to Artun (ibid) Halil Edhem was the person who transformed the Imperial Musuem, which had been the museum of arms and antiquities, into Modern İstanbul Museum. Moreover, the collection which has been called as *Elvah-ı Nakşiye*, formed and curated by Halil Edhem. This collection has constituted the core collection of İstanbul Devlet Resim ve Heykel

Müzesi (İstanbul State Art and Sculpture Museum) in the later years. The museum opened to public in Republican Turkey in 1938. Even the respective Museum occasionally has remained closed for visitors for many reasons the Museum being under custody of the “Academy” prevented the collection to be wasted as in the case of works of art under the state possession (ibid).

It is also important to point at the incoming artists to the country during this period. In the mid 1800’s, there were French artists visiting and later on deciding to settle in Istanbul by establishing their own studios (Artun 2002, p.38-41). Still, this interaction remained settled between the artists and the Palace and Ottoman Palace elites, rather than the “citizens”. For instance, Pierre Desire Guillemet, a French artist, painted the portrait of Sultan Abdülaziz in 1873 and later on appointed a mission to establish an art school in Istanbul. Yet, he died and this mission was given to Osman Hamdi Bey. Museum of Archeology and School of Fine Arts (Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi) founded in the Ottoman, marked the late 19th century art-society and politics relationship.

While in the 19th century the proliferation of the museum was associated with the formation and solidification of nation-states, Sharon J. Macdonald (2003) questions the roles of museums in today’s world where nation-states identities are being challenged while referring to major social transformations such as the demise of the democratic public space by the expansion of mass media and consumerism (Adorno & Horkheimer 1979; Habermas 1989). As Macdonald presents (ibid), differentiation in public sphere characterized by multiculturalism and translationalism (Robins 1994); emergence of ethnonationalisms, the return of the repressed national identities (Castells 1997) and increased global movement facilitated with telecommunication technologies which is characterized by time-space compression (Harvey 1989) and where the individuals make their own identities and decide on who to be (Giddens 1990 and 1991). Macdonald (2003, p.6) argues that: “Museums, precisely because they have been so implicated in identity work and because of their more particular articulations with the kind of identities that are argued to be under threat, are significant sites in which to examine some of the claims of identity transformation”. Macdonald (ibid) further

suggests that while “we might expect to see transformations within museums as they attempt to address and express ‘new’ identities” especially in some avant-garde art museums in cosmopolitan and metropolitan centers which engage with post-modern identities we can also encounter museums that are “deployed in the articulation of bounded national identity”.

4.4. Funding of Museums

This section focuses on the peculiarities regarding the funding of the art museums. The studies that focused on the funding of museums have explored the characteristics of the public and private support in arts and the actors involved in the funding of museums. The specific issues include the impact of funding and the exhibitions as outputs of museums (Alexander 1996a, 1996b, 1996c), public support in the arts in the United States (Netzer 1978) non-profit enterprise in the arts and the support of arts by the independent foundations (DiMaggio 1982a, 1986a, 1986c, 1986d, the economics of art museums (Feldstein 1991), government funding in the arts (Benedict 1991), the prevalent causes and consequences and problems regarding the arts patronage (Balfe 1993a, 1993b) and focused on the impact of corporations in arts and arts institutions (Useem 1985; Useem & Kutner 1986; Martorella 1990) and more specifically the peculiarities of corporate sponsorship (Alexander 1996; Wu 2003).

As these studies reveal, the most important actors that have contributed to the funding of the museums appear as individual philanthropists, foundations, corporations, governments. As Alexander has pointed out in 1996, there has been a change in the funding of American art museums from individual philanthropists towards an increasing support from institutional funders. The change has been one of the important subjects in United States starting from the late 1970s and the question how these external funding sources affected the museums has been debated. While attempting to summarize some of the major arguments put forward by scholars working in the field and seeking answers to the question with offering different theoretical frameworks and concentrations, my main concern is to outline some of the critical issues that are raised with respect to the corporate funding of

the museums which I believe are important to build the framework to discuss the peculiarities regarding the private foundation museums that were emerged in the 2000s in Turkey and their funding structures.

The conception of the museum within a commercial milieu necessitates approaching it as an organization located within the market, seeking for its survival and success through preserving its main goals and functions such as organizing exhibitions, conserving, collecting and developing educational programs and most importantly maintaining its legitimization. And one of the important aspects to consider is their funding structures. As Alexander (1999) have observed one of the challenges faced by the museums management today is to have a secure funding base in which the government spending on arts have been curtailed and the museums have been directed to look for new funding bases and among those, donations from the private sector take the lead. Rosett presented a financial portrait of American art museums in 1989 (published in 1991) and stated that art museums in United States “tend to specialize as to their sources of revenue more than they specialize in the art they collect” (p.138) and identified nine different sources of revenue, which are: federal, state, local, other government, corporate, private (membership, private foundation grants and gifts), , endowment, earnings (admissions, store and restaurant contribution net of direct costs, school tuition and various fees) and used the category “various” to include museums with a diffused sources of support rather than concentrated. In American art museums, as briefly discussed above, the funding of museums is a mixture of corporate and individual resources and museums have been financed by a mix of government, corporate, foundation and individual grants and as stated by Alexander (ibid) American museums are different from the most of the European museums in the sense that they have traditionally been supported by philanthropic ways in which elite individuals and local municipalities have contributed and the Federal Government started to fund the museums not until the mid 1960s where State governments have began funding museums in the late 1960s. In this respect, museums in the United Kingdom appear as important examples to explore the peculiarities rearding the transformation of museums from a largely government

based funding system to a market-based one. Perhaps it is important to note here that most of the literature dwelling on the challenges and consequences faced by the private funding and corporate sponsorship appeared in the United Kingdom, where the move from government-based funding to a market-based one is more overt. The main question however is how the external funding affects the museums; are there any impacts of funding system on the exhibitions and if there any in what ways they are important? Developing a critical perspective on the funding of museums necessitates bondages between the critical issues raised as a result of critical enquiry on the peculiarities of the current forms of arts support. Museums are inseparable part of the framework, constituted by the enterprise culture disseminated in the world especially since the 1980s. Museums have become the institutions in which the funding structures are as important as the classification of artworks in them or their claims of presenting and representing while forming one of the main areas of power and knowledge and reproduction of social hierarchies. Art Museums because of their funding structures can be regarded as sites for conflicting pressures since their funding is based on mixture of different resources. In this respect, Alexander's study "Pictures at an Exhibition: Conflicting Pressures in Museums and the Display of Art" (1996a) is influential since it offers a theoretical approach for studying the conflicting pressures within the museums. Alexander (1996a, p.798-799) offered the use of a strategic institutional theory which combines the strength of both resource dependency (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and institutional theories (Powell & DiMaggio 1991; Meyer & Scott 1992) to understand organizations while focusing on the specific organization of museums, she argued that managers of museums are actors and they cannot be considered solely as reactors since "they strive to maintain their autonomy, their normative visions, and the legitimacy of their organizations as they handle external demands" while they use strategies conceptualized as buffering, resource shifting, multivocality, innovation and creative enactment in order to manage conflicting pressures stemming from funders. The guiding assumption in her work is that the goals, aims or tastes of external parties that fund the museums such as the philanthropists, foundations, elite individuals, government agencies or corporations may structure the type of art exhibited.

I have to point that most of the studies that deal with the question of funding particularly considering the museums in the United States and United Kingdom, reasonably based on the quantitative data gathered from several number of museums and surveys conducted with museums. In the context of Turkey, apart from the museums that have been funded by the state funding mechanisms, the private art museums, although increasing in number during the last decade, form the small number of institutions that have special characteristics in funding and do not reveal any quantitative data as such. However, these studies give crucial and valuable insights for approaching these newly emerging institutions funding structures and their wider social implications.

4.4.1. Individual Philanthropists and Cultural Capitalists

The characteristics of individual art patrons are summarized by Alexander (1996a, p.801) as their connoisseurship, knowledge on art and their love towards the art they support; they collect art and they are comparatively uninterested in attracting broad audiences to museums and prefer smaller exhibitions since they concern the safety of the objects and their main interest is gaining status as pointed out by scholars such as Odendahl (1990), Bourdieu (1984). According to Alexander (1996, p.801), elite individuals concern is much more related with the interest in having their collections exhibited in museums meanwhile the museums help them to conserve, appraise, store, market and care their art objects.

The philanthropy of elite individuals dated back to the end of the 19th century and has been associated with the establishment of American Museums and other cultural institutions (DiMaggio 1982a, 1982b). DiMaggio (1982), in his work “Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth- Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America” focuses on the institutionalization of high-culture and the creation of high-cultural organizations in Boston, United States in the 19th century. DiMaggio, acknowledges that Boston, in the nineteenth century was the most active center of American culture as well as the elite. First of all, DiMaggio, while introducing his work on institutionalization of high culture- sets the dichotomy between high-culture and popular culture as the

background of his discussion, although there are different ways of formulizing the opposition, he argues that the distinction between the two has been implicit. As DiMaggio(1982, p.374) states that while these categories are distinguished by culture critics such as Adorno (1946) and McDonald (1957) by basing their argument on the critique of popular culture and mass culture, popular culture defenders, such as Lowenthal (1961) and Gans (1974) have questioned the normative aspect of popular culture, yet still accepted the categories.

As put forward in the article on nineteenth century Boston, although there were early establishments in Boston's urban setting by the initiatives of urban elites, it is only in the context of cultural capitalism that these establishments took the form of organizational base for high culture in United States. DiMaggio, outlines the steps of the creation of high culture. As he names it, cultural entrepreneurship, in this case, the establishment of the museum of fine arts and Boston Symphony Orchestra has been the crucial example of revealing the centralization of artistic activities within institutions controlled by the Boston's cultural capitalists (DiMaggio, 1982, p.383).

What is striking in his work is the association between the creation of high art and the specific status group. The Boston elites, as a status group, as well as a social class, while creating an organizational base of high-arts in USA, in 19th century Boston, via making of an art museum and an orchestra, "strove towards exclusivity, towards the definition of a prestigious culture that they could monopolize as their own" and "were concerned as any dominant social class, with establishing hegemony over those they dominated" (DiMaggio, 1982, p.392). Furthermore this concern is mediated through the articulation of "education of the community as a whole" as the foremost agenda for the arts institutions. As stated by DiMaggio (1982, p.393):

In structure, however, the Museum and the Orchestra were similar innovations. Each was private, controlled by members of the Brahmin class, and established on the corporate model, dependent on private philanthropy and relatively long-range financial planning; each was sparsely staffed and relied for much of its management on elite volunteers; and each counted among its founders wealthy men with considerable scholarly or artistic credentials who were centrally located in Boston's elite social structure. The

Museum was established under broad auspices for the education of the community as a whole; the Orchestra was created by one man in the service of art and of those in the community with the sophistication or motivation to appreciate it (DiMaggio 1982, p.393).

In United States, between the 1910 and 1920, the trend of collecting modern art sped up. Modern art not only excited collectors but also the wider public. There were only few exhibitions such as 1913 Armory Show for instance where people had the chance to view modern art –which makes it remain as an elitist taste (Zukin 1989, p.85-87). However, by the 1930s, there started the establishments of modern art museums. In United States, private philanthropy and cultural entrepreneurship have been fundamental characteristics of the establishment of art museums. For example 1930's were marked by the institutionalization of arts in New York, initiated by the wealthy Americans.

However, by the 1930s a few small circles of rich, educated and well-traveled Americans who hoped to arouse greater public support for modern art succeeded in establishing museums that took the representation of modern art as their special mandate. For the first time, new museums like the Museum of Modern Art (1929), the Whitney (1930), and the Guggenheim (1939)- all in New York- featured the work of living artists (Zukin 1989, p.87).

Twentieth century's new modern art institutions reflected the elite's cultural views. "The missionary work of the new modern art museums that opened around 1930 operated on a more elite level. Because they were established primarily by individuals of "advanced" cultural views" (Zukin 1989, p.87). These views were mostly celebrated with the strengthened focus on education role of museums in societies. The emphasis on education on one hand was seen as one of the forming reasons of such institutions -best represented through conserving the "best" representative pieces- and on the other, provided a ground for urban entrepreneurs to open their investment to a broader public. Not only the upper social class views were materialized in museums but also, these elites and professionals were personally constructing and forming these institutions. In this respect, significant roles of Solomon R. Guggenheim in the Guggenheim Museum, Alfred Barr and architect Philip Johnson at MOMA, Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney at Whitney museum can be counted as striking examples.

The social-economic aspect need to be considered here is the financial organization of these institutions made possible through the wealth that these elites accumulated in different sectors of capitalist production as well as the foundations. For instance as Zukin states: “The founders of MOMA, for example assiduously cultivated the Rockefeller Foundation and made a serious collector of modern art out of the young Nelson Rockefeller” (1989, p.88). The dependence of museums to private funding can be associated with the significant contributions of upper class collections to museums as well as the lack of state patronage in America.

In America, the lack of a history of state patronage- due to the absence of a centralized state- made all the public museums that were established dependent on private contributions to build their collections. On the one hand, museums solicited donations in the forms of both artwork and money. On the other hand, museum trustees, as well as, for many years, museum directors and curators, represented the typical upper-class pillars of local society. So the “best” art in the museums reflected patrician support and patrician sensibility (Zukin 1989, p.85).

4.4.2. Government

The establishment of the private funding in arts in United States has been closely associated with the government funding in arts. The dependency of museums for private funding to build their collections, and funding the institutions with donations since their establishment as well as its social and political consequences are very important. While Zukin associates this dependency with the lack of state patronage in USA, Zolberg reflects upon the issue by referring to the works of Meyer and Minihan and states that:

Because art collecting and patronage were viewed as private pleasures and hobbies to which the public should not be constrained to contribute (Meyer; Minihan), not until the second half of the nineteenth century did the idea that government support of cultural institutions was a legitimate way to promote moral uplift for the citizenry take hold. In the United States it had to overcome the connection of the fine arts with luxury, impracticality, and aristocratic degeneracy (Zolberg 1984, p.381).

Comparatively, the state patronage in the arts is lacking due to the existence of other ways of funding such as philanthropy, corporate funding etc. as well as the association of fine arts with the individual interests of the aristocracy. This has other consequences such as the establishment of philanthropic foundations and

non-profit sector in the US. It is no coincidence that the literature on the non-profit sector and the arts mostly developed in US. Considering the museums as arts institutions, their dependency on the private funding as well as the contributions such as donations are crucial in establishing the corporate funding culture and sponsorship oriented exhibitions and activities. These characteristics give United States a peculiarity which makes it regarded as the model for building such organizations and institutions as well as administrative structures elsewhere in the world.

Nevertheless, Zukin (1989, p.100-101) argues that with the growing of state's role in society, the idea of state should be a collective patron reflected itself in state being the biggest patron of arts. However, it is important to call US's state men at the time and their importance in developing the notion of "arts constituency". These men were Nelson Rockefeller (late governor), Senator Jacob Javits, and Congressman John Lindsay.

Rockefeller and Lindsay belonged to New York's patrician elite; Rockefeller and Javits (or Mrs. Javits) were patrons of modern art; the three were, at the time, Republicans, and so they were linked to big corporate political (and philanthropic) contributors; and all definitely identify themselves with either major political party (p.100).

As early as 1957 the Ford Foundation had set up its first program on the humanities and the arts. The Ford Foundation's close links with other major foundations, corporations, and the state suggest that their example would eventually have an impact on state policy. Most of the political and conceptual groundwork for state patronage of the arts was laid between 1960, when Governor Rockefeller established a prototype agency, the New York State Council on the Arts (NYSCA), and 1965, When Congress voted to establish the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities. Rockefeller's friends and allies, Javits and Lindsay, rallied congressional support for this legislation, and another New York associate, foundation president August Heckscher, acted as an intellectual link between NYSCA and the White House, primarily by summarizing the NYSCA (and his own) philosophy in a special report on the arts for President Kennedy in 1963 (p.101).

Moreover, "After World War II, support for the arts became a useful tool in the propoaganda efforts of capitalist states. Ideally, these states should place no restrictions on the art they sponsor" (ibid). The support for arts by the government contributed to the state power through justifying the state as a defender of general human aims and aspirations; New Deal principle in which state should encourage

spending and employment in arts; the expansion of state supported employment in the arts as well as increasing rationalization of employment conditions in art and culture (Zukin 1989, p.103).

Alexander (1996a, p.802-803) discusses the effects of government as funding resource on art museums' exhibitions, elaborating on the previous studies of DiMaggio 1991b, Galligan 1993, DiMaggio and Useem 1978 and emphasizing the role of two major players: the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)⁸ and state arts councils. According to her (p.802) NEA must balance the demands of arts professionals with art-historical concerns, that generates the funding and the principles of making art available to broader public and helping museums better serve to the public furthermore both the NEA and state art councils need to maintain their prestige to maintain their supporters of whom are from art worlds and from the political arena. Therefore as argued by DiMaggio (1991b, p.229-30) in order for the government to retain both art and political supporters a mixture of both scholarly and popular exhibitions are called for, furthermore DiMaggio and Useem's (1978) point that stresses government agencies explicit interest in expanding audiences beyond the traditional middle and upper classes once again emphasized by Alexander (1996a, p.802) besides stating that education and outreach are the part of most of the grants given by the respective institutions in this respect.

It is found out that in United States "government arts policy has had two notable and opposite effects on art exhibitions. Government desires for large audiences along with policies which require matching grants has led to bigger, more popular exhibits. Museums, however, want to demonstrate that they are scholarly and that they keep up with current trends in art. Consequently, museums mount small exhibitions of contemporary artists" (Alexander 1996b, p.119). Blattberg & Broderick (1989, p.329) suggested that, decision makers in the museum have been faced with the question of pursuing the goals of government subsidies where for

⁸ NEA was founded by the US Federal Government in 1965.

example servicing low-income audiences can be regarded as a potential for government funding and not servicing the low-income audiences will result in lower revenues because of reduction of subsidies such as free rent or free land. This is also important since the space for the museum is a crucial element for the prestige of the museum as well as an important item of the budget if provided as a subsidy.

4.4.3. Corporations

Among the various resources that museums embrace, corporations have an important stance due to their affect in shaping and framing the contemporary culture through various mechanisms including the ways they alter in the field of arts. Although the corporations have made financial contributions to arts institutions and cultural institutions since the 1970s generally through donations and business had begun to be active participants in “framing and shaping the contemporary culture”; through the 1980s, this active involvement became “ubiquitous and comprehensive” with respect to free-market policies and the ethos of the Reagen-Thatcher decade (Wu 1998, p.28).

As observed by Wu (ibid) during the course of 1980s, the corporations increasingly have set up their own collections, they started to have their own curators and art departments, organizing and touring their own collections of art in their own countries and abroad, while emulating the prerogatives of public art museums and galleries, incorporating art gallery or hosting a branch of public museums within their own corporate buildings, and established contemporary art awards which have given them cultural visibility besides attributing them the appearance of “being the arbiters of society’s taste” and most importantly however, these all in all resulted in the advancing of the business influence in each and every phase- production, dissemination and reception- of contemporary art.

These in turn while providing opportunity for corporations to present their names with prestigious institutions, and arts exhibitions and famous artists, render the

promotion of corporations and at the same time reduce artworks to rather mere decorative objects that “beautify” the office buildings and walls.

The major arguments of Wu (1998) are as follows: (1) “By sponsoring art institutions, corporations present themselves sharing a humanist value system with museums and galleries, cloaking their particular interests with a universal moral veneer” (p.31). (2) Although contemporary art offers more “treacherous” ground compared to the old masters in art companies tend to sponsor contemporary art because “The mythological cult of artistic personality and the strong association between avant-garde art and innovation within the paradigms of modernism have provided the business world with a valuable tool for the projection of an image of itself as a liberal and progressive force” which serves as the basis of the legitimization of corporate intervention (ibid). (3) Senior managers and in particular chairman and Chief Executive Officers play significant roles in corporate arts sponsorship who are described as “an élite within an élite” with their occupations and “positions of great power and influence” and connoting DiMaggio’s (1982, p.35) conception of “cultural capitalist” regarded as “cultural managerial capitalists” for “whom involvement in the arts is a locus of social distinction to which their élite status and class aspirations are anchored” (Wu, 1998, p.32). (4) Art museums play pivotal role in getting corporate support than other museums and this is associated with the higher rank of art museum visitors in socio-economic terms (p.36) and provide well-distinguished areas of sponsorship to gear toward advertising the “so-called ‘enlightened’ corporate image. Moreover, the art museums serving as the domain of public prestige and authority and having a privileged position in society provide a basis for corporations to associate themselves with the museums as a “conspicuous signal of social prestige and power”. Furthermore “This is further reinforced by the claim, widely made in the name ‘art for art’s sake’ in bourgeois culture, by its very nature, resides above the sordid world of politics and commerce” (p.39).

The effects of corporate funding in the operations of museums signify more with regard to provision of arts, while transforming and shaping and framing the museum in contemporary societies. Alexander’s work “From Philanthropy to

Funding: The Effects of Corporate and Public Support on Art Museums” (1996) showed the correlation between the funding type and the types of exhibitions in art museums based on the three formats as the travelling exhibitions, theme shows and ‘blockbuster’ exhibitions and argued that one of the most important effect of the shift from public to private funding is the new emphasis being placed on blockbuster shows which are characterized as attracting large public and more middle-class than traditional exhibits (p.117):

Blockbuster shows represent a significant departure from the traditional image of a museum exhibit involving quiet contemplation of art objects. Indeed, blockbusters often attract a milling crowd which fills the exhibition rooms to capacity, so the viewer does not have time to sit and look at the paintings. There are long lines outside, and the exhibits are crowded inside, with people piled up three or four deep in front of particularly striking or famous objects. In addition, museums often provide acoustiguides for a modest fee. These individual tape recordings act to keep the traffic flowing; at the same time, they restrict the audience's experience of the show, focussing attention on a few easily-described highlights.

The popularity of the blockbuster shows as argued by Wu (1998, p.39) is bound with the museums’ expansion policy which is closely associated with the directors of the museum. In this respect she gives the example of Serota’s directorship of Tate which produced a series of blockbuster shows during the course of 1990s (p.41-42):

The new vision of the Tate produced a series of blockbuster shows, each bigger than the last: John Constable in 1991 (169,412 visitors), Picasso: Sculptor/Painter in 1994 (313,659 visitors) and the 1996 Cézanne extravaganza (408,688 visitors). Not only was a ticket to the Cézanne exhibition the ‘hottest’ in town, with its ticket agency taking some 5,250 bookings a day (admission cost £8.60); but the Tate also mounted an extensive merchandising campaign, with its shop stocking every- thing from vases, tea towels and CD ROMs to £45 Cézanne scarves, not forgetting the ‘Cézanne-wich’ offered at the London branches of Prêt à Manger and a specially bottled ‘Cuvée Cézanne at the Tate’ wine.

In addition to these kinds of examples museums tend to promote themselves in the same fashion with an advertising language, as appealing venues for entertainment and organizing events available for rent. This “mercenary mentality” as connoted by Wu (1998, p.44) is in line with the ensuring of the serving to the business interests of the sponsors.

It is presented in the literature that corporate philanthropy is a way of improving corporate reputation and corporate image (Useem 1985, Wu 1998, Martorella 1990) and the decisions to fund art are given with respect to the corporate self interest as emphasized by Useem and Kutner (1986) and Useem (1987) and corporate sponsorship of arts tend to be characterized with its focus on contemporary arts (Martorella 1990; Wu 1998) besides having being interested in large middle-class audiences as both suggested by Porter in 1981 and Alexander (1996a).

4.4.4. Foundations

The study of independent foundations as sources of funding, as of today is not a hot debate as compared to the role of corporations in the shaping and framing of contemporary culture through various ways of involvement in the arts, including funding museums. Nonetheless, in the mid-1980s in United States it was studied by DiMaggio (1986) and foundations in US were claimed by him to be conservative in their funding patterns and “tend to support well-established organizations that are in the foundations’ own communities, as well as not laying emphasis on the audiences (Alexander 1996a, p.803). Nevertheless, as Alexander (ibid) puts it large foundations in US are exceptions in this regard since among the large, visible museums that she studied in the 1990s these kinds of active, innovative and large foundations were among the supporters of the museums and furthermore she anticipated their preferences to be similar with élite individuals.

Teresa Odendahl studied foundations, non-profit sector and charitable giving in the United States in the late 1980s. Among her works “The Culture of elite Philanthropy in Reagen years” in United States (1989), *America’s Wealthy and Future of Foundations* (1987) and her famous work published in 1990 *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest among the Philanthropic Elite* can be counted. One of the arguments put forward by Odendahl is that “founding families retain control olver most foundations” (Alexander 1996a). More recently *Private wealth and public life: Foundation philanthropy and the reshaping of American social policy from the progressive era to the new deal* published by

Sealand (1997) and *Why the Wealthy Give: The Culture of Elite Philanthropy* by Ostrower (1997) has been published.

Embraced by the enterprise culture, current situation with respect to art museums, transform the conceptions regarding the museum as a site for public aesthetic contemplation and education with regard to increasing significance of private funding in arts through the differentiated ways of involvement of corporations within the museums. Today's museums contrast with the 19th century museums in many aspects. The number of museums worldwide increased significantly and museums have diversified upon subject. Museumification gained importance. Market-oriented ideology and the focus on the revenue generation in museums have become prevalent during the course of late 20th century and onwards. Current era refers to an incorporation of a recreational function to the functions of the museums. Museum experience has increasingly converged with the entertainment experiences. Museums are much more dependent on the external funding and they have become the integral part of cultural policies that promotes culture for touristic purposes which is manifested through the increase in the cities' investment on museums. Cities have been marketed through the fashioning of art museums and compete with their cultural investments within the global market and governments paved the way through the corporate involvement in the arts which make the businesses integral part of the processes and active actors that engage in the production, dissemination and reception of the contemporary arts.

CHAPTER 5

INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF ARTS IN TURKEY

In this chapter I will provide the historical trajectory of institutionalization of arts in Turkey by specifically focusing on the private initiatives and private companies as actors who involve the sphere of culture and arts. My aim is to show the continuities and ruptures of the interference of the private sector in arts and its institutional offshoots.

I argue that, the strategic review of the social, economic and cultural history of the country; by paying special importance to the practices of the private sector in arts provide a timeline of initiatives that allows us to contextualize the emergence of private art museums. I suggest that the structuration processes involved in the formation of private art museums as an organizational field cannot be divorced from the former actors who played pivotal roles as definers, providers and supporters of visual arts. Before I focus the core organizational form, philanthropic foundations, as the key actors that “committed to speeding and shaping the diffusion process” (DiMaggio 1991, p.268) of the private art museums in Turkey, I find it necessary to present an overview of the artistic field and the major actors that committed to the process of diffusion of financial supports in arts.

In the first section, I focus on the historical trajectory of institutionalization of arts in the Republican Turkey. It reveals that, the state appeared as the major patron of the arts in the early Republican Era, whereas in the following years, private initiatives appeared in the cultural and artistic sphere by the organizational forms of art galleries, auction houses, art spaces and art platforms and most recently private art museums. The main actors in the cultural and artistic sphere include the state-especially through governments and Ministry of Culture and Tourism-companies, particularly banks, philanthropic foundations, art dealers and artists. The banks have been prominent actors in the financial support for the arts by

forming collections, providing exhibition spaces, and later turning their collections into art galleries.

In the second section, I will discuss the restoration of the philanthropic foundations in Republican Turkey, and the change in the legal framework that constitute them as new institutional actors in civil society. For the purposes of this thesis, philanthropic foundations are the crucial actors. They constitute the umbrella organizational form for the emergence of the private museums. Therefore, upon discussion on the legal framework by focusing on the changes in 1967, in the third section, I will elaborate on the example of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (İKSV). İKSV is the major philanthropic foundation which have affected the production, distribution and consumption of arts and affected the cultural and artistic sphere in İstanbul since its establishment in 1973. The İKSV is important on two levels. First, its emergence is directly affiliated with its leading founder Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı who is one of the subjects I will discuss further in detail in Chapter 7 in relation to the origination of idea of building private art museum. Second, İKSV plays an important role in various ways for structuring the field such as organizing festivals, facilitating the flourishing of cultural industries, cultural policy orientation, legitimization and proliferation of cultural and artistic sponsorship, and providing the ground for the origination of building a private museum of modern art.

5.1. The Peculiarities of the Field of Arts in Turkey

5.1.1. The Ottoman Legacy

First of all it is important to underline that, discussions on visual arts in Turkey had been shaped more on the history of its emergence than the issues such as its patronage, the economics of it or the significance of actors that support it. These issues are recently emerging fields of speculation. The main reason behind the neglect of these issues until recently, arguably, is the comparative recent history of the Western forms of visual arts that can be traced back to 18th and 19th centuries Ottoman Empire. As I pointed earlier in Chapter 4, the entrance and production of

Western forms of arts and genres have been subject to critical inquiry and conceptualized as “translation” of the Western forms (Artun 2007). Therefore, the forms of canvas painting and sculpture even have been symbolically important as the carriers of the “Western” and the “modern”. Consecutively, since the 18th century, the support given to the dissemination of these forms and their consumption is symbolically important for the actors who participate in funding of arts and the wider public.

There was an important rupture and a radical break with Ottoman Empire by the formation of the National Assembly in 1920, and establishment of Turkish Republic in 1923. This process also focused on Turkishness, and the negation of the old regime and disowning the Ottoman legacy (Timur 1987). Nonetheless, Ottoman Empire initiated pioneering modern culture and art institutions and these institutions form the grounds for future establishments. The Imperial Treasury, in the 15th century, consists of the gifts presented to the sultans in addition to the works produced in the palace’s workshops called as *nakkaşhane* and the valuable pieces acquired through wars, referred as the one of the first collections of the Emperor (Guerrieri 2002, p.58). *Fatih Köşkü* (called as the Conqueror’s Pavillon or Conquerer’s Kiosk) which was constructed between 1562-1463 under Fatih Sultan Mehmet II (Sultan Mehmet II (Conqueror) Pavilion/ Treasury Department 2014) hosted the collections of the Imperial Treasury. Based on the documents prepared by the foreign guests allowed to visit the Treasury, from the 17th century, it is suggested that the collection had an inventory list and the collection was formed by the principles of uniqueness, high quality and Sultans’ taste and in the period of Sultan Abdülmecid between 1839-1861, for the first time, part of the valuables were displayed in wooden cases yet the public was not allowed to see; nonetheless part of the collection was exhibited when Topkapı Palace was transformed into museum in 1924 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s initiative (Guerrieri 2002, p.60-61).

In the second half of the nineteenth century, where museums flourished as the symbolic representations of the nation-states in Europe, and the objects in the museums had been glorified as witnesses of history. During the rule of Sultan

Abdlmecid, the first Ottoman excavations were initiated, which provided excavated articles to be displayed in museum settings (Shaw 2003). Following the excavations, the principal institutional structures were formed. The archeological finds of the 1846 excavations were transported to the Hagia Irene where guns were kept; and the collection gave way to the establishment of the Imperial Museum in 1869, and French history Professor Edward Gould from the Galatasaray Lycee was appointed as the first manager of the collection. In 1871, the first catalog of the museum was prepared in French. In 1872, the Imperial Museum was refounded; this time with the appointment of German Dr. Philip Anton Dethier as the manager and in 1873, the idea of opening the collection to the public became overt. Consecutively, the restoration of the *Çinili Kşk* (Tiled Kiosk) set within the outer walls of the Topkapı Palace was initiated and in 1880 the museum was reopened in *Çinili Kşk*. Following the appointment of Osman Hamdi Bey as the museum director in 1881, a new era had begun in the museumification in Turkey. Osman Hamdi Bey initiated and participated in various archeological excavation projects including Nemrut Mountain, Alexandria in 1883 and 1887-1888 respectively. Meanwhile he initiated the first regulations on the archeological heritage of the Ottoman Empire in 1884, which was accepted as a law later. He also initiated the construction of a building which was supposed to serve as the first Fine Arts Academy of the Empire in 1883 (Today the building serves as the Old Eastern Works Museum as part of İstanbul Archeology Museums). Again, with the initiative of Osman Hamdi Bey, in 1891, a new building was constructed, for the Imperial Museum and today, this building serves for the İstanbul Archeological Museums. The architect of both of the buildings was Alexander Vallaury (Shaw 2003 and Ycel 1999; Atasoy & Barut 1996; 2. Mzecilik Seminer Bildirileri 1981; Prof. Tomur Atagk İT Seminars on Museology and the history of Museology, cited in Guerrieri 2002). Osman Hamdi Bey died in 1910 while he was planning the opening of the first Painting and Sculpture Museum. His plans were carried forward by his brother Halil Edhem who constructed the museum as a modern institution, to display the *Elvah-ı Nakşıye* (canvas paintings) collection and incorporating the art produced in the academy to the collections until his retirement in 1931 (Artun 2010). His efforts to build a modern art museum paved

the way for the establishment of State Painting and Sculpture Museum in 1937 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, in the Republican Turkey. It is crucial to note that the Ottoman dynasty appeared as the first major patron of arts in the 19th century. The dynasty commissioned artworks from Western painters, were the patrons of Western artists in the palace, and supported the organization of the first exhibition in Çırağan Palace in 1845 by an Austrian artist Oreker, appointed the artists Şeker Ahmet Paşa to acquire artworks for the palace during his trip to Europe in 1870 (Üstünipek 1998,p.60-67). The Ottoman dynasty also supported Turkish artists by military funds, for their participation in the international exhibition in Vienna (Arseven 1993, p.63).

The military school based artists trained in Europe had an impact on the provision of works of art in the early periods of Turkish painting. They were important actors in rising interest in arts, organizing exhibitions, forming associations of artists (Artun 2007). Moreover, in the 19th century Ottoman Empire the role of non-Muslim individual artists and non-Muslim families were important in the sphere of arts. Among those, Guillemet atelier founded in 1874 in İstanbul Beyoğlu which opened art exhibitions, the ABC Club which's members were consists majorly foreign artists, Abdullah Frères photography studio can be counted as examples to vitalize the art world in the Ottoman Empire (Üstünipek 1998, p.62-63). Moreover, İstanbul based Jewish-Ottoman Camondo Family was known as contributors to the culture and arts, especially by initiating buildings that had impacted İstanbul's cultural scenery in the 19th century; although they supported arts mostly in Europe (Şeni 2000).

I want to focus on funding of the cultural activities by the private capital in this period. Although it appeared to be a recent phenomenon in Turkey it is important to point out that the idea for looking for a fund from the private capital was already apparent in the late 19th century, Ottoman Empire. Osman Hamdi Bey was in correspondence with the director of German Museum of Antiquities, Alexander Conze during the course of initiating excavations in the Nemrut Mountain. Osman Hamdi Bey shared his interest on initiating excavations and his need for a fund with his German networks. German railroad engineer Carl Humann, who had

previous encounters with the excavation site in Bergama alerted Osman Hamdi Bey to collect funds from different resources. Consecutively, “he collected funds from the Ottoman Bank, the Eastern Railway Company, and the Haydar Pasha Railway Company” (Shaw 2003, p.108-109). Apparently, the roots of the engagement of banks with the support in arts and culture were present in the Empire. The role of banks for supporting arts has continued in the Republican Era. The activities under the framework of Imperial Museum were publicized both domestically and internationally. For example, the acquisitions of the museum were advertised in the newspapers *Tercuman-ı Şark* and *Vatan* and were published in French, which provided the excavations to be recognized in the European stage (Shaw 2003, p.109).

5.1.2. Republican Turkey

I will review the main characteristics of the field of arts in Republican Turkey in this section. My aim is to present main characteristics embodied in today’s field and major institutions as agencies that have shaped the artworld.

First of all, the state appeared as the major actor in the structuration of the field of arts in early Republican Turkey. Upon playing various roles, state facilitated the establishment of the field. Turkish art scene, built upon the legacy of the Ottoman Empire, had been transformed in association with new ideologies of the nation state and in line with the project of building a new nation with its own citizens. Arts, in this respect, were articulated into the mission of education. They were considered as one of the mediums of enlightening and modernizing the nation. Fine arts have been an important aspect of the founder of the proclaimed Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s understanding of modernization which valued arts and culture as the significant components of progress: “It should be confessed that there is no place on the road towards progress, for a nation which does not do painting, which does not make sculpture, which does not fulfill the requirements of

science⁹” (Mustafa Kemal Atatürk). Art was given special importance and treatment, which appears in the famous quotation from Mustafa Kemal Atatürk “A nation deprived of art is a nation who has lost one of her veins”¹⁰. Supporting arts and artists were adopted as state politics; national identity and dissemination of the arts in the country had been kept in the foreground; and international exhibitions had gained importance and new museums were opened (Kalaycı 1998; Beykal 2004; Yücel 1991; Ünsal 2009; Giray 1998; Germaner 1999 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.72-73). During the Republican People’s Party’ single party rule until 1950, state appeared as the major patron of arts, through supporting artists in educational training and supporting education in European arts institutions; acquisition of artworks on behalf of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk as the President of the country, commissioning paintings and sculptures, opening new museums, organizing exhibitions, forming the institutional and legal infrastructure for the purpose of disseminating Western forms of art and raising interest in public.

The appearance of the state as the major provider affected the form and content of the works of art produced in the period. The prominent form had become sculpture and monuments during this period; sculptors and painters focused on themes such as Turkish revolution and Atatürk as subject matter. For example in 1926, two sculptures of Atatürk were placed in İstanbul Sarayburnu and Konya; state requested the artists to concentrate on the pains and proud of the War of Independence as the major theme (Giray 1998; Mülayim 2005; Tansuğ 1999; Gezer 1984 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.74-75). During the course of the 1930s, the theme of nationalism had become prominent and between 1933 and 1936 the exhibitions of Revolution were organized by the state to facilitate the depiction of the theme of War of Independence and reforms, among the artists (Giray 1998; Üstünipek 1999 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.97).

⁹ Translated by Gözde Çerçioğlu Yücel. The original phrase in Turkish: “Bir millet ki resim yapmaz, bir millet ki heykel yapmaz, bir millet ki fennin gerektirdiği şeyleri yapmaz; itiraf etmeli ki o milletin ilerleme yolunda yeri yoktur.”

¹⁰ Translated by Gözde Çerçioğlu Yücel. The original phrase in Turkish: “Sanatsız kalan bir milletin damarlarından biri kopmuş demektir”

The main characteristics of the early Republican Era that, both the education level and the material conditions of the public were not suitable for the appreciation and consuming of arts. Consecutively, until the 1950's "The state was not only the sole customer and collector of their art but also its exhibitor, audience and critic." (Artun 2008 cited in Önsal 2006, p.68). This claim gains more importance when we evaluate the period for the emergence of the art market since, the actors that engage in buying arts were either the state institutions or the political elites identified with the Republican Peoples' Party. For example, Hamdullah Suhbi Bey bought three paintings chosen by the selective committee on behalf of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, from the 5th Galatasaray Exhibitions organized by Fine Arts Association in 1923. Ministry of Education and municipalities bought most of the paintings from the 6th Galatasaray Exhibitions (Üstünipek 1998, p.74). Another example is the acquisition of paintings by the Ministry of Education, Assembly and Ministry of the Interior in 1927, from the exhibition in Ankara organized by Fine Arts Association (Üstünipek 1998, p.75). As stated by Önsal (2006, p.73), "ruling elites prolonged the patronage routine that was practiced by Atatürk in early Republican Era. Following Atatürk, İnönü continued the role of the "patron of the arts". Önsal gives the example from an exhibition organized around 1944 in which İnönü bought some of the paintings on the last day of the exhibition when he saw that paintings were not sold and directed the Republican People's Party to buy more for the purpose of recovering expenses of the exhibition. Önsal suggests that patronage of political leaders were important for the production and consumption of arts, however, the absence of art galleries and art dealers hindered the maturation of the conditions for the emergence of an art market (ibid). Consecutively in this period state appeared as the major provider, audience, consumer and critique of arts as I mentioned referring to Artun (2010). State support for the arts was organized through the emergence of a national infrastructure. Sending artists abroad for education, buying artworks from exhibitions, organizing official painting and sculpture exhibitions, initiating Provincial Tours for artists and providing educational and exhibition spaces with People's Houses were organized via state at the level of Ministry of Education (which functioned as Ministry of Culture as well until 1935) appeared as elements

of emerging national infrastructure. At the core of this infrastructure were the agencies of ruling elites, Ministry of Education, Republican People's Party. If one considers the tensions within the institutionalization process, it was suggested by Üstünipek (1998) that two major actors, namely the artists and the state appear as in compromise rather than conflict. This was because their relationship was shaped by the effect of reciprocal expectations and the negotiation among the parties: Artists, considering the vital necessity of state's financial support in their artistic production, had tried to balance the needs of the state with their expectations. While the state and ruling elites interfered in some ways to orient the output of the artists by orienting the artists to focus on "nationality" and the "gains of the Turkish revolution". Germaner opposes that artistic production was governed by the state for propaganda in this period (cited in Önsal 2006, p.60). Rather, she states that artists willingly produced the works which were in line with the missions of state exhibitions since they were personally devoted to the revolutions (ibid). During the period, artists organized around associations and societies (Fine Arts Association, Association of Independent Painters and Sculptors, Group D, New Group, Harbour Painters). They needed state initiated exhibitions alongside their own initiatives because of the lack of mediating organizational forms and agents such as the galleries and art dealers. Ankara was highlighted as the center of culture and arts of the new Republic, and *Ankara Sergi Evi* (Ankara Exhibition House), People's Houses, Fine Arts Academy and Galatasaray Lycee in İstanbul served as the first exhibition spaces. Ministry of Education had appeared as the major institution buying artworks on behalf of the state. The Minister Hasan Ali Yücel, in particular, appeared as an effective personality in determining the state's cultural policies and the support for arts in the period between 1940 and 1950 (Üstünipek 1998).

This period was characterized by the institutional establishment of the state that mainly shaped the production and dissemination of arts to the public. Major

initiatives in building institutions were the establishment of Ministry of Culture¹¹ and organization of cultural policies through the Ministry; the opening of *Halk Evleri* (People's Houses) in 1932, which served as institutions focusing on education besides providing exhibition space for state initiated exhibitions and newly emerging artists and diffused in branches domestically, until their abolishment in 1951 (Ölçen 2001 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.90); the organization of Exhibitions of Reforms (İnkılap Sergileri) in Ankara between 1933-1936 (Giray 1998 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.97); State Exhibitions of Painting and Sculpture first initiated in 1939; Yurt Gezileri (The Provincial Tours) initiated in 1938 and continued until 1943¹²; the organization of the 50 Years of Turkish Painting and Sculpture Exhibition (50 Senelik Türk Resim ve Heykel Sergisi) in 1937 (Aksel 1943 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.102) and consecutive opening of İstanbul Painting and Sculpture Museum in the same year in the Heir's Quarters of the Dolmabahçe Palace. The core collection of the museum was consisted of the collection of the original paintings and reproductions previously formed by Osman Hamdi Bey and Halil Edhem, the works of art that had been owned by the state and the palaces that transformed into museums, and the ones that displayed in the 50 Years of Turkish Painting and Sculpture Exhibition (Aksel 1943; Beykal 2004; Katoğlu 2009;

¹¹ The Ministry was called as the *Maarif Vekaleti* (Ministry of Education) from 1923 to 27 December 1935 and from 28 December 1935 to 21 September 1941 referred as Ministry of Culture. Through the years, the Ministry changed names and focus. In 1971, The Ministry of Culture was established and the Undersecretary of Culture and relevant directorates of the Ministry of Education were assigned to the Ministry of Culture. In 1972, this Ministry was abolished and as in the form of Undersecretary of Culture was connected to the Prime Ministry. However, in the same year, the Ministry of Culture was re-established and in 1977 the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Culture were reintegrated and recalled as Ministry of Education and Culture. The Ministry of Education was separated in 5 January 1978 and in 1980 the Ministry of Culture was renamed as Ministry of Culture and Tourism, this time with the integration of two ministeries on culture and tourism (Kasalı 2010, p.76-77) and this constituted the basis for the main complaints of the actors that initiate cultural and arts institutions.

¹² Provincial Tours were organized with the aim of initiating travels of the artists to encounter and examine the culture in the countryside and "In this program, artists within groups who were determined by Fine Arts Academy were sent to the provinces for a month to produce works representing the social and cultural atmosphere and characteristics of the place. It is decided that when the tour was over, works were going to be presented to a jury in order to be evaluated. During the following six years, tours continued regularly despite the Second World War and its pernicious affects on economy. Artists were paid commissions in acknowledgement of their service by RPP, and usually accommodated in the People's Houses" (Önsal 2006, p.62).

İskender 1983 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.102). Nonetheless it is important to underline the absence of a modern art museum in Turkey. It had been regarded as one of the dramatic issues in the field, because according to Üstünipek (1998, p.95-96) the state's interest on the Painting and Sculpture Museum did not continue in the following years, and the museum did not contribute to the development of an art market in Turkey since its collection is mostly comprised of donations rather than acquisitions. One of the main reasons behind this is the fact that until today the museum has enriched its collection mainly by donations from artists and official state institutions.

Exhibitions abroad appeared as another area of state's initiatives in arts. For example in 1936, Exhibition of Modern Turkish Painting (Çağdaş Türk Resim Sergisi) travelled to Athens, Bucharest, Moscow, Leningrad and Belgrade and the exhibitions abroad have accelerated in the post Second World War era (Beykal 2004 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.73).

Second, although the production and consumption of arts centered in Ankara, in the early years of the Republic, the process continued in İstanbul. This process was in parallel with the decreasing of state support in arts and consecutive emergence of an art market and cultural industries in İstanbul. Ankara, as the capital city, was highlighted as the new center of culture and arts of the new Republic (Cantek 2003 cited in Önsal 2006, p.59) through a decision given by the Council of Ministers in 12 September 1926 that declared the exhibitions that would be opened in Ankara would be official, awards would be given to the artists, and paintings would be bought (Üstünipek 1998, p. 74). In this respect, opening of the Painting Department of the Gazi Educational Institution in 1931 (Önsal 2006, p.60), the initiative of Exhibition of the Paintings of the Revolution (Üstünipek 1998, p.83-84) first opened in 1933 in Ankara People's House that continued until 1937, the annual event of State Exhibition of Painting and Sculpture which was first initiated in 31 October 1939 in Ankara (Devlet Resim ve Heykel Sergisi Talimatnamesi 1939, p.84 cited in Kasalı 2010, p.108) can be counted as major activities that facilitated the implementation of the aim of highlighting Ankara as the center of arts. Alongside these state initiated events, the exhibitions of Fine Arts Association

organized in Ankara (Üstünipek 1998, p.75) also contributed to the rise of Ankara during the early periods of Turkish Republic. Nonetheless, the center of culture and arts has shifted from Ankara to İstanbul in the following years, especially in post 1980s, which I will discuss in Chapter 6.

Third, the role of the state has started to decrease with the multi-party period. This period saw the flourishing of private initiatives. As Altunışık and Tür (2005, p.28-31) summarize the particularities of the period are: Multi-party system in politics was introduced in 1946 and the elections on 14 May 1950 resulted with the opposition party's coming to power. As an outcome of the Second World War years which were characterized by the high-inflation and new taxes which undermined the support for Republican People's Party (CHP) rule and the alienation of traditional CHP supporters through CHP policies, opposition to one-part regime increased and Democrat Party (DP), as the only opposing party came to power. The peculiarities of the Democrat Party years between 1950-1960 are: bringing of new social groups and elites that had remained outside of the political elite that had been in power until then; appeal of its policies for the masses; legitimizing Islam and traditional rural values; moving people in a populist fashion; instrumentalist use of Islam; the economic boom and growth supported by US aid during the early years which then left its place economic stagnation and spiraling inflation in mid 1950s which gave rise to authoritarian rule and the increase in the instrumental use of the Islamic symbols for propaganda. Furthermore as Timur (1987, p.10) states that after the Second World War a new conception of history was established in Turkey and Democrat Party in this respect, "approached and looked upon the Ottoman ascent with praise and longing".

During the course of Democrat Party governments, Public Houses were closed down in 1951. The importance of culture and arts has declined at the policy level (Kasalı 2010; Önsal 2006). Üstünipek (1998, p.137-139) summarizes the developments regarding this period as: increasing individual attempts of the artists to find ways of producing and distributing their works, increasing significance of social groups who grow rich and constitute a potential group of consumers,

increasing in the number of exhibitions opened by the artists, the decrease in number of official exhibitions; an increase in the participation of artists in the international exhibitions and events such as Venice Biennial and Sao Paolo Biennial; recession of the importance of Ankara with the rise of İstanbul as center for new initiatives; the lack of art dealers; individual efforts of the artists to sell their work through mechanisms such as opening permanent exhibitions, providing the possibility of paying with installments, discounting prices of the artworks; the appearing of architectural sites such as Anıtkabir, Grand National Assembly of Turkey, Etibank Headquarter and hotels and İzmir Fair as opportunity for artists to earn a living.

Moreover, an investigation of cultural policies of the period reveals that there had been initiatives such as enhancing cultural relations with United States of America, France and Britain, passing bills on protecting works of art, increasing the budget of public museums for their provision of exhibition complexes and opening exhibitions, agreement on increasing sources of revenue for the museums during the period (Kasalı, 2010). If one considers the decrease of attention to the arts and the introduction of economically liberal policies it will not be surprising to see the increasing number of individual exhibitions and art galleries. This development can be regarded as filling the gap that had been formed by the withdrawal of the state from the sphere of arts as the major supporter and provider (ibid).

The first initiatives of establishing private art galleries in İstanbul and Ankara were remarkable developments that were observed in the 1950s. The galleries emerged in Ankara in 1950s were studied by Başak Önsal (2006). She argues that these galleries in Ankara (Helikon Derneği Galerisi, Milar Mobilya ve Dekoratif Sanatlar Galerisi, Sanatseverler Derneği Galerisi) aimed to occupy the vacancy that was left by the abolishment of People's Houses. As Önsal (ibid) states, these galleries served to wealthy and cultured people at the time. Despite the fact that these galleries both in İstanbul and Ankara were enthusiastic places for small intellectual circles of the time, they were obviously the indicators of state's recession in the arts regarding its role in funding the arts.

Fourth, as CHP and DP period reveals, conception of art in Turkey is highly politicized and ideological. In the 1970s the political and ideological significance of visual arts in Turkey become much more explicit. Turkey witnessed two military coups that impacted civil-military relations (Hale 1994; Cizre 2004; Heper 2005 and 2011; Narlı 2011) and affected the production and consumption of arts in the 1970s. The first one was on 27 May 1960 which resulted in the toppling of Democrat Party Government. The second one witnessed on 12 March 1971 as an outcome of an increasing polarization in the society.

The 1961 military coup was assessed as a “reaction of the official elites-both military and the civilians- against the decline in their power, prestige and status in society” during the era of the DP rule and as a demonstration of the return of the military-bureaucratic elite to the centre to overcome their diminishing role in the country’s politics, and associated with the causes of the attacks on Islam and the Kemalist principles (Hale cited in Altunışık and Tür 2005, p.32). With the enactment of a new constitution by the military rulers a more liberal approach to secularism, religion and individual and social rights was adopted. Additionally, the introducing of an independent constitutional court was introduced (ibid.,p.33). In addition to the establishment of National Security Council which served as a special place for military to intervene with the politics of the country, the constitution aimed to prevent the elected governments from abusing the national will through authoritarian rule. The new election law replaced the majoritarian system with the proportional one (ibid). The 1965 and 1969 elections were resulted with the victory of Justice Party, and with a political turmoil because of increased polarization between the right and the left. In addition to these, I want to underline some economic changes and developments which I consider important for forming the ground for the development of the private sector as an actor in the social spheres.

Bek (2007, p.190) suggested that the major developments which shape the cultural and artistic sphere in Turkey between 1970 and 1980 were rapid politicization, industrialization, urbanization, the independent movements and initiatives in the arts, and the commodification of arts. Moreover, the period was characterized by

the politicization of the arts. The social and political atmosphere following the 1961 Constitution brought a period of political instability reflected through the short-lived coalition governments. The example Bek (2007, p.191) gives on the reflections on İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts' events are interesting. She suggested that the leftists groups criticized that the festival organized by the Foundation is elitist depending on the high ticket prices and the claim that festival serves for bourgeois. By contrast, conservative right-wing groups criticized it for not reflecting Turkish culture and that it served for the diffusion of the foreign cultures into the country and represented West. During this period, among fifteen governments that had been in power, five of them had the Ministry of Culture and the cultural policies remained at the discursive level. This period had been characterized by inadequate budget, lack of permanent staff, and lack of coherent cultural policies and deficiency of the state meeting the demands of the art world (Bek 2007, p.192). The state which was the patron of the arts in the early Republican period appeared with its diminishing role in the provision and support of arts. While the State Arts and Sculpture Exhibition took place in 1973 for the commemoration of the 50th year anniversary of the Republic, state started to head towards international events as occasions to promote events (Bek n.d. and Üstünipek 1998). As Bek (ibid) suggests, the political atmosphere of the country reflected itself in the cultural and artistic sphere as the appearance of censorship toward the artworks from different ideologically opposing groups and which can be seen in examples such as the assaults towards the artworks in the Antalya Painting and Sculpture Exhibition in 1976, assaults and displacement of the sculptures that were placed in İstanbul under the framework of 20 Sculpture Project, the narrative build towards the State Fine Arts Academy from conservative groups claiming that the institution did not reflect the *milli kültür* (national culture).

Fifth, the changes in economy and increasing accumulation of wealth accumulation in certain individuals, including the families Koç, Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı I am dealing with, led to the emergence of an independent art market. Various economic and political developments gave way to the emergence of an art

market. In the aftermath of the 1960 coup, Military Regime established the State Planning Organization (SPO). As stated by Pamuk (2007, p.14-15) “The idea of development planning was now supported by a broad coalition: the Republican People's Party with its etatist heritage, the bureaucracy, large industrialists and even the international agencies, most notably the OECD” while the economic policies of the period aimed to protect the domestic market and industrialization through import substitution. The governments extensively used the restrictive trade regime and they attempted to achieve the goals of the import substitution by state economic enterprises and subsidized credit (ibid). The SPO played a crucial role in private sector decisions given that the private sector investment projects required the approval of the SPO to benefit from, tax exemptions, import privileges and access to scarce foreign exchange (ibid). The state economic enterprises had major roles in leading the industrialization during the 1930's where private sector was weak. By contrast, after the 1960s, state enterprises' role in industrialization characterized by the emergence of “big family holding companies, large conglomerates which included numerous manufacturing and distribution companies as well as banks and other services firms” as the leaders (Pamuk 2007, p.15).

It is also important to point at some other political and ideological issues during the period after the military intervention of 1971. The military intervention of 1971 appeared in a political scene in which the political parties Justice Party, Republican People's Party, Turkish Workers' Party, National Order Party and Nationalist Action Party represent different ideologies which gave way to a significant polarization between the groups on the right and the left. The Demirel government with the Justice Party resigned in the aftermath of the Military Intervention in 1971 with a memorandum. The important implications of the military intervention included the closing of the organizations on the right and left, curtail of freedom of press, the closing down of the Turkish Workers' Party and National Order Party (which can be considered as the politicized version of Islam) and appearance of National Salvation Party in 1972 (Zürcher 1993; Landau 1976; Toprak 1984; Alkan 1984; Saribay 1985 cited in Altunışık and Tür 2005, p.37-38).

Another important development which reflects the class positions in politics was the 1973 elections (ibid) in which Justice Party was advocating the interests of the bourgeois and status quo, and CHP shifted towards left of centre claiming to support rights of workers and “promising a ‘new’ order under its ‘new’ leader Bülent Ecevit”. CHP won the 1973 elections. National Salvation Party built a coalition with CHP despite their major ideological differences and National Salvation Party’s conception of the party as “anti-Islam” and “Western”, “immoral” and “infidel” (Ahmad 1991 cited in Altunışık and Tür 2005, p.39-40). Turkey was ruled by coalition governments until the end of 1970s. This period was characterized by the severe economic measures and economic problems which were worsened by the negative impact of intervention in Cyprus in 1974 and 1973-1974 oil crisis, beginnings of identity politics, intense conflict in society and violence, assassinations, last but not least, Demirel’s -then leader of the Justice Party Government- decision to start a major reorientation of the economy which had introduced then head of the SPO, Turgut Özal as the man to launch a new economic policy and initiate structural adjustment towards economic liberalisation (ibid., 40-41).

The importance of this period with regard to the funding of arts and emergence of an art market in Turkey is the increase in the number of private galleries, auctions and most importantly, the appearance of private sector as the source of demand. Moreover, the contribution of the media in disseminating the issues related with arts through flourishing and increasing significance of periodicals such as *Milliyet Sanat*, *Yeni İnsan*, *Ankara Sanat*, *Varlık*, *Hisar*, *Yeditepe*, *Arkitekt* contributed to the dissemination of the art news and relevant topics such as the “value of the work of art” (Üstünipek, 1998, p.147).

The private galleries opened in this period not only oriented towards the economic gains and increasing its potential through searching for new channels to sell artworks such as organizing events at the hotels, but also changed the exhibition spaces and initiated new ways of promoting events. As Ütünipek (1998, p.180) states with the opening of private galleries, the facilities of lighting, distribution of promotional and informative material such as brochures, organizing opening

receptions and promoting the events through using media channels appeared as new developments. The symbolic practices involved in the field of arts have provided the ground, for economically powerful actors to manifest their distinct social positions while served as the maintenance of their social class positions. Bourdieu (Swartz 1997, p.9) suggests that social life is in unity whereby material dimensions and symbolic dimensions are combined. Not every action is necessarily economic, for example collecting artworks, visiting museums, participating in cultural events can be regarded as symbolic practices. However, reflecting upon Bourdieu's concept of *misrecognition* symbolic practices "dellect attention from the interested character of practices and thereby contribute to their enactment as disinterested pursuits" while they gain legitimacy as much as they "become separate from underlying material interests and hence go misrecognized as representing disinterested forms of activities and resources" (Swartz 1997, p.43).

Sixth peculiarity of the field of arts in Turkey is the prominence of banks in supporting arts. In fact as I mentioned earlier in this chapter, traces of banks' support in culture can be traced as far back into the Ottoman Empire, as Ottoman Bank appeared as one of the first "sponsor" of culture by supporting the excavations in Nemrut Mountain.

The support of banks to the arts was actualized with their acquisitions during the early republican period. The main examples are in fact state banks by the time, *Türkiye İş Bankası* (İş Bank) which was founded in 1924 and has started to establish its collection and *Ziraat Bankası* (Ziraat Bank) which commissioned works from Namık İsmail, İbrahim Çallı and had bought works from the State Exhibition of Painting and Sculpture (Üstünipek 1998, p.116). *Yapı ve Kredi Bankası* (Yapı Kredi Bank) which was founded in 1944, right from the beginning encountered the sphere of arts with the enthusiasm of its founder Kazım Taşkent. It is suggested that in the case of İş Bank, the interest in buying works of art led by Bank's Vice General Manager Saim Aybar, in an environment vitalized with the flourishing of State Exhibition of Painting and Sculpture and from 1940 and onwards bank appeared as the consumer of the works of art (Giray 1997 cited in

Üstünipek 1998, p.116). Awards for the arts have been established by the banks which have had an important impact in the sphere of artistic production.

Alongside the banks mentioned above, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez Bankası* (Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey) added to the list in the 1940s. Banks, mostly began to establish their collections during this period and the acquisitions were being made by the initiatives of top level executives nonetheless, the acquisitions that were being made did not show professional character and based on connoisseurship except the case of Yapı Kredi Bank which was oriented by the influence of the art and culture consultancy of Vedat Nedim Tör (Üstünipek, 1998, p.134). In this respect, the awarded exhibition organized by Yapı Kredi Bank in 1954, in the special theme of “Production” selected as a pioneering example since the bank initiated the occasion for the commemoration of its 10th Year Anniversary (ibid) which I suggest was important for demonstrating one of the earliest examples of instrumentalization of an art event for a business purpose. Moreover, this competition marks a turning point in Turkey because for the first time an artist outside the Academy was awarded. This facilitated the questioning of the Academy, the quality of the work of art and the concept of national art. Aliye Berger, as an amateur, who painted oil on canvas, won the award with her work titled as “Sun” and this surprised the artists who committed willingly to paint “copies” of Western paintings and dedicated to cubism. Alongside the criticisms proliferated with this groundbreaking competition, there had been an orientation towards abstract painting (Kasalı 2010, p.170-184).

I want to underline that, there was one example of support of a venture capitalist during in the 1940’s which I consider important since it appeared in an environment devoid of such practices. In October 1945, during the course of the 7th State Exhibition of Painting and Sculpture, a businessman named Ahmet Çanakçılı put an award amounting 1500 TL by the time, to be given to the selected work, among the 562 works exhibited (Üstünipek 1998, p.115). Moreover, in 1947, Çanakçılı continued his support by the award mechanism; this time naming the award as “Çanakçılı Award” (ibid). Üstünipek evaluates this example as the first occasion in which art was recognized as an element of social prestige since

the award given, found a space in period's newspapers and magazines and was appreciated. When I researched about Çanakçılı, I found out that his name was on the list of the founders/shareholders of *Garanti Bankası* (Garanti Bank) which was founded in 1946 appeared in the main convention of the establishment of the bank (Garanti Bank Main Contract). The connection of him with the bank's interest in supporting art is not clear, yet, it is interesting to see the engagement of the actors who supports arts with the banks even at this early stage. Although there were traces of the support of banks as early as in the Ottoman Empire, the prominence of support of banks in modern Turkey can be traced back to the early periods of Turkish Republic.

The banks started to appear explicitly during the late 1960s as emerging actors that shape the demand in arts. Besides building their collections during the period, banks such as İş Bank, Yapı Kredi Bank, Akbank had formed exhibition spaces by using their own corporate buildings. The district of Galatasaray and Beyoğlu in İstanbul appeared as the place of initiatives of exhibitions. For example Yapı Kredi Bank allocated a space for exhibitions in Galatasaray during this period (Üstünipek 1998, p.149). The acquisitions of artworks expanded with the banks' increasing roles in purchasing works for expanding their collections while the other economic sectors started to discover the benefits of supporting arts for their corporate images and improving their reputation. For example DYO organized an exhibition in 1967 with a scope of Aegean region, whereas Mobil Oil Company introduced an art award in 1970 and Vakko opened "Vakko Art Gallery" on İstiklal Street in 1962 (ibid). The exhibition spaces of the banks transformed into galleries in mid 1970s. Meanwhile the capital owners and high-level executives appeared as the collectors of artworks during the late 1960s and paved the way through exhibitions of collections during the course of 1970s. Despite all odds, during the period, the processes of urbanization and of capitalization gave way to the capital accumulation in certain groups. The conception of artwork as an investment, and the social privileges of possessing artworks as a marker of high status, has started to emerge among the private sector and upper classes. The shift in the individuals and groups who possess artworks, from intellectuals towards the

actors of the private sector indicates to the social differentiation in Turkish society during this period.

Currently, various banks support visual arts in various ways including establishing their own art centers and platforms and sponsoring cultural and artistic events. Among those Garanti Bank is a crucial example for the establishment of SALT (2011). Akbank is another important example considering Akbank Art Center (1993) in Beyoğlu. However, these establishments cannot be divorced from the rise of İstanbul as a center of culture and arts especially within the last two decades which I will discuss in detail in Chapter 6. In 1990s and onwards, banks focused on contemporary arts by opening art spaces and art platforms in this direction or shifting their priorities. I consider them important for yielding the major trends for support in arts among the private sector in Turkey, besides their peculiarity in orienting the interest towards the contemporary arts since the 1990s. Thus, the recent emerging interest in forming private museums that concentrate on contemporary arts, which I will discuss in Chapter 8 in detail, cannot be divorced from the former initiatives of banks in this respect. Moreover, banks are also important for being the sponsors of the cultural activities initiated by İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, which followed by their sponsorship in the activities and exhibitions of the private museums that I focus. Additionally, through initiatives such as SALT, Akbank Art concentrated on contemporary arts; they have been effective in the flourishing of new professions such as art curators, art consultants and consecutively professionalization in the field of arts which I will elaborate in detail in Chapter 8.

Last and the seventh characteristic that I want to focus on is related to the collection practices. In contrast to conventional association of collecting works of art driven by the sophisticated taste and connoisseurship, the development of collection practices in Turkey has a peculiarity. It is suggested by Bourdieu (1984, p.1) aesthetic taste is not a “gift of nature” to individuals, rather the “cultural needs are the product of upbringing and education: surveys establish that all cultural practices (museum visits, concert-going, reading etc.), and preferences in literature, painting or music, are closely linked to educational level (measured by

qualifications or length of schooling) and secondarily to social origin.”.Given that, the diffusion of the Western forms of art is relatively very late compared to the Western countries in Turkey, absence of these art forms arguably, highlighted the economic values associated with the works of art, rather than class based aesthetic preferences. Bourdieu’s (1984) conceptualization of cultural capital as a form of power is still relevant for the earlier periods of Turkish case, but with slightly different connotation, whereby taste was not the primary motive behind cultural practices. It is suggested by Üstünipek (1998, p.119) that in the period before the 1950’s there was a group of people, who constituted the demand in the art market, however they were directed towards luxurious consumption and their attention was on curiosities that they believed to have a value, rather than the paintings of the period. And this was evaluated as an absence of aesthetic taste and connoisseurship.

Turkish contemporary artist Bedri Baykam’s¹³ assessment of the nature of collecting and collectors’ practices represent the “conspicuous” character of arts consumption in Turkey which I think not have ceased to an end:

In Turkey there are some acquisitions guided with fashions. There are purchases which led by trends, rumors, gossips and market fashions. There are purchases of artworks for decoration since they were conceived as decorative. There are purchases because the artwork has a good price.

¹³ Bedri Baykam is a Turkish artists. “He studied at the Sorbonne University in Paris from 1975 to 1980 and got an MBA degree. Baykam has been working actively for several institutions as a political activist, taking the defense of Turkey as a secular democratic country respecting fully all human rights. He has been one of the main spokesmen of the Kemalist movement since the eighties and has he writes in the leftist - democratic daily Cumhuriyet. He was a Party Assembly Member of CHP in 90’s. He is still an active member of the Party. He is one of the central characters of the Turkish intellectual and political milieu since the 80’s.

(...) Baykam is one of the founders of the Turkish Plastic Arts Association (UPSD) within the International Art Association (IAA) which is a partner NGO with UNESCO. The artist has been the President of UPSD-Turkish National Committee since 2006 and he is in the Executive Committee of IAA Europe and IAA World. Baykam is also the founder of the film production and publishing company Pyramid and Pyramid Sanat (www.piramidsanat.com) both based in Istanbul.” (Bedri Baykam Biography, n.d.)

However, there is no consciousness of buying art as part of history, as a historical artifact (cited in Çalıkoğlu 2009, p.91).

Do you know how artworks purchased in Turkey? Whatever work of art is chance bargained in whatever auction, is added to the collection. The rationality of collecting has deteriorated in Turkey until this point. Because, interestingly, in this geography, the lack of education, the lack of museum going, like the Dutchs and French have been used to since their births, the lack of institutions such as museums and exhibitionary places have resulted in this: First, “Let’s buy it if it has a value”; Second, “Let it cannot be made by my child, let it be a more difficult thing”. Because in Turkey the typical conservative collecting necessarily wants to see a skill and labor inherited in the work of art. Another dimension of it is: “As we buy a dead artist’s work as much as expensive we can, we can show off and we can be proud insomuch, and this shall appear in newspapers (cited in Çalıkoğlu 2009, p.94).

On these grounds, I will further elaborate on the field of arts in relation with the global trends within the last decades that paved the way through the emergence of private art museums established by philanthropic foundations in Chapter 6. Now I shall move to the legal framework of the philanthropic foundations, which I conceive as core institutions in the emergence of private museums.

5.2. Legal Framework for the Emergence of Philanthropic Foundations

The philanthropic foundations are important as umbrella organizations to establish and control the private art museums in Turkey. The three cases of this thesis reveal that, the three private art museums discussed in this dissertation emerged as “foundation museums”. Consecutively, my aim in this section is to provide the legal framework that provided the revitalization of *vakıf* system in Turkey which paved the way not only for the interference of private actors in social matters but also are at the core for the establishment of private museums as separate organizational forms. In section 5.3 I will exemplify the functioning of the philanthropic foundation system in the field of arts by elaborating on the İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, as “the organization” that shaped and frames many aspects in the field. In Chapter 7, I will discuss particularly the cases of Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and relevance and relationship of them with the main philanthropic foundations which gave way to the idea of

building museums and interest in supporting arts via the umbrella organization of philanthropic foundations.

The term *vakıf* in Turkish had been used to connote pious foundations in Turkey, yet it has been transformed in parallel to the social and economic transformation Turkey has encountered. The first *vakıf* establishments date back to 1048 as stated by the Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Directorate General of Foundations. The Ottoman Empire *vakıf* establishments (*waqfs*) referred as the establishments responsible for the building of “mosques, churches, synagogues, shrines, lodges used by Mevlevi dervishes, domes, madrasahs, imarets, Turkish baths (*hamam*), caravansaries, covered bazaars, fountains, bridges, mansions, pavilions - palaces, clock towers” (Prime Ministry Directorate General of Foundations Official Web Page) and so on, working under special jurisprudence formed for them. Three definitions of the term by the modern Turkish dictionary reveals the meanings attributed to the term: (1) money or property that has been endowed (donated) by an individual or a group under certain conditions in an official way for the provision of services in future, (2) the organization in which the money and the property endowed (donated) by an individual or a group is administered, (3) an institution that is established by group of individuals with a principle of working for social benefit.

The establishment of Directorate General of Foundations in 1924 points out to a different stage in the official status of the *vakıf* institutions in modern Turkey; where the foundations subject to the Turkish Civil Code constitute a different set of institutions other than the foundations that were established prior to the enactment of the code. The philanthropic foundations have been studied by Akgündüz (1988) and Çizakça (2000). The book by Murat Çizakça (2000) *A History of Philanthropic Foundations: The Islamic World From the Seventh Century to the Present* is my main resource in this section by providing information on the “centralization of the *waqf* system” in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey and the “survival and restoration of *waqf* in Turkey” by focusing on the 1967 legislation which had considerable impacts on the survival and restoration of *waqfs* in Turkey. Çizakça (2000, p.1) uses the word *waqf* referring to the use of

the term in the Islamic world and “the word waqf and its plural form awqaf are derived from the Arabic root verb *waqafa*, which means to cause a thing to stop and stand still”. A second meaning of the word is the philanthropic foundations. The main definition of the waqf institution in the Islamic civilization is “a privately owned property, *corpus*, is endowed for a charitable purpose in perpetuity and the revenue generated is spent for this purpose” (ibid). Revealing the history of waqfs in the Islamic world, Çizakça argues that the waqfs had become the subject of deliberate destruction inflicted upon them during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This destruction took place with the impact of western imperialism in colonized countries. In Turkey, paradoxically, as being one of the few countries which was not colonized, a major deliberate destruction took place. Nevertheless, surprisingly with the developments in the 1960s and most importantly with the legislation that was accepted in 1967, the waqf has survived and revitalized in Turkey. And, here I want to underline one other emphasis Çizakça made with regard to the formation of respective legislation: the impact of Vehbi Koç. I will outline major arguments provided by Çizakça, the peculiarity of the legislation and its impacts not only in the framework of the establishment of philanthropic foundations but also their social functions.

The interference of the state in waqf affairs were traced to the Ottoman Empire, and the process of centralization that took place in the Empire starting from middle eighteenth century. The Waqf institution which was designed to be autonomous (Çizakça 2000, p.82) had been the subject of central authority, often involved the violation of its legal autonomy. According to Çizakça (2000, p.86) the “destruction” of the waqf system in the Ottoman Empire, continued in the Republican Turkey. I want to restate some of the major moments of waqf centralization process and its consequences in the Ottoman Empire, forming the institutional background, presented by Çizakça (2000, p.82-86): The Ministry of Awqaf was founded during Abdülhamid I’s reign. It reached to its fullest development during his son Sultan Mahmud II in the nineteenth century. *Nezaret* was established and brought the financing of the hundreds of additional bureaucrats by the waqf “for which no resourced had been endowed” before.

Because, taking measures for such expenses were out of the scope in the classical era since centralized management was not present. Since “collecting taxes due to the waqfs was a significant part of the process of centralization, unscrupulous bureaucrats who collected the waqf funds had all the opportunity to keep these funds for themselves” thus “the system was being cheated by the very persons who were supposed to protect and manage it” (Çizakça 2000, p.83). The waqf system could be forced to lend money to the state. The establishment of new waqfs made difficult by the intervention of the state in 1863 by subjecting the establishment of new waqf to more difficult conditions. The state had begun to act against the system more severely in the Tanzimat Era and “it was decreed that all taxes due to the waqfs from the peasantry cultivating waqf lands were to be collected not by the waqf trustees anymore but by the treasury officials” (Çizakça 2000, p.84). This put the waqfs at “mercy” of the central authority where the rule was expanded to apply to all waqfs in 1847 (ibid). In 1882 “all the revenues of the education related waqfs were transferred to the *Ministry of Education*” (Çizakça 2000, p.85).

Çizakça (2000, p.87) is critical against the official steps which were taken against the waqf system in the Turkish Republic until 1950, and consecutively, conceptualizes the process as the “process of destruction”. Therefore, 1967 legislation is much more important since it provided the grounds for the “survival” of the system. The reaction against the waqf system, that was oriented towards the abolishment of the system was in conformity with the Republican People’s Party ideology and with the main slogan of “for the people” “as if what was being sold off had not been endowed “for the people” in the first place” (Öztürk 1995 cited in Çizakça 2000, p.87). Çizakça (2000, p.87-90) listed the steps taken for the waqf system in the Turkish Republic as follows: *Committee for Abolishment of the Waqfs* was established in 1937 (p.87). The step taken in the Tanzimat Era that resulted in the abolition of the financial autonomy of the waqfs continued (p.89). It is stated that (p.89) “The central authority began to usurp increasing proportions of this waqf revenue and the repayment of the thus collected revenue to the waqf was delayed as well as curtailed”. The Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Education competed for the waqf property where the old educational establishments of waqfs

were sold off (p.88-89). Central Waqf Administration “was made responsible for loss-making state enterprises” and “forced to invest in and manage these enterprises, which were totally unrelated to the waqf system” (p.89). “[W]aqf funds originally endowed by private persons were channeled to state enterprises and municipal authorities” and “the revenues and assets of all the education related waqfs were transferred to the *Ministry of Education*”(ibid). The destruction of the waqf system gained legitimacy through the “*étatiste* and populist ideology of the republic” (ibid). “[F]ormer tenants were made co-owners of the waqf property and were strongly induced by the state to purchase the rest of the waqf’s assets” (ibid). In cases where the former tenants could not buy the waqf assets, auctions organized in which waqf assets were sold off (P.89-90). In 1954 all the cash waqfs were abolished and their confiscated capital formed the basis for the establishment of *Vakıflar Bankası* -Bank of the Awqaf- (Çizakça 2000, p.87-90).

Nonetheless, the 1967 legislation which was submitted to the parliament by Aydın Bolak, a Member of the Parliament contributed most to the “survival and restoration” of the Turkish waqf system. The story behind the birth of the 1967 legislation is interesting, and has a direct relation to the subject of this dissertation. The visit of businessman Vehbi Koç to the United States after the Second World War and his encounters with the American trusts who were already well aware of the traditional Islamic waqf system paved the way through the restoration of the waqf system:

The opportunity to observe these trusts functioning arose during business negotiations with the Ford Motor Company. When he visited a hospital run by the Ford Foundation for a check-up, he was convinced that the traditional Islamic waqf should be modernized. By 1951 he began seriously to consider the idea of setting up a philanthropic foundation along American lines in Turkey (Çizakça 2000, p.91).

Vehbi Koç, as one of the important subjects that I focus on in this study, not only for his direct affiliation with the waqf system that have given way to the establishment of private museums, but also as a businessman who also initiated the idea of the first private family museum in 1980 under the framework of the Vehbi Koç Foundation. I will elaborate on Vehbi Koç in detail, and the flourishing of his idea of setting up a philanthropic foundation and the *Sadberk*

Hanım Museum in Chapter 7. Yet, for now I will present the peculiarity of the 1967 constitution lead by the enthusiasm of Vehbi Koç for setting up a philanthropic foundation along American lines in Turkey.

Vehbi Koç realized the necessity of a completely new law to form the philanthropic foundation he desired. This law should combine the Islamic traditions with the latest developments in the West. Koç and Aydın Bolak have spent years through series of meetings with the legal authorities of the country and had consultance of institutions such as Institute of Private Law at Ankara University and Faculty of Law (Çizakça 2000, p.91). The most important item introduced by the draft bill was “the tax exemption to be granted to the waqfs as well as to those who made donations” which received resistance by the time nevertheless. The bill became law on 13 July 1967 after several amendments (ibid).

Çizakça (2000, p.91-92) listed what has brought in by the 1967 legislation. According to this new legislation the will prescribed in the foundation document cannot be changed. “The Civil Tribunal is authorized to register the waqf and to give it a judicial personality” (p.92). The word *tesis*¹⁴ (establishment) is replaced by the word *vakıf*(ibid). The creation of waqfs that opposes the law or national interests, support current politics or a certain race or a community is prohibited (ibid). “Providing that 80% of their revenues are reserved for public purposes, the waqfs *can* be exempted from taxation. This exemption can only be granted by the *Council of Ministers* (Article 4 and 5)”¹⁵ (ibid). *General Directorate of Waqfs* is directly addressed as the institution responsible for the control of waqfs (ibid).

¹⁴ Çizakça (2000, p.92) views the prohibition of the use of the word vakıf before the amendment, in the Turkish Civil Code and the Code of Commerce, as the representation of hostility of republican government to the waqfs.

¹⁵ Çizakça elaborates on this item stating that the word “can” is deliberately italicised to suggest that the reservation of 80% of their revenue, does not automatically guarantee tax exemption for waqfs where following a difficult procedure and approval of the Council of Ministers is obligatory (see Çizakça 2000, p.93). Moreover, only 195 waqfs have been granted tax-exempt status among the 4000 waqfs established in the Republican Era (Aydın and Sağlam 1999, cited in Çizakça 2000, p.106). As the current list of tax-exempted foundations reveals, the number increased to 260: for more information please see: Bakanlar Kurulunca Vergi Muafiyeti Tanınan Vakıfların Listesi, Available at: <http://www.gib.gov.tr/index.php?id=406>, Access date: 20.08.2014

“The annual profit of a waqf is to be added to the original capital of the waqf stated in the waqf deed and is reported at the beginning of each calendar year to the inspectors (Article 81)” (ibid). The waqf can be created by a multitude of persons, by this new legislation waqf is allowed to establish a company and allocate company’s total profits, or a share, to its own specific purpose, which have had important consequences for the waqf system (p.92-93). “Establishment of a waqf has been simplified” and “*Istibdal* has been re introduced (Article 80/A) and is applied subject to the decision of the court”¹⁶ (p.92).

Alongside the issue of tax-exemption one of the main contributions of this legislation is the situation whereby a waqf can create its own company and a company can create its own waqf, moreover “waqfs have become direct recipients of companies’ realized profits” (Çizakça 2000, p.95-96). Vehbi Koç Foundation was given as the example of a conglomerate creating its own waqf. The waqf-company linkages were strengthened at the Koç Conglomerate by an exchange of executive officers: executive officers to be appointed by the conglomerate to sit at the Executive Board of the Vehbi Koç Foundation and two persons appointed by the Foundation sit at the Executive Board of the Holding (Çizakça 2000, p.96).

Çizakça (2000, p.97-101) argues that, the situation can be interpreted as the rebirth of cash waqfs which were destroyed by being incorporated into the bank of waqfs as mentioned above and elaborates on the case of The Vehbi Koç Foundation by tracing roots of his decision to found the philanthropic foundation as a cash waqf which I will elaborate in Chapter 7, where I particularly focus on Vehbi Koç and the emergence of Vehbi Koç Foundation.

Considering the nationwide administration of waqfs, The General Directorate of Waqfs (GDW) appears as the major institution. It operates under the Prime Minister

¹⁶ Istibdal means the Exchange of a property with another beneficial property in the case where “properties of waqf whose income does not suffice to meet its expenditure, or in case these properties do not yield any revenue commensurate their real value” (Çizakça 2000, p.93). With Article 80/A according to Çizakça (ibid) the ancient Islamic principles were re-introduced by modern law makers without any reference to the historical controversies inherited in the issue.

and the top administrative organ Awqaf Executive Board is appointed by former; and followed by the General Director and it has 28 regional and municipal administrators (Çizakça 2000, p.104-105). GDW “takes 5% from the net incomes of all awqaf as supervision and auditing fees”¹⁷ and “has the right to invest its income in various sectors” the profits of the *Vakıflar Bankası* “are expected to be spent for the needs of the waqf properties” (ibid). As stated by Çizakça (2000, p.105) waqfs have been obliged to deposit their cash incomes either to the *Vakıflar Bankası* or state banks despite the lower interest rates of these banks compared to the private banks and this was considered as an inconvenience by the waqfs. “Tax liabilities of the awqaf are determined by tax inspectors on the basis of all legal records and book keeping” (Çizakça 2000, p.106). Waqf properties are supposed to be exempt from corporate tax, income tax, expenditure tax, property purchase tax, stamp duty, customs duty and inheritance tax” although Finance Ministry rarely grants tax-exempt status in reality (Saygın 1998, cited in Çizakça 2000, p.106).

Alongside the impact of the Law No. 903 in 1967, in the acceleration of number of waqfs established, Çizakça (2000, p.102 and p.108) emphasized the contributions of the waqf system under the respective legislation on the historical development and especially underlined its impact on education whereby by 1998, altogether 16 waqf universities were established. Moreover, he claims that the waqf system was embraced by secularists lately, by emphasizing the example of Third Sector Foundation (TÜSEV) headed by Koç and Sabancı families, representing seven hundred waqfs and suggests that the claims of TÜSEV reveals the importance of waqf system in human rights. My point here is although philanthropic foundations have been referred as the major institutions mostly in relation to the field of education, considering the impact of universities established by them, I argue that recently, they have become the major agency in establishing museums and thus interfere in the field of culture and arts. And I hope presenting the significant examples of Sabancı Museum, Pera Museum and İstanbul Museum of Modern Art

¹⁷ Awqaf is the plural form of waqf.

in Chapter 8 will provide the demonstration of the importance of the waqfs in the field of culture and arts. Here, it is worth mentioning that the waqfs controlling the respective museums, namely Sabancı Foundation, Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation and İstanbul Foundation for Modern Arts are all exempted from tax by the *Council of Ministers* and considered under the framework of “New waqfs” established during the Republican Era under the provisions of Law No. 903.

In section 5.3. I will elaborate on the specific case of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, as a good example demonstrating the actual impact of philanthropic foundation in the field of arts and culture. Moreover Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts has a direct relation with the subject of this dissertation. It is a precursor to the development of private museums by being relevant to the emergence of the infrastructure that supports the private museums.

5.3. İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts

İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (İKSV) is a non-profit and non-governmental organization founded in 1973 by seventeen “businessmen” and “art enthusiasts” who gathered under the “leadership” of Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı (İKSV History, n.d.). The initial aim of the Foundation presented as to organize arts festival in İstanbul and “to offer the finest examples of art from around the world, while at the same time promoting the national, cultural and artistic assets of Turkey, by using arts to create an international platform of communication” (İKSV History, n.d.). The official aim appeared in the founding waqf deed states that the aim of the foundation was: “appraising our country’s potential for tourism; and organizing international culture and art festivals in various regions of the country with the purpose of introducing all aspects of our national culture to the public” (Official Gazette of Turkish Republic, 29 June 1973). İKSV has been located in İstanbul and concentrated on the city, rather than acting nationwide, and has organized international festivals which are mostly based on bringing international artist and performing artworks.

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was the person who considered the idea of setting up a philanthropic foundation and to organize festivals. His personal experiences with the European examples motivated him. Especially Salzburg Festival, which he enjoyed during his education in Germany inspired him. Consecutively, he met the founder of the Salzburg Festival, Prof. Dr. Bernhard Paumgartner and examined Bergen Festival and its founders Arne Jensen and André Borocz (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.2). I will examine the roots of the flourishing of such an idea in Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and its social implications in detail in Chapter 7.

İKSV was founded under the 1967 legislation. However, in contrast to the Vehbi Koç Foundation which was established by a large conglomerate; it was founded by contribution of businessmen. Nonetheless, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, as the founder of Eczacıbaşı Conglomerate and the leading figure of İKSV's establishment stand out among the other trustees and founders. For a long time, İKSV was referred as "Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's waqf" and considered as his "extension" (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.8) for various reasons which I will discuss in Chapter 8. Concordantly, the official history provided by İKSV highlights Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı as the leading figure of its establishment. Currently, Eczacıbaşı Holding is referred as the "leading sponsor" of İKSV alongside the various sponsors of its events and activities. İKSV is embraced by the Eczacıbaşı Holding as part of the conglomerate's 'social responsibility' projects on culture and arts; and from 2006 and onwards the Group, expanded its ongoing financial support, and has considered as the *öncü sponsor* (leading sponsor) (İKSV Sponsorship,n.d. and Eczacıbaşı Social Responsibility, n.d.). İKSV was granted tax-exempted status on 25 December 1984 by the Council of Ministers (Revenue Administration List of Tax-Exempted Foundations,n.d.).

When the founding history of İKSV is reviewed it is seen that the waqf was established by the various trustees. The Official Gazette of the Turkish Republic, on 29 June 1973 reveals the trustees of İKSV were a combination of banks, industrial and trading companies and businessmen: Türkiye Turing Automobile Club, Burla Bilâderler, Eczacıbaşı Conglomerate, *Osmanlı Bankası* (Ottoman Bank), *Perfectüp Sanaii Lim. Şir.* (Perfectüp Company), *Sınai Yatırım ve Kredi*

Bankası A.O., Tatko (Automobile Tire and Machine Trading Company), *Türkiye Sınai Kalkınma Bankası* (Industrial Development Bank of Turkey), Mehmet Fettah Aytaç, Mehmet Ragıp Devres, Mehmet Ali Koçman, Bernar Nahum, İshak İzzet Pensoy and Ömer Afif Tektaş. The total amount trusted by the time was 970.000 TL¹⁸ and the administrative organs included *Şeref Kurulu* (Honorary Committee), *Kurucular Heyeti* (Board of Trustees), *Sanat ve Teknik Danışma Kurulu* (Art and Techniques Advisory Board), *Denetim Kurulu* (Supervisory Board) (Official Gazette of Turkish Republic, 29 June 1973). Esat Berksan, as a lawyer acted as the legal consultant since the establishment of the foundation and currently he holds the position of “Corporate Communication Advisor” at the İKSV. He took on the responsibility of preparing the legal procedure and preparation of the waqf deed (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.8). In addition to Berksan, an art and music historian, Cevat Memduh Altar appeared as the key figure who directed attention to the possible risks. Altar suggested that, there could have been problems due to the functioning of bureaucracy. Consecutively, he tried to take measures during the course of preparation of the waqf deed towards the possible threats. The major risk to be prevented according to Altar was that the functioning of the waqf was in opposition to the Atatürk’s principles. Altar (cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.4) states that:

The interesting part of the waqf deed is this: When the founders die and left the waqf, the waqf will be under control of others. These handovers can cause the change in the ideals. If the waqf deed is not prepared in accordance, the waqf functioning in concordance with Atatürk’s principles can function in the opposite direction. Therefore, in one of the articles in the waqf deed, it is stated how persons who act against these principles should be suspended after identification of the persons by a commission. No such person acting against these principles can function in this waqf.

İKSV’s establishment committee’s vice president Mehmet Şuhubi, underlined the main “philosophy” during the foundation’s establishment period. He suggested that Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’s personality underlied behind the institutional structure of

¹⁸ Approximately \$USD 69.286 in 1973 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

the foundation. According to him, the regulations prepared for İKSV was distinct by bringing rules which did not exist for the other philanthropic foundations in Turkey. He exemplifies these rules by emphasizing the division among the members, *kurucular kurulu* (establishing committee), *daimi yönetimde olacaklar* (those shall be in administration perpetually) and *kısmen değişerek katılacak* (those shall participate by changing partly). Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı limited the entry to the establishing committee besides personally choosing the members one by one. Currently, İKSV's administrative organs consist of Board of Directors, Members, Corporate Identity Advisor, Corporate Communication Advisor, Legal Advisor and Administrative Affairs Advisor and General Directorate alongside the specialized departments administered by the General Directorate (İKSV About, n.d.). Boards of Directors are Bülent Eczacıbaşı, Ahmet Kocabıyık and Prof. Dr. Münir Ekonomi. Chairman of the Board of Directors is Bülent Eczacıbaşı. Vice Chairman is Prof. Dr. Münir Ekonomi.

According to Münir Ekonomi (Vice Chairman of the İKSV and member of Executive Committee) İKSV, represented the implementation of the “social responsibility” concept that was dispersed during the time, and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was the leading figure directing attention to adopting this principle in the country (cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.6). Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı took the lead during the course of the establishment of İKSV. He approached juristic and real persons to request financial contribution, he contacted state authorities for asking support and thus he instrumentalised his social networks in use of the foundation. The persons approached for asking financial contribution, during the course of preparation, were characterized by their success in business and/or being Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's connections. Although not listed in the official record on the Official Gazette, former General Manager of Akbank Hamit Belli, Akbank culture and arts consultant Vedat Nedim Tör, Asım Kocabıyık (former Chairman of the Board of Directors of İKSV and founding Chairman of Borusan Holding¹⁹ Company)

¹⁹ It is important to note that Akbank and Borusan are important actors in contributing to the field of arts and culture by their initiatives. Akbank is owned by Sabancı Holding and has an art center

represented as the founders of the İKSV in the book focused on foundation's 40 years of history (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.6-7). It is suggested that even today, the majority of the resources of the foundation are provided by the entrepreneurs and social responsibility expenditures that they reserved from their budgets (ibid).

In the first two decades of its history, both the founding actor Eczacıbaşı's main sponsorship and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's personal efforts to generate funding from the business world, from his social acquaintances, appeared to be crucial feature regarding the financing of the institution. The quotation from Esat Berksan (cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.7) represents how social networks of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı were used in order to generate funding for the Foundation:

Nejat Bey gave me the list of those will be the founders of the Foundation. The amounts in the list were so low for such an investment. The highest amount was given by the Turing Club, of which he was the Chairman.

İKSV adopted another strategy to find financial resources. It arranged the timing of the first festival in parallel with the program developed for the 50th Year of the Turkish Republic. Consecutively, it benefited from the funding opportunities allocated to the celebration program by the Ministry (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.7). As the above quotation indicates, the major funding support was given by Turing Club however it was inadequate to make the intended festival. Consecutively, the idea of taking advantage of the official occasion was developed and negotiated with the state authorities. The quotation by Esat Berksan (cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.8) explains an event from 1972. It demonstrates how social networks had been utilized in benefit of the foundation, for requesting financial support and negotiating the conditions of funding from the state institutions:

I went to my friend, İsmail Hakkı Tekinel, who was the Deputy Premier at the time being. I requested him to help us organize concerts in Hagia Irene and Topkapı Palace, as well as asked him to give us a share from the budget of celebration of 50th Years of Republic. İsmail Hakkı Bey, gave no offense and asked us to come to Ankara together with Nejat Bey. He met us in the long meeting table of the Prime Ministry and stated that they found it suitable to

called *Akbank Sanat* in Beyoğlu since 1993 and organizes two major events: Akbank Jazz Festival since 1991 and Akbank Short Film Festival since 2004 and the main sponsor of İKSV organized Film Festival. Borusan is a large industrial conglomerate founded in 1972 by incorporating various Borusan companies and has an institution called *Borusan Sanat* (Borusan Art) which hosts Borusan İstanbul Philharmonic Orchestra, Borusan Quartet, Borusan Classic, Borusan Contemporary (Office museum of contemporary arts), The Borusan Music House, music awards and publications.

support the Festival and that they were going to calculate and determine the amount to be given. When we returned İstanbul, it was necessary for us to prepare trust indenture and juridical registration to establish the Foundation as a legal entity. I made a phone call to a very close acquaintance of mine, İstanbul 20th Notary Uğur Kalafatoğlu. I made someone work through the night to write the official trust indenture. On that day we approached 50 people to get their approval and signatures and the next morning I went to the Civil Court of First Instance on duty in İstanbul Juridical Court and registered the Foundation. Consequently, we obtained the funding as a juristic personality.

In the institutionalization of the waqf, the relations with the state and political key figures play important roles especially in two important axis of institutionalization: space and funding. Not only the social networks established by key political figures are crucial, as the above example demonstrates, but also to maintain the relations is at the core. The mediating key actor in these relations is Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, and other family members. Therefore, I will focus this issue in detail in Chapter 7. Nonetheless, I want to underline that incorporating professionals from the state institutions, or former state officers, into the administration of the foundation, to keep good relations with the bureaucracy and to benefit from the expertise and social networks appear as a crucial strategy. In 1983, there was a major change in İKSV's administration with the suggestion of Mehmet Şuhubi. The General Director Aydın Gün's responsibility was restricted to the directorship of Arts, while the former Ministry of Education under Turgut Özal's period, Avni Akyol was appointed as the administrative director of the foundation with Esat Berksan's suggestion. Avni Akyol's previous experience was formed in State Planning Organization which had been one of the key institutions in implementing economic policies in the direction of economic liberalization in late 1970s and 1980s. Moreover, compared to Aydın Gün, he was from an opposing ideological camp by supporting *milli kültür* (national culture) and Turk-Islam synthesis. Despite these differences, his expertise and social networks were instrumentalised in İKSV's administration in the areas of executing relationship with the state, taking official permissions for the spaces that would be use for festivals, free allocation of venues such as Hagia Irene and Yıldız Palace (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.110). Avni Akyol, at times of crisis solved the problems encountered by instrumentalising his broad social network (ibid). This strategy has been embraced by other cultural and artistic institutions

established by other philanthropic foundations which I will elaborate in Chapter 8, when I focus on the private museums.

İKSV has a vital importance in İstanbul's cultural and artistic life by the festivals it has organized since its establishment. The first International Festival was organized in 1973, on the 50th Anniversary of the foundation of the Turkish Republic. During the course of late 1970s and 1980s the Foundation included other activities to its program such as film screenings, theatre productions, jazz and ballet performances, and art exhibitions held in historic venues which later evolved into distinct festivals. The "International İstanbul Filmdays" initiated in 1983 and the film week transformed into the International İstanbul Film Festival in 1989; 1987 marked the beginning of the International İstanbul Biennial, and in 1989 the International İstanbul Theatre Festival was initiated. Soon after, İKSV initiated The International İstanbul Jazz Festival in 1994 and the same year that the International İstanbul Festival changed its name to the International İstanbul Music Festival (İKSV About, n.d.). İKSV's events are not limited with 5 gradual festivals it organizes throughout the year, in 2000s it initiated various events such as Filmekimi (a week of film screenings in October) in 2002, The Foundation continued to add brand new events to its portfolio such as Phonem by Miller (alternative rock and electronic music performances in November) and Minifest (3 days of children's activities in the summer) in 2003 besides the initiation of the bi-annual Leyla Gencer Voice Competition (İKSV About, n.d.).

It is also important to note that İKSV also engages in the organization of International festivals in major European cities which was started with the organization of "Şimdi Now" in Berlin in 2004 and followed by "Şimdi Stuttgart" in 2005, "Turkey Now" in Amsterdam and Rotterdam in 2007 and 2008, Russia in 2008, and Vienna, Austria in 2009. Additionally, İKSV also organized The "Cultural Season of Turkey in France" activities held between 1 July 2009 and 31 March 2010 in collaboration with Culturesfrance. Furthermore İKSV has been organising the Pavilion of Turkey at the Venice Biennale since 2007. These events are presented by the İKSV as commitment to "bringing together different cultures

and contributing to the creation of a platform for multicultural dialogue” (İKSV About, n.d.).

The Foundation has a membership program which was initiated on the occasion of its 30th anniversary referred as the “İstanbul Friends of Culture and Arts Tulip Membership Programme” (İKSV Lalekart, n.d.) which is presented as part of the broad aim of “protecting cultural heritage and fostering the development of arts” which offers “variety of privileges during İKSV-organised events including the İstanbul Festivals” and which is recognized under the framework of “social responsibility project”(İKSV History, n.d.).

5.3.1. Facilitating the Flourishing of Cultural Industries

Given the absence of technical and industrial infrastructure in the cultural production during the course of İKSV’s emergence, overall evaluation of the history of İKSV festivals reveals that, the foundation’s activities gave way to the flourishing of cultural industries and professionalization in Turkey. In DiMaggio’s (1991) terms, this makes it one of the central organizations which offer support for the structuration of organizational field of private museums. For example the lack of translation and subtitle system in the film festival in the mid 1980s (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.103-104) gave way to the professionalization in translating films, incorporation of subtitle system and the flourishing of suppliers. Another example can be the development of graphic design and preparation of promotional material that facilitated the advertising industry in accordance with İKSV’s demands in establishing a corporate identity (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.152 and p.162). The first Biennial experience, paved the way through the development of curatorship (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.159). An example from 1992 reveals that the transportation of artworks for the Biennial was a big problem because of an absence of a transportation facility specialized in artworks and lack of professionals, nonetheless the activities demanding such professions and providers proliferated the emergence of providers (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.228). My point is that in an environment characterized by the absence of professional institutions providing cultural and artistic services (such as technical infrastructure to set up a stage,

providing subtitle system for films, logistics) the structuration of the production in the field of arts and culture owes very much to İKSV in terms of its role in facilitating the flourishing of culture, arts and entertainment sectors. I find the following quotation by Viktor Bensusan²⁰ (cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.314) important in summarizing İKSV's impact in the flourishing of cultural industries:

The locomotive of the transformation in the culture, arts and entertainment sectors is İKSV, because İKSV has been the first to make a job, and after it, others say that "A-ha! This means this could be done". The subsequent ones perhaps have made it better but the important thing is that the first step had always taken by İKSV. Furthermore, İKSV has been the one that provided the institutionalization of some businesses. Eventually, the things we referred as "No money can be made from this business, it can only make a side job" has been taken to a point by İKSV. Consequently we have been institutionalized, corporatized, and since our school was here [İKSV] we established our basis on our learnings. Similarly, İKSVlilites [İKSV'liler] have been in the executive administration of the other institutions in the market, so to say the İKSVlilites that we knew from 1990s. İKSV not only remained with creating its own customer but also created this business and its providers.

5.3.2. Cultural Policy Orientation

Alongside organizing İstanbul's major cultural and artistic events, and having been affected the flourishing of cultural industries, İKSV, provided the ground for cultural policy making. One of the first initiatives of Bülent Eczacıbaşı, as the Chairman was the declaration of the Foundation's interest in developing cultural policy, by an emphasis on the traditional arts and cultural heritage as new expansions in the Foundation's fields of activity (Erciyes 2010). İKSV has developed programs for the organization of workshops, conferences, symposia and preparing publications in this respect. They emphasize their aim as follows: "enriching the exchange of ideas about arts and culture, increasing the participation of artists and art enthusiasts in this dialogue, and contributing to the development of cultural policies" (İKSV Cultural Policy, n.d.). In this respect it is also important to note that İKSV is in collaboration with various organizations and

²⁰ He worked as a guide in the festivals and later served as a coordinator of guides and in the production team at the İKSV. He is the owner of *Organizma Company* which was founded in 2002 with the aim of serving in the area of branding and marketing communications and a business partners of İKSV (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.615 and Organizma Official Website, 2014).

networks that constitute the EU's cultural policies, in addition to being the head of the Turkish network of Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation (İKSV History, n.d.).

This was covered by Erciyes (Radikal Newspaper, 22.10.2010) as a new period in İKSV's history, since the Foundation was to undertake this initiative and much more active role in the determination of cultural policy. The Foundation, then approaching its 40th anniversary, was one of the first ones to express this intention explicitly. However it was not surprising considering the increase in the number of actors since the establishment of the foundation and the competition among them in determining the rules of the field. The representation of the position of İKSV by Erciyes (ibid) reveals that the primary role and status attributed to the institution in the field of arts and culture. What is also striking about this attempt is the appropriation of traditional art forms, which have been clearly neglected in the cultural and artistic programs of the high-culture focused institution. Still, it did not fully mean that İKSV changed orientation in terms of content of its activities, rather for now, incorporating traditional art forms to its programs remains at the intention level.

The interest in developing cultural policies, although more explicitly declared by İKSV recently, was an old phenomenon. For example Şakir Eczacıbaşı, İKSV's former Chairman and brother of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, founded *Kültür Girişimi* (Culture Initiative) in 1998 with various other actors²¹.

²¹ The members of the Cultural Initiative were: İsmail Cem, Şakir Eczacıbaşı, Oktay Ekinci, Ufuk Esin, Bozkurt Güvenç, Talat Halman, Hüsrev Hatemi, Doğan Hızlan, Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı, Emre Kongar, İona Kuçuradi, Metin Sözen, Hıfzı Topuz and Tahsin Yücel. Culture Initiative organized several events on various themes such as I. Ulusal Kültür Kongresi: Demokrasi Kültürü ve Globalleşme (Democracy Culture and Globalization) in 1997, II. Kültür Kongresi Barış Kültürü (2nd Culture Congress, Culture of Peace) Kültürel Açından Avrupa Birliği'ne Yaklaşım Sempozyumu (Symposium on a Cultural Approach to the European Union) and İstanbul'da Yaşam Kültürü (Culture of Life in İstanbul). Among these events, Türkiye'de Kültür Politikaları (Cultural Policies in Turkey) symposium organized in 1998 and published in 2001 is associated with developing cultural policies and arts in Turkey. The symposium was organized between 26-28 October 1998 and the below names presented papers: Atıf Berberoğlu - Aysel Çelikel - Oktay Ekinci - Necat Erder - Ufuk Esin - Mark Fisher - Nedim Gürsel - Bozkurt Güvenç -

5.3.3. Legitimization and Proliferation of Cultural and Artistic Sponsorship

İKSV can be taken as one of the pioneering institutions in the emergence of arts sponsorship in Turkey while establishing the mechanisms that serve to legitimize it. On one hand, İKSV pulled together the resources of different corporate groups in one single hub for the realization of its events and on the other, by doing so, it has attracted the attention of the private capital towards the field of culture and arts, as a field for struggle for social recognition and reputation.

Financing along with the finding a venue for the events have been two crucial problems that İKSV has encountered since its founding years. In the 1980s the state's financial support was relatively limited and the allocation of spaces by the relevant Ministries, to hold festivals were considered as the major support of the state (Baliç and Ermiş, 2013, p.87).

The review of institutional history and the narratives provided by the work by Baliç and Ermiş (2013) reveals that there has been a problem of perpetual resource for the running of huge events and the institution throughout its 40 years of history and sponsorship appears as a prominent theme. The lack of adequate financial support from the state and municipality (Münir Ekonomi cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.6) might be considered one of the factors orienting towards the sponsorship as a resource for funding. For example, in 1981 the major funding resources can be summarized as the donations taken from the founders (7-8 million), revenues from ticket sales which consisted more than half of the total income, state support via Tourism and Promotion Ministry, 10 million by 1981, Ministry of Culture 2-2 and a half million, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Culture Department about 3 million (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.87).

Talat Halman - Hüsrev Hatemi - Doğan Hızlan - Nevzat İlhan - Hakan Karaca - Ercan Karataş - Mehmet Kesim - Hüsamettin Koçan - Emre Kongar - Zülfü Livaneli - Niyazi Öktem - Mahmut Tali Öngören - Jacques Ricaud - Pulat Tacar - Hıfzı Topuz -Şerafettin Turan, Tahsin Yücel, Raymond Weber (Türkiye'de Kültür Politikaları Sempozyumunda Sunulan Bildiriler,n.d.)

Although, since its establishment İKSV sought external funding İKSV, the professional application of the notion appeared in 1978. Betül Mardin, was a public relations specialists had been a close acquaintance of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and through this relationship she was associated with the İKSV, especially during its formative years. The following quotation from Betül Mardin (cited in Baliç and Ermiş, 2013, p.58) demonstrates how the idea of sponsorship came to the stage starting from late 1970s. It exemplifies the interaction with the European institutions and forms which have impacts in structuring the organizations and their practices. It also demonstrates the role of individual social class position, cultural capital and social capital in accession to certain places and in deciphering meanings and their broader connotations:

Meanwhile I was permanently in İstanbul. Since I had worked in BBC, I have a very good relationship with the British. I went to London and was going to stay there for 10 to 15 days. An invitation arrived to me: A reception at the Windsor Chateau and later a concert. I went there. When we arrived there, we saw a man beating “Bam, ban, bam!” and calling Betül Mardin! And we entered and he announced that we’d arrived. (...) I was standing and was speaking with someone from BBC. Suddenly the man stopped and said, “We would like to thank our sponsor, Marks & Spencer”. I said “What’s going on?” He said “Certainly, it’s our sponsor” and I asked “What does it mean?” and he said “My dear, Marks& Spencer paid for the food, drinks and the concert, therefore we are thanking them under the program [flyer]”. I asked “How much?” and he replied “More or less 100.000 pounds!” I got the flyer and, went directly to Aydın! (Gün). I told Aydın about the thing and said “Now we are finding a sponsor”. I can’t tell you how moneyless we [İKSV] were working and how moneyless we were at the time. Nejat Bey said “They won’t give”. I said “What’s the matter, let’s try.” We tried and Jak Kamhi became the first sponsor of the festival.

When Melih Fereli came to the directorship of the İKSV, one of the first things he did was the establishment of a sponsorship program in 1993, which was regarded of vital importance (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.235). Melih Fereli initiated a separate sponsorship department in 1994 to professionalize the use of sponsorship and to move it from being an outcome of personal relations and requests to a professional basis in which a new perception of sponsorship developed to represent it as a reciprocally lucrative process (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.249).

In the following years different mechanisms were developed in this respect such as the establishment of different sponsorship categories. For example in mid-1990s,

festival sponsorship category emerged (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.309). Sponsorship has been represented as a medium for prestige and getting through the target markets of the companies. Right from the beginning of sponsorship programs, various privileges have been provided for sponsors. It is not only through using their company logos in the promotional materials of the festivals, but also through commercials that have been shown in the intermissions of film festival for example, or the appearance of TV commercials later in 1990s and onwards which have paved the way for building awareness in society about the “sponsor” of the events. This has some critical consequences and social implications:

[B]ecause festivals are financially dependent on sponsors; there is a certain concern to match the festival contents with their target markets. The Music Festival for example, chooses to invite renowned artists, such as the New York or London Philharmonic Orchestras, to meet sponsors’ demands in terms of publicity. It is more difficult to obtain funding for venues with lower seating capacities, because the audience exposed to sponsors’ name and logos is smaller. Therefore, larger settings such as the Cemil Topuzlu Open Air Theater, and the Cemal Reşit Rey Concert Hall are preferred by the festival organization. Moreover, it is commonly argued that a ‘refined image’ associated with the performance and the place facilitates the provision of funding (Yardımcı 2007, p.11).

Currently, the major funding actors of İKSV are Eczacıbaşı Holding, as the leading sponsor of the Foundation, official sponsors include Turkish Airlines (official airline), Vodafone (official communication), DHL (official carrier); festival sponsors are: Akbank (31st International İstanbul Film Festival) Aygaz, Opet, Tüpraş (18th İstanbul Theater Festival), Borusan (40th International İstanbul Music Festival), Garanti Bank (18th International İstanbul Jazz Festival), Koç Group (12th International İstanbul Biennial), Eren, Koray, Vitra, Vestel are co-sponsors of İstanbul Design Biennial (İKSV Sponsorship). The current scheme of sponsorship organisation of the Foundation is highly diversified, divided among categories such as leading sponsor, official sponsor, festival sponsors, press sponsors, TV sponsors, radio sponsors, magazine sponsors, and service sponsors (ibid). Among these sponsors, Koç Group companies are notable. Not only Koç Group sponsored International İstanbul Biennial, but also the sponsors of the Theater Festival, Aygaz, Tüpraş and Opet are also Koç Group companies (Koç Holding Fields of Activity, n.d.).As the current scheme also implies, İKSV’s major

events as well as events' and the İKSV's promotion through various mediums such as press, radio, television, magazines, are all supported by external funding mechanism developed by the foundation. However, I want to underline that although İKSV form one of the important grounds for the diffusion of cultural and artistic sponsorship in Turkey alongside the global trends and narratives that have been reflected in the Turkish context, it is not immune to external factors. For example, economic crises in 1994 and especially 2001 crisis negatively affected İKSV (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.367) and oriented it towards economizing. Moreover, the acquisition of the historical building called Deniz Palas in Şişhane in 2009 under the chairmanship of Şakir Eczacıbaşı, marked another economic problem faced by İKSV. Because of the debts, the building was planned to be sold in 2013 (Tez 2013). Nonetheless, Deniz Palas sale was cancelled when Eczacıbaşı Holding assumed İKSV's debt by donating 46 million TL (İKSV Archive, n.d.). This situation demonstrates two important things. First, ongoing relationship of the Eczacıbaşı Holding and İKSV and the importance of Eczacıbaşı Family members in the functioning of the İKSV and the importance of İKSV for the family members which I will discuss in detail in Chapter 7. Second, it demonstrates the current crisis of İKSV. Initiatives that followed İKSV, such as the art platforms, private galleries and private museums, not only demonstrate a growing corporate interest in intervening culture with the recognition of sponsorship as a lucrative practice, but also as Akay (2014, p.6) argues marks the crisis of İKSV since each and every corporation seeks to initiate its own cultural institution. He states that during the course of 2000s the appearance of banks, which supported arts before through building collections and opening galleries, have changed in direction of prioritizing contemporary arts. Moreover, İstanbul, which was once recognized with the power of the Biennial in the artistic and cultural sphere, has become the center of cultural activities with increasing divergence and number of new platforms and exhibitionary spaces. This had an important consequence for İKSV since its financial supporters-corporations- started to initiate their own festivals and support arts that are produced in their own interested fields, meanwhile "calculating" the possible profits. Consecutively, they prioritize their own investments and withdraw their financial support from others.

5.3.4. The origination of the idea of setting up a modern arts museum

I will discuss the emergence of the ideas of establishing a museum when I focus on the flourishing of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art. Yet, I want to underline that, the aspiration of establishing a Museum flourished within the framework of İKSV. The history of the İstanbul Modern is closely associated with the history of İstanbul Biennial organized by İKSV (Baliç and Ermiş, 2013, p.160). As, current Chairman of İstanbul Modern states (ibid) the first steps taken forward for establishing a Museum of Modern Art was concurrent with the initiation of 1st İstanbul Biennial. Consecutively, the permanent organizational form of philanthropic foundation, gave way to another organizational form, namely the “private museum”.

5.3.5. Critical Evaluation of Social Implications

İKSV and social implications of its festivals are examined by Sibel Yardımcı’s (2007) article “Festivalising Difference: Privatization of Culture and Symbolic Exclusion in İstanbul”. Her focus and findings about İKSV are especially inspiring. Yardımcı (2007, p.3-6) suggests that, 1970’s were period of setting up for the İstanbul Festival whereas 1980s brought greater change and professionalization. Festival was developed into different events with diversifying audiences and sponsors. According to Yardımcı (2007, p.3) “the relationship with the festivals and *their* city has extended to new dimensions following the recent restructuring of global capitalism” in which the events as such “now designed to attract not only tourists and visitors, but also capital itself, executive classes and skilled workers”. As Yardımcı suggests (2007, p.3-6) the organization of İKSV festivals has become part of a project of promoting İstanbul as a global capital of culture, and received support from intellectuals, politicians and corporate patrons. while the International İstanbul Festival has expanded, diversified its audiences and pulled together economic and strategic resources from different economic and administrative bodies, it had articulated its educational objective which was

internalized as part of the modernization project of the nation-state, into more instrumental strategy of globalization (ibid). These, according to Yardımcı did not contradict with each other since both were taking “West” as their reference point and excluded the Islamic ethos (p.5). Acknowledging the turning of İKSV into a prominent “cultural institution” of the city and its development into an authority which has been addressed for consultancy by others who attempt to organize cultural and artistic events, Yardımcı (2007, p.5-6) asserts that companies willingness to support festivals is related with the culture’s increasing instrumentalisation in city promotion. Nevertheless, the dependence of festivals on sponsorship has some social implications. Yardımcı (ibid) emphasizes the increasing vulnerability of festivals to private intervention which forces festivals to “abstain from politically marginal projects, turning them into a ‘safe’ parade of international cultural forms ranging from entertainment to soft-core politics” which implies to the importance of cultural capital in defining the basis of social difference. In this respect, and Yardımcı (p.6-10) directs attention to the “Gated-community of İstanbul Festivals” characterized by the high levels of economic capital, connoisseurship in certain cultural forms and willingness to participate “to an exchange of cultural and symbolic capital in a cultural/symbolic economy” as well as being the targets of sponsors and the imposition of festival for distinction in this respect. The importance laid however is on the constitution of a temporary community sharing the same space through festivals by the group of spectators of similar tastes and lifestyles where festivals impose themselves as part of ‘desired’ lifestyles which are socially produced and promoted (p.9).

There is a strategic turn of İKSV, towards internationalization as also addressed by Yardımcı (2007, p.4-5) “cultural integration started to be seen as a prerequisite of full economic globalization” and accordingly festivals developed “an international-multicultural orientation” without losing Atatürk’s legacy- “cultural transformation in terms of appropriation and deployment of Western cultural forms”. What I find interesting in this phase is the articulation of this rationality with the organizational structure and shifting of interests towards “an international-multicultural” orientation. First, in the organizational structure, the

ideological twist mentioned above manifested itself in the change of the Director of the Foundation from Aydın Gün to Melih Fereli in 1993²². Melih Fereli was the symbolic representation of the break with the nationalist-modernist orientation towards a more international-multicultural one. At the expense of offending Foundation's first General Director Aydın Gün, who set up the organizational structure and provided his resources of expertise and social networks in service of Foundation from 1974 and onwards, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı had been in search for a "new man". This search represented the new orientation of the foundation shaped in concordance with market rationality. The recruitment process of Melih Fereli is also important since it denotes to the selection process of employees which is related with the use of social networks of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı; his social networks is instrumentalised as resources for the foundation.

It is important to note that, İKSV, more explicitly oriented towards sponsorship, internationalization through partnerships with profit-based institutions, expansion of events in direction of building international recognition during Fereli's directorship. For example, International İstanbul Biennial; the emergence of a narrative on European Union; initiation of partnerships with cultural institutions

²² In this respect 1993 was critical for denoting to a shift both in the internal organization and to the external macro trends in the perception of the qualifications of a manager. First of all, Aydın Gün who was one of the founders and the first director of the foundation for about twenty years, he was a state originated artist, the founder of İstanbul and Ankara Opera who was described with holding qualifications of a manager, in addition to him being an artist with a familiarity of foreign countries and expertise in technical matters (Baliç and Ermiş, 2013, p.13). In comparison to Aydın Gün, Melih Fereli was trained in Robert College in Turkey and then received his Masters degree in Mechanics from Virginia Tech University and lived and worked in an industrial company based in London (VKV Official Web page, 08.05.2014) as well as working for Philharmonia for a short period (Baliç and Ermiş, 2013, p.229). Yet, he was the "right" option at the "right" context which was characterised by the growing of the Foundation that necessitated the professionalization in the administration (p.229) as well as the rumors of conflict of interest, about Aydın Gün who wanted to keep his position and status in the making of Cemal Reşit Rey Concert Hall while heading the Foundation. Furthermore, as like the major decisions in terms of the key staff working in the Foundation, he was assigned by Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. Melih Fereli was the General Manager of İKSV between 1993-2001. He is currently Vehbi Koç Foundation's culture and arts Advisor, Board Member of Borusan Culture and Arts and Member of the İstanbul Biennial Advisory Council. (Baliç and Ermiş, 2013, p.618)

such as British Council, Goethe Institut, Italian Cultural Center based in İstanbul in mid 1990s; convincing the capital to provide financial support by instrumentalising İstanbul; the emergence of an idea of a project of a cultural center in İstanbul appeared more openly during Fereli's management between 1993-2001. These developments gave way to the narratives build around international expansion, developing economic relations, "Promoting Turkey". The initiatives of "Şimdi Now" in Berlin in 2004 and followed by "Şimdi Stuttgart" in 2005, "Turkey Now" in Amsterdam and Rotterdam in 2007 and 2008, Russia in 2008, and Vienna, Austria in 2009, "Cultural Season of Turkey in France" held between 1 July 2009 and 31 March 2010 in collaboration with Culturesfrance and the Pavilion of Turkey at the Venice Biennale since 2007 that are also mentioned above can be regarded in this respect. These initiatives cannot be divorced from the macro trends of globalization, the role of global cities and Turkey's take on in these issues. I will discuss the specific role of İstanbul, as a rising center of culture and arts, in relation to the global trends of branding cities, the significance of the Justice and Development Party in providing the lucrative conditions for private supports in arts, in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 6

1980 AND ONWARDS: THE CONTEXT FOR THE EMERGENCE OF PRIVATE MUSEUMS

This chapter aims to provide the particularities of the post 1980's Turkey enabling the private entrepreneurship and private investments in arts. Turkey has encountered tremendous changes in the political, economic and cultural spheres following the Military coup in 1980. First I will focus on the economic and social context framed by the economic liberalization in the 1980's and onwards. I elaborate on the social implications of neoliberalisation and the relevance of post 1980's social and economic context with the rise of private investments in arts. Second, I will focus on İstanbul, as the major setting of the flourishing of private cultural and artistic institutions. I will explore the social, political and economic dynamics that has made İstanbul as the center of culture and arts in the post 1980's. I will also focus on the significance of AKP in particular to explore the roots of its cultural policy orientation towards the global-city project and branding the city. Third, I will discuss the legal framework enabling the private entrepreneurship, corporate sponsorship, private investments and establishment of private museums in art. I will explore the characteristics of cultural policies and their relevance with expansion of interest in culture and arts. Fourth, within the context of 1980's Turkey, I will focus on private initiatives in arts and their characteristics and will elaborate on examples.

I argued in Chapter 5 that İKSV provided the infrastructure that supported the development of private museums. I suggest considering the context that will be provided here in a similar way: as the setting which facilitated the emergence of private art museums and their modes of diffusion. Also, I aim to reveal the underwritten particularities of the expansion of private interest in arts.

6.1. Economic and Social Context

In 1980 Turkey witnessed a military coup on September 12 and this date marked an important rupture in the political, social and economic history of Turkey. In the aftermath of the 1980 military intervention, Motherland Party (ANAP) governed Turkey with the leadership of Turgut Özal between December 13, 1983-October 31, 1989. In 1989, Özal was elected in the third round of the Presidential election on 31 October 1989 and became the 8th President of Turkish Republic. Motherland Party was founded by the active engagement of Turgut Özal in its establishment in 1982-1983 period and later symbolized by his name. The party was claimed by him to be different than other political parties by its emphasis on representing the “main pillar of the society” (Kalaycıoğlu 2002, p. 45) and surpassing the elite vs non elite divide in the Turkish society (Öniş 2004). Özal’s desire for a “*modern society held together by conservative values*” (Kalaycıoğlu 2002, p.46) characterized the image of the Motherland Party which hosted contradictory ideological strands of conservatism, nationalism, economic liberalism and social democracy. Özal is referred as the “pious agent of liberal transformation” by Acar (2002) and later by Öniş (2004) as a strong representative of the neoliberal populism.

Turgut Özal and Motherland Party (ANAP) under his leadership considered crucial for restructuring the economy in the neoliberal direction and for transforming economic and social history of Turkey (Heper 1989 and 1990; Kalaycıoğlu 2002; Sayarı 1996). Özal played a significant role “in the liberalization of the economy” and “in the shift from import substitution to export orientation in Turkey” which are considered as important steps “toward a strong state *vis-à-vis* the economy” (Heper and Keyman 1998, p.266).

According to Öniş (2004, p.15) “Turgut Özal’s unusually diverse background equipped him with a unique set of advantages to play an effective leadership role during the course of Turkey’s neo-liberal transition”. Turgut Özal was born in Malatya in 1927, raised in a conservative and religious family, studied electrical engineering at İstanbul Technical University (İTÜ) İTÜ years. The relationship

that he had with Süleyman Demirel, studying engineering at the same university, had an important impact in the future political career of Özal. For example, he joined the Justice Party in the early 1960s and appointed as the Under-Secretary of State Planning Institution during Demirel's Prime Ministry. Besides, Özal's past experiences in the World Bank in the early 1970s and Sabancı Holding in managerial positions, served as major assets during his rise as a political power (Öniş 2007, p. 5). His political personality also enabled the establishment of neoliberal ideology (Acar 2002; Öniş 2004). Özal's political personality encompassed the strong representation of transnational capital, appealed both the conservative masses by his "moderate Islamic learnings" and the secular elites with his "projects aimed at modernization and economic reform" (Öniş 2004, p.116) during the period of his office as the Prime Minister (1983-1989) and his Presidency from 1989 to until his unexpected death in 1993.

The impact of Özal in Turkey's economic liberalization history traced back into the appointment of him by Demirel to plan and implement an economic reform program when he was the head of the State Planning Organization (SPO) in 1979. This program was aimed at planning and adopting economic and financial measures to integrate the country with the world economy. This reform program was instigated on 24 January 1980 and often referred as "24 of January Decisions". As Boratav (2004, p.147-148) summarizes the particularities of the program were: devaluation, abolishment of raises in the state owned enterprises, abolishment of price regulation. According to Boratav (ibid) the program took measures which were even beyond the requests of International Money Fund (IMF). Moreover, the program had major goals of establishing domestic and foreign trade, strengthening national capital towards the labor in concordance with the promotion of the World Bank and international capital. Thus, it was not only a stability program, rather a structural adjustment one; it contained both the elements of standard stability policy package imposed to many underdeveloped countries by IMF in 1970s and the structural adjustment program developed by the World Bank. As Boratav argues (ibid) the program was away from consistent and systematic implementation before the military intervention. The September 12

regime, by military governance of the labor market, provided the conditions for the consistent implementation of the program in line with the requests of the capital, and facilitated it as the counter-attack of the capital. In the aftermath of the collapse of the civilian government by the military intervention, Turgut Özal's role continued "as the key technocrat responsible for the stabilization and reform program" with his strong orientation to implement the economic measures to transform country's economy in the neoliberal direction. Furthermore, his skills in negotiating international organizations rendered him as an attractive choice for the military elites (Öniş 2004, p.116)

David Harvey (2007) conceptualize neoliberalism as a hegemonic discourse and "creative destruction" and asserts a relationship with the processes associated with the neoliberalism and the ways people think, interpret and act in the world. Harvey (2007, p.23) stresses the importance of the influence of the "advocates of the neoliberal mindset" by referring to the positions they have in the areas of education, media, corporate administration and financial institutions. The role of the international financial institutions such as IMF and the World Trade Organization (WTO) that regulates global finance and commerce are of great importance. According to Harvey (2007, p.29) political scheme of neoliberalism aimed at reestablishing the conditions of capital accumulation and "restoration of class power". Harvey (2007, p.24 and p.27) focuses on the geographically uneven development of neoliberalism and suggests that the role of neoliberalism in countries that are considered to be periphery, upper-class power is significant. In line with Harvey's points, in Turkey, Özal used the neoliberal economic ideology as a consistent ideology and implementation and means to transform and shape the Turkish economic structure in this direction (Kongar 2006, p.413).

Özal's neoliberal populism in conjunction with his market-oriented political personality, emphasized the importance of making money easily and the appreciation of wealth and the wealthy, and used the economic terminology that were accompanied by the advocated virtues of consumerism and entrepreneurialism (Kazgan 2004). Özal's use of media is considered as fundamental characteristics of his populism. He excluded the opposition parties

and views especially using Turkish Radio and Television Corporation which raised criticisms (Tafolar 2008, p.154-160). Despite the criticisms, the media during the 1980's was strongly instrumentalized by Özal to convey his political statements and messages and to influence different segments of the society. This further provided the conditions for the dissemination of neoliberal ideology in the public.

In this respect, in the 1980's entrepreneurial activity has been appreciated, market values such as efficiency has become prominent, free market rules have started to dominate, opening Turkish economy to the world market has become the major political and economic agenda and Özal's grand project of setting the market rules reflected in his extreme way of policy-making (Heper and Keyman 1998). These have had important repercussions throughout the 1980's and 1990's (Öniş 2004).

According to Boratav (2004, p.172) the period of 1989-2002 in Turkey remarks an uneasy transition to hegemony of international finance capital. Alongside the economic and political problems and the increased dependency on the external world, this transition period also marks the growing interest and growing expectations from the external world (Kazgan 2004).

During the course of 1980's, with the impetus of 24 of January decisions, governments were oriented towards liberalization of the repressed financial system. Governments' attempts of liberalizing financial system have had direct impact on the Turkish banking system:

Concerning the financial deregulations, the Governments started to liberalize the foreign exchange regime, certain restrictions on capital movements were removed, and the convertibility of the Turkish Lira was provided. Meanwhile, restrictions on interest rates were removed, a short-term money market was established, the Central Bank was allowed to engage in open market operations and most of the regulations concerning the financial markets were eliminated in the context of liberalization and globalization. These deregulation efforts speeded up the linking of the domestic financial market to the rest of the world, and provided more competitive working conditions to the commercial banks. Liberalization and integration occurred more rapidly than expected, partly due to advances in the telecommunications sector (Ertuğrul & Selçuk 2001, p.12-13).

I suggest an association between the competitive working conditions of commercial banks and their engagement in 'social responsibility' projects. Banks

started to compete in the non-economic areas under the framework of social responsibility projects. Culture and arts, is determined as an area under this framework. Sponsorships, support of banks in cultural events and arts exhibitions, their establishment of cultural and artistic platforms during the course of 1990s can be evaluated in this respect.

Cizre & Yeldan (2005) studied Turkey's encounters with neoliberalism. Cizre and Yeldan (2005, p.388) emphasize the rise of the "hegemony of the neo-liberal orthodoxy", the rhetoric of "there is no alternative" and aims of neoliberalism. Neoliberalism aims to build the conditions suitable for the profitability of the capital, and it has a crucial role for setting the conditions of capital's dominance as part of its hegemonic agenda. As stated by Cizre & Yeldan (ibid) "privatization, flexible labor markets, financial de-regulation, flexible exchange rate regimes, central bank independence (with inflation targeting), fiscal austerity, and good governance" are the fundamental conditional elements and measures of neoliberal agenda. The neoliberal ideology maintained its hegemony justifying the motive behind the financial liberalization with the claims of restoration of growth and stability (ibid). Nonetheless, Turkey encountered phases of financial liberalization marked by financial destructions and witnessed devastating economic crises.

The country witnessed harsh economic crises in the post 1980's which had severe economic and social consequences. "In the beginning of 1994, the Turkish economy found itself in a very severe financial crisis which, in turn, hit the real economy. The Turkish lira depreciated by almost 70 percent against the US dollar in the first quarter of 1994. The Central Bank heavily intervened in the foreign exchange market, and as a result, lost more than half of its international reserves" (Özatay 2000, p.1).

The "painful experiences of transition to the hegemony of international financial capital" in the period of 1989-2002 (Boratav 2004, p.172), short term cycles of instability and growth instability in the 1990s and 1994 economic crisis were followed by the 2001 financial crisis. The 2001 crisis severely hit Turkey, and worsened the conditions by deepening and continuing in the following years (Cizre

& Yeldan 2005). Official wisdom explained the crisis as a “result of a set of technical errors or administrative mismanagement unique to Turkey” (Cizre & Yeldan 2005, p.387). Nonetheless, the crisis was a “result of a series of pressures emanating from the process of integration with the global capital markets” contrary to the official explanations (ibid).

The economic and financial crisis that hit Turkey in 2001 was severe in many aspects (Pamuk 2014, p.284). The Turkish government invited Kemal Derviş, who had been working in World Bank to take the job of the Minister of Economy. This attempt was resulted in the development of an economic program with the IMF support. “The program adopted a floating exchange rate regime and converted the outstanding liabilities of the public sector banks to long-term public debt. It also featured some long-term structural reforms, including measures to reform the vulnerable financial system, and a series of laws that attempted to insulate public sector banks and state economic enterprises from the interference of politicians and strengthen the independence of the central bank.” (Pamuk 2007, p.20).

Meanwhile, Justice and Development Party (AKP) was founded in 2001 under the leadership of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. AKP’s campaign in the 2002 elections suggested “that the party would remain within the bounds of the IMF program as well as devote more attention to social policies, in particular poverty and unemployment” (Patton 2006, p.513). As summarized by Altunışık and Tür (2005, p.64-65) AKP emphasized the integration with the European Union and the world market. It was stated by AKP that “they would neither base their politics on Islam, nor use Islam for rhetorical purposes” and “refrain from confrontation with the secular principle of the state, established institutions and the military-bureaucratic elite”. In November 2002 elections AKP and CHP passed the 10 percent threshold to enter the parliament. AKP received one-third of the votes by 34.28 percent, CHP won 19.39 percent of the votes, and 45 percent of the votes were not represented in the parliament. It further meant that AKP could form the “country’s first single-party government in a decade”.

The new phase of neoliberal restructuring under AKP, underlined the “EU anchor” and globalization (Öniş 2009). As Öniş (2009, p.8) states:

The fact that the EU anchor has become more visible and tighter in the course of the 1999-2004 period has clearly helped to boost the prospects for investment and helped to generate growing interest in the Turkish economy on the part of long-term foreign investors. The real breakthrough in the Turkish economy in terms of foreign direct investment (FDI) flows and large-scale privatization occurred in the course of 2005, once the opening up of accession negotiations emerged as a concrete possibility.

Öniş presents (2009, p.10-13) the elements of the new phase of neoliberal restructuring. They are: re-regulation and de-regulation, improvement of the regulatory capacities, and improvement in the investment environment for foreign investors. Öniş (2009, p.13) emphasizes that the power and influence of the external actors, EU and IMF, the influence of private actors, foreign participation in the banking sector, the power and autonomy of regulatory institutions have been expanded considerably. Most importantly, larger domestic firms and conglomerates benefited disproportionately from the improvement in the macroeconomic and regulatory environment and “the crisis have accelerated the transnationalization of major Turkish conglomerates” and paved the way for expanding their operations in neighboring countries (ibid).

According to Patton (2006, p.535) AKP has been conformed to a neoliberal agenda, which places trust in the market as the main engine of economic growth. Patton (ibid) suggests that this is problematic because the market is a source of massive social and economic inequalities. AKP has focused on the macro economic issues rather than the social agenda. The pressures from IMF, the lure of EU membership, and AKP’s lack of preparedness hindered the focus on the social agenda. Thus, the economic policies have been successful in servicing debt, bringing down inflation and reining fiscal discipline. Yet they have “neither improved income distribution nor addressed the problem of unemployment” (ibid).

In 2007 national elections, the AKP increased its votes from approximately 34.3 percent to 46.5 and this resulted in the receiving of the overwhelming majority in the Turkish Grand National Assembly (Kalaycıoğlu 2010, p.29). According to

Kalaycıoğlu (2010, p.43) “the performance of the AKP at the polls in 2007 depended mainly on its economic performance in government between 2002 and 2007. It was under the AKP government that the three-decade old chronic stable high consumer price inflation decreased to single digits”. Kalaycıoğlu argues (ibid) that “the voters chose to support the AKP not only as a reward for its past economic performance but also to prolong the AKP’s economic program, that is, expected economic stability from the AKP”.

Pamuk (2014, p.291) describes the economy in the course of the AKP Era, as an economy which consumes more than it produces. Making investments is highly dependent on debts from overseas, banks could have found credits from overseas and allocated some of the credits to the private sector, and some of it has been oriented towards the finance of private consumption. These have been represented by the increase in the number of shopping malls in the big urban settlements and increase in the construction of residential buildings (ibid).

Pamuk (2014, p.292) emphasizes that the authoritarian character of the AKP rule gained significance in its later years. This affected the autonomy of the regulatory institutions that were supposed to be independent. Consecutively, the capital groups which have been closely associated with AKP have gained privileged positions in the public procurements and within the process of distribution of credits by the public and private banks. Pamuk (ibid) states that capital groups and new holding companies that are conservative and akin to AKP have become prominent in the big cities and industrially grown new centers. Thus, compared to the coalition governments in the 1990s, and former periods of the rule of ANAP and Justice Party, the relationship between the political power and the capital groups have become wide and deep in the AKP Era (ibid).

6.1.1. Brief Notes on the Social Impact of Economic Liberalization in Turkey

First, post 1980’s Turkey is fragmented and polarized in terms of social identities. Kandiyoti (2002, p.5) emphasizes the process of fragmentation and polarization which has been precipitated in the political economy of 1980s in Turkey and

became evident in the “fragmentation of social identities and an increasing complexity in their public articulation”. Post 1980’s hybrid cultural atmosphere can be represented from various aspects. It is structured around the changing patterns of social differentiation and stratification, changing patterns of cultural production, transforming politics of culture and shifting identities.

The study of social identities cannot be divorced from the Turkish economic liberalization in the post 1980’s. Kandiyoti (2002, p.13) suggests that the question of “how the ideologies of the market and the state, the circulation of commodities and symbols interact and coalesce in the constitution of new identities”. As summarized by Kandiyoti (2002, p.2-3) in the formative years of social science, the major binary opposition that set the analytical framework of discussions were modern versus traditional. By the turn to the globalization as a central analytic category, the central attention has been on the consumption of material products, circulation of people, technologies, images and ideas. The binary opposition local and global displaced the analytical framework set by modern and traditional.

Kandiyoti (2002, p.5) asserts, given the complexity of transformations brought by the post-1980s, the necessity of close-ups to the society has become more important. but Absence of “the studies of the ways in which codes of class and status were produced, reproduced and politicized as competing cultural styles, preferences and orientations” in the sociological and anthropological accounts of Turkey became “even more glaring” (ibid). Therefore studying the social production of styles of consumption, cultural preferences, the symbols, meanings that signal varying cultural orientations and different lifestyle options gained importance (Kandiyoti 2002, p.9).

In this dissertation, I hope to contribute to the understanding of businessmen’s cultural orientations by revealing the importance of private museums for them. In this respect I will reveal the meanings attributed to the private museums by founding key figures in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8.

Second, the state as an agency should not be overlooked. There is a conviction that the term neoliberalism “refers to the liberalizing of global markets associated with the reduction of state power,” minimized state intervention in the economy, emphasis on privatization, free trade, free markets and free enterprise (Oxford Reference, n.d.). Despite the ideal case of neoliberalisation where state interventionism and state power in the economic sphere is reduced, the role of the state in the Turkish case worth considering.

One of the prominent aspects of the role of the state is the relationship between the state and the business in Turkey. Buğra (1994, p.4-5) suggests that “[t]he overwhelming significance of the state in determining the course of business life appears as a key determinant of the character of business activity in Turkey”. Buğra (1994, p.xi) means the relationship between businessmen and government authorities when referring to the “state-business relations”. She argues that state institutions are important influencing the social position of the business community (ibid). According to Buğra (1994, p.8) the justification of business activity in Turkey “has little to do with profit maximization”, the justification criteria are based on the “nationally set objectives” and the social position of the businessmen rely on their “contribution to these objectives”. Therefore, if one considers business activity in Turkey, the empirical findings diverge from the ideal case of neoliberalisation.

Buğra (1994, p.69) reviews the autobiographies of eight businessmen that shaped and influenced business life in Turkey. She presents that there are differences among the businessmen in terms of their business lives, educational background and fields of specialization. Nonetheless, the state appears as a crucial element of business life because “even if the state does not appear as a source of credit at the initial stage, the turning point in business life can often be traced to a project in which the state plays a key role as the contractor, principal buyer, or the provider of the capital necessary to take the step that would change the course of the businessman’s career orientation” (ibid). Moreover, state does not appear as a source of complaint among the businessmen even if it is the major source of difficulties. On the contrary the presence of the state has been normalized. The

main criticism that came up among the businessmen towards the state is the uncertainty it entails. The uncertainty refers to the “frequent changes in economic policy, constant reshuffling bureaucratic positions, and even the absence of planning” (Buğra 1994, p. 70).

I concentrate on three businessmen, namely Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı who are also the subjects of Buğra’s (1994) study. I concentrate on them because I find these key figures directly related with the subject of this dissertation. First, I suggest a relationship between the growth of their businesses in the form of large conglomerates and their engagement with culture and arts. Second, they are the subjects who first thought about the possibility of founding a private museum under the framework of philanthropic foundations. Third, the private museums that I concentrate were founded as in relationship with these key businessmen. Fourth, private museums are synergic institutions to the respective conglomerates and philanthropic foundations. Therefore, I suggest the relationship between the businessmen and the state can be traced in the functioning of cultural and artistic establishments that were formed in association with these figures and the conglomerates they have founded.

Third, as I referred to Öniş (2009, p.10-13) large conglomerates in Turkey benefited disproportionately from the improvements in the macroeconomic environment and have become transnational in their operations. I especially consider these related with their involvement in the spheres of culture and arts. Especially the orientation towards transnationalisation has been an important feature of their interest in international recognition. I suggest, the conglomerate’s interest on arts have accelerated in the post 1980’s in relation with this increasing international orientation. Supports given to arts and culture and the establishment of private museums in three of my cases serve for the domestic as well as international recognition of the large conglomerates associated with them. I will elaborate on this issue in Chapter 8.

Fourth, I find Pamuk’s (2014, p.292) argument that I referred above, on the conservative capital groups akin to AKP relevant. During the last decade,

conservative capital groups have started to be interested in the support of arts. Some conservative capital owners appeared as new actors in the field of arts, by collecting practices and sharing their interest in building private art museums. I will discuss these as the recent developments in the field in section 6.4 of this chapter.

The recent proliferation of enthusiasm of businessmen in supporting arts, is also related with the İstanbul's rise as the "center of culture and arts" which now I shall discuss its particularities and significance.

6.2. Globalizing İstanbul

Saskia Sassen (1991) coined the term "global city" in her work *The Global City*. According to Sassen (2001, p.xviii) theoretical and empirical understanding of the globalization of economic activity and the new organizational structure it entails, requires a new type of conceptual architecture and the conceptual construct of "global city" is the crucial one in this new type of conceptualization. Sassen suggests that and "dynamics and processes that get territorialized" in the "global city" are "global". On the contrary, Öncü and Weyland (1997) argue that globalization also entails a process of localization and its dynamics cannot be reduced to the logic of global flows because these dynamics find their expression in the struggles over resources and meanings of different competing social groups (cited in Kandiyoti 2002, p.4).

The analytical turn towards globalization in Turkey has been reflected in the increased focus on İstanbul as the locus of attention (Keyder and Öncü 1993; Aksoy and Robins 1994; Keyder 1999; Aksoy 2008 and 2012; Göktürk, Soysal and Türeli 2010). As Kandiyoti (2002, p.4) summarizes Keyder's account on İstanbul, "He argues that unevenness in the pace of globalization feeds a cultural conflict revolving around the definition of locality and identity, between the globalisers and the localisers, a conflict fuelled by widely discrepant access to the material benefits of globalization". In this respect, small segment of the population

incorporates into the “opportunity structures offered by the new economic dynamics” (ibid). Aksoy (2008) presents the scene of İstanbul as a “globalizing city under radical transformation” and focus on the new urban public culture İstanbul entails.

Aksoy (2008, p.74) argues that “the project of globalizing İstanbul, turning İstanbul into an internationally competitive city attractive to investors, businessmen and tourists, is now being fully realized”. In this respect, she considers this new new moment as a “new round of urban globalization” since she suggests the project of globalizing İstanbul has started in mid 1980’s, it was partially achieved throughout the 1990s, yet fully realized recently (ibid). Aksoy (2008) suggests that this new round of globalization is not only primarily driven by real-estate (p.73) but also it is a cultural project too (p.75).

Aksoy (2008) exemplifies this cultural project with the opening of Kanyon shopping mall demonstrating the incorporation of public space into the culture of hyper consumption (p.75), the Beyoğlu Municipality’s initiative of regenerating the city quarter of Algeria Street into French Street and commercializing it (p.76) and recent undertakings of conglomerates that turn culture into a business opportunity (p.77). Aksoy directly refers to the opening of İstanbul Modern, the launching of bid by Suna and Kırâç Foundation to turn metropolitan municipality owned TÜYAP area into an international culture and arts center, and the five-year protocol signed by the Sabancı Museum and Louvre for artistic and scientific cooperation “whereby the Louvre will be bringing cultural capital in the form of exhibitions, know-how and networking to İstanbul” (p.77) as examples. It is crucial to note one of Aksoy’s (2008, p.80) major arguments; she states that “the opening of the cultural field is underwritten by gentrified class-base of the neoliberal regime. Cultural liberation progresses in the direction of what suits the needs of the rising elites of the city, in ways that respond to their expectations of higher living standards”.

In similar logic, Yardımcı (2007) discusses the recent developments in İstanbul’s cultural scene, namely the “expansion of the events organized by the İstanbul

Foundation for Culture and Arts, the mushrooming of art galleries and publishers supported by banking companies, successive openings of universities and museums owned by large capital groups and the multiplication of other smaller scale private/semi-private artistic initiatives. Yardımcı (2007, p.2) states that these institutions and cultural events provide “a room for international cultural exchange” and “link the city to global artistic networks” and “ascribe a cultural capital/ world city status to İstanbul”. Yet, Yardımcı (2007, p.10) argues that the increasing privatization of culture has important social implications because “the more private institutions shape the public space created through culture, the greater is their ability to control it, including or excluding individuals and groups that might occupy that space”.

6.2.1. The Significance of AKP

AKP is an important actor in the implementation of the project of globalizing İstanbul (Aksoy 2012). Before elaborating on AKP’s role in globalizing İstanbul, I want to briefly note the connection of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the founding leader of the party, with İstanbul before he came to power as the Prime Minister. Erdoğan was the İstanbul candidate of the Islamist *Refah Partisi* (Welfare Party) during the 27 March 1994 municipal elections. He was elected as the Mayor of the İstanbul in 1994 and he served for the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality until 1998.

Bartu (1999) views the municipal elections of March 27, 1994 as the “reconquest of the city”. According to Bartu (1999, p.38-39) resurgence of the Ottoman past and of İstanbul is an important element of the Islamist discourse. “As a movement that challenges the Turkish nationalist project (which defines itself in opposition to the Ottoman past), the Islamic movement attempts to revitalize and resurrect the past. (...) The Islamist aim is to resurrect the lost “glorious Ottoman past.” İstanbul, the glorious capital of the empire, is a key symbol of this revival.” (Bartu 1999, p.39). The Welfare Party was the only party which did not embrace the global city project (ibid). And the elections in the municipality of İstanbul and the district of Beyoğlu which was recognized as the symbol of Westernizing reformers of and the entertainment center of the city by the secularist, won by Welfare Party

(p.40). And it followed by different strategies by Welfare Party to claim Beyoğlu back and gave way to political battles. Tanıl Bora (1999) in his work “İstanbul of the “Conqueror The Alternative Global City Dreams” of Political Islam” argues that (p.48) within the Islamic discourse, İstanbul “is believed to be lost, divorced of its true essence because of its experience of westernization” thus it “needs to be conquered again”. Bora (ibid) states that this theme came on the agenda in 1953, on the five hundredth anniversary of Conquest of İstanbul by Fatih Sultan Mehmet. Thus, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan came to power with the aim of transforming İstanbul into the object of Islamic nostalgia and to remake it in the original Conqueror’s image (p.49). Although Erdoğan distanced himself from the global city project during the respective elections, his attainment of power changed his rhetoric towards the logic of economic rationality and towards thinking about the city as a business enterprise (Bora 1999, p.55).

Bora (1999, p.55-56) states that: “İstanbul is the key to WP’s bargain with the established structures of power-primarily because the city is the locus of capital. As the Islamist movement seeks to come to an understanding with the Turkish bourgeoisie, it also has to accept the global-city project of big capital” and Welfare Party’s developmentalist heritage and focus on industrialization drew the party towards embracing global-city project. However, global-city project was internalized by the Islamic politicians with an addition of alternative signification which fits for the purposes of an Islamic or neo-Ottoman hegemony over the region (p.56).

The internalization of the global-city project and the significance of İstanbul has become more explicit during the AKP Era. As stated by Aksoy (2012, p.98) “Globalization is a central mission of the AKP government, and İstanbul is the privileged arena of operation”. It is pointed out by Çınar (2003) that “AKP’s pro-globalization stance can be understood within the context of party’s drive to show ‘that it has adopted the original Republican mission to catch up with the modern world’” (cited in Aksoy 2012, p.98). Aksoy (ibid) emphasizes the commitment and consensus between the urban and the central government to turn İstanbul into “Turkey’s global power-base”. Aksoy (ibid) states that: “The consequence of

Istanbul being governed by an AKP administration has been the emergence of a total accord between central and local governments—between Ankara, where the central government is seated, and Istanbul, which is being promoted to the global stage.” It is crucial to note that exploiting İstanbul’s potential for culture and tourism reached its climax when İstanbul became the European Capital of Culture in 2010 (Aksoy 2012, p.103). Istanbul European Capital of Culture Agency was set up by a law and making İstanbul a ‘brand city’ was the key objective of the Agency, in the framework of İstanbul 2010 programme both the urban and central government were committed to the restoration and regeneration of the city’s rich cultural heritage and this was supported by a controversial new law on ‘renewal’ of historic areas (ibid). Most importantly however, while İstanbul has been transformed and opened to market-driven global forces under the state-led project, the social divisions escalated and urban public culture has been increasingly privatized:

The prevalence of neoliberal values within the Islamic AKP (Justice and Development Party) government, over the last decade or so, is associated with this more assertive, globalizing and entrepreneurially minded Istanbul. As global processes increasingly, and seemingly irreversibly, affect the daily life of the city’s 15 million residents, older modes of urban living and established forms of public culture are damaged, if not devastated. This represents one contemporary variant of world-oppennes-the neoliberal articulation. Oppennes to global economic forces is associated with escalating social divisions, existensial loss of control, increasing privatization of urban public culture, and in fact end of İstanbul as we have known it (Aksoy 2012, p.93-94).

As Aksoy asserts in the above quotation, during the AKP Era İstanbul has become the main focus of attention to operationalize the aim of integrating Turkey with the world-market. In this broad process the urban public culture is transforming in direction of privatization.

The shift in Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s stance towards the aspirations of big capital can be demonstrated by one particular ironic case which is directly associated with the subject of this dissertation. In the late 1980’s, the idea of building a modern art museum emerged in İKSV and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. It was declared to public that the Feshane will be renovaded and turned into a museum with the contributions of Eczacıbaşı Family. Efforts were given in this direction including the renovation of

the building by Gae Aulenti with a huge financial support from the Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. Nonetheless, the project was cancelled due to the friction between the initiators and local government when Recep Tayyip Erdoğan became the Mayor of İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality. As I will elaborate the issue further in Chapter 8, it was Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, who supported and enabled the establishment of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art in İstanbul in 2004, initiated by the same capital group.

Alongside AKP, corporations and corporate actors have become the conveyors and crucial actors of İstanbul's transformation in neoliberal and global direction. United under the umbrella of attracting capital and globalizing İstanbul, various capital groups engaged in activities and events supporting culture and arts with the aims of fostering culture and tourism.

It is argued by Aksoy (2008, p.79-80) that the city space of İstanbul has been mobilized for market-oriented economic growth and elite consumption practices and this transformation is underwritten by the coalition of two elite groups. Two groups are “the post 1980's generation of secular, middle-class and professional workers” referred by Esen (2005 cited in Aksoy 2008, p.79) as ‘North-İstanbul elites’ and “the rising commercial elites of the Islamic-oriented traditional circles, politically represented by the ‘innovative group’ in the ruling AKP”. Aksoy (2008, p.80) states that:

These two elite groups, who until recently were polarised, now share a common aspiration which informs their actions and their discourses. What is held in common is a vision of Istanbul as a city that is globalised and gentrified, providing orderly and cleaned-up public spaces and residential quarters, with an attractive public image, world-class services and goods. We might then argue that the opening of the cultural field is underwritten by the gentrified class-base of the neoliberal regime.

In this context, I will first elaborate on AKP's pro-privatization stance on culture and arts by focusing on legal and regulatory changes which enable privatization in the urban culture. And second, I will focus on the recent private initiatives in the field of culture and arts by elaborating on examples to demonstrate the rise of İstanbul for the implementation of global-city project.

6.3. Legal Framework Enabling Privatization in Culture

AKP governments have instrumentalized culture and arts with the aim of enhancing the “image” of Turkey within the global markets and İstanbul has been the center of this operation. In this context, within the last decade, corporate sponsorship and private investments in culture and arts, establishment of private museums are supported by the laws and regulatory changes. One of the crucial aspects to consider is the taxation policies. Furthermore, the rhetoric on privatizing state cultural institutions and draft bill shall be evaluated within this context. I will briefly discuss the legal and regulatory framework which I consider important for building the infrastructure for the intervention of non-state actors in the field of arts and culture; thus, enabling the increasing privatization in culture.

Legal framework constituted by Law No: 5225, Law No: 5422 and Circular in 2005 and Regulation on Private Museums and Supervision is directly related with the subject of this dissertation.

The sponsorship as a corporate act comes along with the legal framework that determines the ways in which corporations can act. Cultural sponsorship has been transformed into an appealing activity within the context of legal and regulatory initiatives in the AKP Era. The lucrative character of sponsorship cannot be reduced to the advertising of the sponsors; its instrumentalisation for social recognition and prestige. Rather, if one considers the economic benefits of cultural sponsorship, state incentives and tax advantages should be recognized.

First of all I want to briefly outline the developments in the legal framework. Law number: 5225 titled as the “Law of Incentive for Culture Investments and Enterprises” was enacted in 2004 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 25529, 21.07.2004). The aim of the law is presented by the Revenue Administration as follows:

The purpose of the law numbered 5225 is to provide meeting of individual and society requirements; preserving of cultural assets and abstract cultural heritage and becoming it an item of sustainable culture, activating the environment of cultural communication and interaction, producing of cultural and artistic values, creating and developing possibility of society’s attention

of these values; keeping our country's cultural assets alive and utilize and use it as contribute element to country economy, promoting cultural investment and enterprises to build and running of cultural centers (Revenue Administration, n.d.).

One of the most important items to be considered in Law No: 5225 is the incentives granted to the subjects who financially support culture and arts. The incentives provided by this law are: income tax withholding deduction, allocation of immovable property, abatement in employer contributions, water cost discount and energy support, ability to employ foreign personnel or artists, ability to function in weekends and official holidays.

Another most important item to be considered introduced by this Law, is the tax exemption to be granted to the investors in arts and culture. Although it is not clear whether the investors in Turkey benefit from this law or not (Kösemen 2014, p.34) it clearly provides tax deductions and apply incentives for those who intend to invest in arts and culture. For example "Corporation Tax Payer Investor or entrepreneur who has license in scope of this law can deduct %50 of the income tax in the phase of investment not longer than 3 years and %25 of the income tax in the enterprise phase not longer than 7 years from the tax accrued in their withholding tax return based on their monthly insurance payroll given to the administration only for the worker wages that will be worked in the licensed investment or enterprise. (Law No: 5225, a.5/b)" (Revenue Administration, n.d.). Tax incentives also apply for the deduction of the tax paid for the employer contribution. The law is clearly associated with the neoliberal understanding of the economy as well as the instrumentalisation of culture for the purpose of promoting the country.

Tax incentives are also granted for sponsors of culture and arts. On 14 July 2004 legislation is enacted. Law No: 5422 amending Decree Having Force of Law No:178 and Some Other Laws. With this law some articles were amended in the Law that was enacted on 10.06.1949, Law No: 5422 Corporate Tax Law. Relevant articles were amended in the Law No: 193 Income Tax Law, which had been enacted on 06.11.1961 (Central Directory of Revolving Funds Tax Advantages in

Sponsorship, n.d.). The respective amendments provided remarkable tax incentives for various kinds of expenditures, donations and supports in the field of art and culture. The legislation provides tax incentives for the expenditures, support and donations of public administrations, special provincial administrations, municipalities, villages, associations that work for commonweal, the philanthropic foundations that are exempted from tax by the Council of Ministers and the scientific research institutions. Moreover, the incentives also applies for individuals or groups who spend, donate or support the activities either supported or approved to be supported by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. According to the respective amendments in the articles, the respective subjects can be deducted 100 percent. For example, they are deducted from the corporate revenue on corporate tax base calculation. And they are deducted from revenues subject to income tax declaration on income tax base calculation. And the Council of Ministers has the authority to reduce the amount deducted or increase it to the legal percentage.

A Circular was publicized in 2005 which stated the sponsorship in the field of culture has been supported legally by the incentives. Both the legislation and the notice cover a wide variety of activities. The sponsorship activities that are subject to incentives are: (1) Making of noncommercial domestic or international cultural organizations. (2) Production of books, catalogs, brochures, cassettes, CD and DVD. (3) Preparation of audio or visual materials and the compilation or research, relevant with the culture, arts, history, literature, architecture, cultural assets and abstract cultural heritage that are relevant with country's civilization assets or oriented towards country's promotion (Central Directory of Revolving Funds Sponsorship Activities, n.d.). (4) Restoration and preservation, transportation of the immovable cultural property and cultural works that are under the scope of the Law No: 2863 Conservation of Cultural and Natural Property. (5) Preservation and digitalization of handwritten works and curiosities and adding them to the collection of Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (6) Archeological and scientific excavations. (7) Development of cultural inventory. (8) Preservation of the immovable cultural assets abroad or the transfer of them to the country. (9)

Bringing in the cultural property and the works of art, contemporary and traditional handiworks to the collection of Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (10) Establishment of workshops, studios and film studios, the making of films, the preservation and restoration of respective establishments, the production and activities regarding abstract cultural heritage and fine arts, cinema, contemporary and traditional handiworks. (11) Establishment, preservation and modernization of institutions such as library, museum, art gallery, cultural center, movie theater, and halls for theater, opera, ballet and concerts.

Respective legal adjustments provide tax advantages for a multitude of persons and occasions. And most importantly, these amendments have been made during the AKP Era. As I pointed above, it is not known to what extent the capital owners, corporations, foundations and firms benefit from these recent changes. Yet, for example, a presentation was made by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism General Directorate for Cultural Heritage and Museums to the İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts about the tax incentives provided by the laws for the cultural sponsorship to build awareness (İKSV Sponsorship Presentation, n.d.).

I want to point to the amendments in Regulation on Private Museums and Their Supervision (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 18289, 22.01.1984). In 1980, “Regulation on Private Museums” was enacted (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 17129, 18.10.1980). The first amendments were made in 1984 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 18289, 22.01.1984). The recent amendments were made in 2006 in the AKP Era (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 26356, 24.11.2006). Current Regulation of Private Museums and Their Supervision introduced the following:

- a) The statement “cultural property” was replaced by “movable cultural and natural heritage under the scope of Law No: 2863 Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage” (Article 1)
- b) A multitude of persons- ministries, public institutions, real persons and judicial personalities and foundations- can form collections and establish private museums consist of all kinds of “movable” cultural and natural heritage. (Article 4 is made suitable with Law No: 2863)

- c) Establishment of a private museum has been made easier in terms of museum space. While the former regulation stated no museum could be established in a rental building (Article 5). The recent amendment of the Article 5 introduced the establishment of private museums in a rental space under the condition of providing a document that permits the use of the space for at least ten years.
- d) The copy of the inventory register should be submitted to the public museum, that the private museum is affiliated for supervision. (Article 9) The private museums are under supervision of the public museums determined by the Ministry for their periodical supervision at least once a year (Article 11)
- e) Private museums can exchange and sell all kinds of movable cultural and natural property within their collections among each other under the condition of preserving the unity of their collection and taking the approval of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The museums that are subject to the Ministry have priority in the acquisitions. Private museums should inform the management of the museums that they are affiliated to, fifteen days prior to the transactions by providing the contract of circulation or sale (Article 10).
- f) New regulations were introduced and were detailed for the cases of closing or moving private museums. (Article 13).

In Turkey, Ministries, public institutions, persons, judicial personalities and philanthropic foundations can establish museums that contain all types of movable cultural and natural assets for the realization of their areas of service or aims. The control and supervision of the private museums are directly vested with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Although relatively autonomous compared to public museums, especially with regard to their funding, private museums are subject to state control and supervision maintained by mechanisms such as application procedures and routine inspections by the public officials of the public museums specifically allocated for each and every private museum.

DiMaggio (1991) emphasizes the models of diffusion as a moment in the structuration of art museums as an organizational field. DiMaggio (1991, p.268) argues that among the American art museums there is a “substantial discord about key aspects of museum form and function as well as the emergence of a national infrastructure- at which professional organizations supported by philanthropic foundations are at the core- committed to speeding and shaping the diffusion process”. The Regulation on Private Museums and Their Supervision forms the

national legal infrastructure for how to organize as a private museum. I will argue in Chapter 8 that on one hand private museums function on the basis of this regulation. On the other, private actors speed and shape the diffusion process of specific model of a museum, by establishing private museums under the framework of philanthropic foundations.

AKP's stance towards the state cultural and artistic institutions is another area to consider. Although it is not in the field of visual arts, I find the discussions about the privatization of state-funded theaters in 2012 striking. First, it reveals the interest of the ruling party to privatize the funding of the provision of arts and culture. Second, it represents the ideological struggle between the Kemalist-modernist intellectuals and the conservatist and Pro-Islamist views. In April 2012, the İstanbul Mayor Kadir Topbaş "amended the regulations of the City Theaters, which are run by the Metropolitan Municipality, to increase the influence of civil servants in selecting the repertoire and to better control the artistic content of the theater"(Hürriyet Daily News, 30.04.2012). which resulted in a growth of tension and rallies of actors and actresses to protest the move. The protestors, accused the government for using its authority for potential censorship. Erdoğan took up Topbaş's claim and made the following statements:

No theaters are being run by the state in almost any developed country. I congratulate Mr. Kadir Topbaş, [the İstanbul Mayor], and I will bring the same [suggestion] to the Cabinet,

They have started to insult us and all conservatives over a change in the City Theaters regulations. For God's sake, I am asking: Who are you? From where do you get the authority to express opinions on every issue, to argue that you are not the only eligible person to know everything? Are theaters your monopoly in this country? Are arts your monopoly? These days are gone," baş, [the İstanbul Mayor], and I will bring the same [suggestion] to the Cabinet, (ibid)

"You can play on your theaters freely after privatization. If there is a need for support, then we as the government can sponsor plays that we want," "Here there is freedom. You can play whatever you want and wherever you want. No one will prevent you. Sorry, but you cannot get your salary from both the municipality and City Theaters and then criticize the management. There is no such absurdity (ibid).

In the aftermath of this harsh declaration, despite the tension and the uproar, the privatization of the state art and culture institutions has been on the agenda of the Justice and Development Party government. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan who

suggested that “art could not be made by the hand of the state” paved the way for the preparation of a bill in this regard. It is stated in 2013 that the “ the new bill reportedly provides for the creation of an 11-member board appointed by the Cabinet that will have every prerogative in terms of choosing the theater, cinema, ballet or opera pieces that will be funded by the state.”(Hürriyet Daily News, 25.05.2013). A bill was prepared by the Erdoğan government titled as *TÜSAK Yasası* where TÜSAK stands for Turkish Art Institution composed of 11-members appointed to by cabinet. The opponents claim that “the draft law will result in the closure of 55 state institutions and turn artists into unqualified or subcontracted workers. It would also give critical authority to 11 people to be appointed to TÜSAK by the Cabinet, which would secure added power to make wide-ranging decisions affecting national arts institutions”(Hürriyet Daily News, 04.03.2014). It is feared that the autonomy of the arts will be eliminated and the bill is suspected to facilitate tight government control on arts. The bill received much attention in the spring, 2014 (Arts Freedom,15.05.2014). Nonetheless, government has not taken a step back. Moreover, President Gül defended the draft law on TÜSAK, and suggested that: “Contrary to discussions, TÜSAK has a goal to support the project owners. The claims that all art events in Turkey will be managed by this law are not true. As for the claims about the closure of the DOB [State Opera and Ballet] and the DT [State Theater], they are not true. No, they will not be closed. These institutions will be reconstructed” (Hürriyet Daily News, 04.03.2014).

Very recently Aksoy and Şeyben (2014) discussed the implications of AKP’s stance towards state cultural and artistic institutions in their article “Storm over the State Cultural Institutions: New Cultural Policy Direction in Turkey”. Aksoy and Şeyben (2014) suggest that there is a transformation in the state’s role in arts from the “producer” to the “facilitator” (p.3). In the initial years of AKP, the emphasis was on the encouraging private-sector investments and entrepreneurialism through tax breaks. Second line of cultural policy was treating cultural and artistic investments as instruments for city branding and image creation (p.4). Recently, the cultural policy emphasis of AKP shifted in terms of content, first demonstrated with the attempt to demolish Atatürk Cultural Center in İstanbul (ibid). According

to Aksoy and Şeyben (2014, p.10) “there is an attempt to constitute a national high culture according to the ‘civilizational’ precepts of Turkish conservatism. In a very similar way to the earlier generation of Kemalists, who created a modernist and westernist elitism that would seek to negate the Ottoman and Islamic past, the conservatives of today are campaigning to disinherit the legacy of the secular Republican project, and, instead, create yet another elitism, based this time on a nostalgic and idealized perception of the Ottoman and Islamist past and of its cultural and artistic achievements”. Aksoy and Şeyben (2014, p.11) conclude that “[t]he challenge in Turkey today is clearly to articulate how the autonomy of culture will be created, and how its plurality of expression is going to be safeguarded”.

I will now focus on the recent private initiatives and their characteristics in Section 6.4.

6.4. The Rise of Private Entrepreneurship and Private Funding in the Field of Arts and Its Social Implications

The literature recently emerged in Turkey with the intention of inquiring the role of private capital in arts, mostly focuses on the relationship between the “contemporary art” and the capital and excludes the fields of music, performing arts and folk arts. This is mostly because the emergence of contemporary art works as objects of interest and investment by the corporate figures within the last two decades. In Turkey, the discussions regarding the relationship between the contemporary arts and capital develop simultaneously by the discussions regarding the autonomy of arts. A couple of social scientific journals in Turkey have given place to the importance of the changing characteristics of artwork considering the convergence of arts with the economics and its consequences in the Turkish case. Among those, the specific thematic issues allocated to the arts and theory and to the contemporary arts in Turkey edited by Erden Kosova and Tümay Aslan by *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi* (Journal of Society and Science) in 1998 and 2012 respectively can be counted as contributions to the literature in the field. Recently (April 2014) the *İktisat Dergisi* (Journal of Economics) in Turkey published an

issue on contemporary art and capital, edited by Fırat Arapoğlu, Gülnur Elçik and Begüm Kösemen. The questions that guide the discussions in Turkey are very similar with the issues and concerns brought by abroad (Arapoğlu, Elçik & Kösemen 2014). Given that corporations establish their own galleries and hire their own curators, the questions posed are: Why arts have become an important area of investment for corporations? What kinds of benefits do the corporations receive through becoming/ substituting the cultural institutions? How the independence of the curators and the artists can be evaluated considering the former questions and the relationship between the beneficiary relations between the corporations and the arts? What does it mean for holding owners or collectors to collect art in an era of unification between arts and capital? Is it related with the future plans of establishing museums? Should we deal with the arts as an element of prestige or a new trend which builds new possibilities of expression via becoming international?

The global orientation towards contemporary arts has been reflected in Turkey. The orientation of private actors towards contemporary arts in Turkey can be traced into late 1980's to the initiation of İstanbul 1st International İstanbul Contemporary Exhibitions in 1987 by İKSV. 1990's witnessed extraordinary sales of contemporary artworks in the auctions that changed the dynamics of the art market. (Artun 2011, p.176-181) used the concept *sanatın müzayedeleşmesi* (auctionization of arts) to refer to the recent situation in Turkey. Artun (ibid) states that the story of speculative auctions began with the auction of paintings that were owned by the famous businessman Halil Bezmen in 1995. Mensucat Santral A.Ş. that was owned by Bezmen was bankrupted and then the Turkish Treasury obtained the artworks that were supposedly smuggled to United States. The artworks auctioned by Portakal Sanat Evi owned by Raffi Portakal. The total sales of 203 works in the respective auction amounted 36 billion TL. A contemporary artwork *İstasyon* by Neşe Erdok reached twenty eight times of its opening price and was sold for 1 billion 400 million TL. Balkan Naci's work raised its opening price by thirty times captured the headlines. The so called authorities of the art market such as Raffi Portakal and Yahşi Baraz cheerfully celebrated the exploding

prices. The power of auction was associated to the contemporary artworks by them. This emphasis carried the Turkish contemporary art on the agenda for the first time that much and referred as a groundbreaking event. The political instability and the problems that occurred in the economy which especially hit the banking and financial sectors during the late 1990s and early 2000s (Pamuk, 2014, p. 283) have had important consequences for both the emergence of the contemporary art market and speculative auctions. This is because the collections that were owned by bankrupted bankers (such as Erol Aksoy, Uzan Family, Murat Demirel and Ali Banker) had become the subjects of speculative auction sales from 2004 and onwards in the aftermath of the forfeiture of the artworks by Savings Deposit Fund (Artun 2011, p.177).

These developments resulted in the transformation of auctions in Turkey in direction of speculative sales, prominence of speculators instead of collectors, replacement of antiquities by contemporary artworks in the auctions. Artun (2011) suggests that the initiatives of international art market players in Turkey had given way to the increased significance of auctions and contemporary art in Turkey. The first initiative was taken by the Foundation for Fine Arts and Cultural Heritage in 1990. Sotheby's "Contemporary Turkish Painters" auction was organized in İstanbul. Later the Sotheby's opened an agency in İstanbul and organized "Turkish Contemporary Arts" auction in its London Center in 2009. How these Sotheby's auctions functioned demonstrates how the groups of businessmen in Turkey act in the field. The Sotheby's initially intended to facilitate a market for Turkish contemporary art in the international art market through organizing auctions in its London center from 2009 and onwards. It is known that artworks were transported to London with high transportation and insurance costs. However, except one work of art, the works were bought by the İstanbul based collectors. And among these İstanbul based collectors half of them were the members of well-known families and patrons of contemporary art (Artun 2011, p.181).

The interest of non-state actors on contemporary arts has continued until today. Particularly banks appeared as actors dedicated to support contemporary arts. Wu (1996, p.91) emphasizes that the appealing character of contemporary arts for the

corporations stems from its representations. According to Wu (ibid) contemporary art represents the avant-garde art and innovation within the paradigm of modernism. Wu (ibid) argues that this provided the “business world with a valuable tool to project the image of itself as a progressive and innovative corporate force.” The banks’ and large conglomerate’s enthusiasm for contemporary arts can be explained in this framework. As I will discuss in section 6.4.1. most recent initiatives of banks and large conglomerates focus on contemporary arts. Banks lead this trend by incorporating contemporary arts to their missions of making İstanbul as part of the global market.

The number of private museums established and planned to be established have increased between 2002 and 2012 (Artun & Baransel 2011). Most of them being contemporary arts museums, and 9 of them exhibiting family or corporations’ collections, total number of 21 arts museums have been opened during the same period (ibid). The number of private museums located in 36 cities was 151 in 2011. In 2013 it has increased to 175 museums in 38 cities (Anadolu Agency, 2013). And as of July 2014, there are 192 private museums in Turkey that are officially considered in the private museums status (General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, 2014). Highest number of private museums is located in İstanbul with 46, followed by Ankara with 36 museums and İzmir with 14 museums, followed by Bursa and Gaziantep with 8 museums hosted by the cities. Museums vary according to their areas of specialization and collection. Several areas such as geology, archeology, press, communications, industry, sports, transportation, war, and children can be counted including the house museums dedicated to famous artists and individuals, city museums that specialize on urban history. In 2000s, the interest in establishing private museums has been enhanced. For example in 2005 it was announced in Milliyet Newspaper’s economy page that twenty two businessmen were preparing to establish art museums. Yunus Büyükkuşoğlu, Kaya Turgut, Hasan Çolakoğlu, Oktay Duran, Mustafa Özkan, Sinan Genim, Kemal Bilginsoy, Mehmet Ürgüplü, Turgut Ciner, Çetin Nuhuğlu, Barbaros - Sema Çağa, Erdoğan Demirören, Ender Mermerci, Can Elgiz, Nezih Barut, Jefe Kamhi, Mustafa Taviloğlu, Ali Kibar, Erol Kiresepi, Suna

- İnan Kır  , Oya - B  lent Eczacıbaşı and   mer Ko   were referred as individuals preparing to establish private museums. Similarly, Ak  am Newspaper was reporting the enthusiasm of businessmen in 2009 with the title “Business World Run for Opening Museums”. This recent *m  zemani* (musemania) as Artun & Baransel (2011) coined the term should be understood within the context of the expansion of private capital’s interest in arts framed and shaped by neoliberalisation processes and globalization of İstanbul.

Large conglomerates (ex: Ko   Holding, Sabancı Holding, Eczacıbaşı Holding, Do  u   Holding), individuals associated with these conglomerates, and banks appear as prominent actors in forming collections and competing in auctions. The interest on arts recently expanded among Islamic-oriented circles. An article titled as *Sanat Artık Para Ediyor* (Now Art Makes Money) published in a pro-Islamist newspaper *Yeni   afak* (2012). Art dealer and owner of an auction house Mehmet   ebi stated Eczacıbaşı, Sabancı as major investors in art and   lker and Ramsey as companies recently added among the investors.   lker and Ramsey are referred as Islamic-oriented traditional companies.   lker is the subsidiary of Yıldız Holding and Holding’s Chairman Murat   lker recently appeared as an important figure in controversial acquisitions of contemporary art and living artist paintings for extraordinary prices. For example he bought Burhan Do  an  ay’s *Blue Symphony* for 2.2 million TL in 2009 (Zaman Newspaper, 18.11.2009). The painting was auctioned by Antik A.  . (a prominent and famous auction house in İstanbul). On one hand the auction directs attention to the expansion of interest on contemporary arts within the Islamic-oriented traditional circles. On the other, it demonstrates the characteristics of the auctions. Rumors accompanied the auctions and it was suggested that the painting might be purchased by   mer Ko  , B  lent Eczacıbaşı, Cengiz   etindo  an and İnan Kır   (ibid). The rumors and addressing of few specific names from well-known families of Ko   (İnan Kır   is associated by Ko   Family by marriage) Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı characterize the auctions in Turkey. More recently, Murat   lker purchased living artist Bedri Baykam’s work *The Empty Frame* for over \$100.000 (Radikal Newspaper, 02.04.2013). The acquisition gave birth to vivid discussions since the work is literally an empty

frame and the price was found very high. The owner of Ramsey textiles company Remzi Gür is known for his close affiliation with Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. He is referred as “one of the best customers of Savings Deposit Fund”, because he purchased the collection items (antiquities, paintings, firmans) of Cem Uzan whose collection was seized by the Savings Deposit Fund because of corruption lawsuit. He pronounced to establish a private museum in the Anatolian side of İstanbul (Gazeteport, 19.01.2012).

6.4.1. Private Initiatives in Arts

I want to state some examples of private initiatives in arts and culture from 1980’s and onwards. The developments reflect expansion of in arts during the course of post 1980s and especially in 2000s. In 1980 the first private family museum Sadberk Hanım Museum was opened in Sarıyer, İstanbul by Vehbi Koç under the framework of Vehbi Koç Foundation. I will discuss the characteristic of the museum and the meanings Vehbi Koç attributes to it in detail in Chapter 7. In 1981 *Ziraat Bankası Müzesi* (Ziraat Bank Museum) was established in the headquarter of the bank in Ulus, Ankara. In 1985, *Yaşar Eğitim ve Kültür Vakfı Müzesi* (Yaşar Education and Culture Foundation Museum) was founded in İzmir. In 1987 1st International İstanbul Contemporary Art Exhibitions was initiated by İKSV. It transformed into International İstanbul Biennial and respectively 2nd İstanbul Biennial was organized in 1989 and continued until today. In 1993, Aksanat Beyoğlu was founded in Beyoğlu, İstanbul. *Ziraat Bankası Tünel Sanat Galerisi* (Ziraat Bank Tunnel Art Gallery) was founded in 1999 in Beyoğlu, İstanbul. In 2000 *İş Sanat Kibele Sanat Galerisi* (İş Sanat Kibele Gallery) was opened in İstanbul as İş Bank’s initiative. Platform Garanti Güncel Sanat Merkezi (Garanti Platform Contemporary Art Center) was founded in 2001 in Beyoğlu as Garanti Bank’s initiative. In the same year *Proje 4L İstanbul Güncel Sanat Müzesi* (Project 4L İstanbul Museum of Contemporary Art) was founded by the collection of businessman Can Elgiz. In 2002 Sabancı Museum was established under the framework of Sabancı University founded as Sabancı Foundation’s university. In

the same year Ottoman Bank Museum was founded by Garanti Bank in İstanbul. In 2003, Garanti Bank established Garanti Gallery in Beyoğlu, İstanbul. In 2004 İstanbul Museum of Modern Art was founded as Eczacıbaşı Holding initiative. Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation established Pera Museum in 2005 in İstanbul. Santralistanbul Museum was founded in 2007 as an initiative of İstanbul Bilgi University and Rezan Has Museum was opened under the framework of Kadir Has University. In 2010 Arter was founded in Beyoğlu by Vehbi Koç Foundation as the contemporary art platform. In 2010 Cer Modern Art Center was founded in Ankara as an initiative of Association of Turkish Travel Agencies. In 2011 SALT was founded by Garanti Bank and former Garanti Bank institutional initiatives were incorporated under the framework of SALT. Currently SALT has three branches SALT Beyoğlu, SALT Galata in İstanbul and SALT Ulus in Ankara. In the same year Borusan Contemporary was opened in İstanbul at the *Perili Köşk*, the headquarter building of Borusan Holding based on the contemporary artwork collection of the holding.

If one considers the list above İstanbul clearly appears as the center of mushrooming of cultural and artistic institutions. These investments should be evaluated within the context of neoliberalisation, cultural policy orientation towards private investments and entrepreneurship and branding İstanbul that I discussed above. In 2000's İstanbul witnessed the major developments in this respect. I want to point to the example of Contemporary İstanbul within this context. Contemporary İstanbul was firstly organized in 2006 by İkon Events Company. İkon Events company was founded in 1998 by the name İkon Tourism. The company's mission is "to promote İstanbul as a preferred destination for global congress tourism" (İkon Events Official Webstite, 2014). Current Chairman of the company Ali Güreli was also one of the founders of Turkey's Touristic Hotels & Investors Association, and the Board Member of Tourism Development Foundation (ibid). The clearly stated mission of marketing İstanbul has been reflected through the organized fairs and events within Turkey. The company's first initiative in the field of arts dates back to 2002. It organized *Art İstanbul Contemporary İstanbul Art Exposition*. The organization transformed into an art

fair, *Contemporary İstanbul* (Ci) in 2006. The fair was directed by Orhan Taner with the claims of “being the first contemporary art fair” in Turkey. The main sponsor of the art fair was Deutsche Bank. In the same year, the company also organized the *The Soul of İstanbul Photography Exhibition*. In the following years in 2012, the company organized *Art İstanbul: A Week of Art and in April 2013* and *All Arts İstanbul*. The event that focused on traditional and classical Turkish, Islamic and Ottoman Arts and antiques approached 21000 visitors. Recently, the company also organized receptions abroad. These include Contemporary İstanbul Basel Reception, Venice Reception, Dubai Reception in 2013 and 2014: New York Reception in 2014, Contemporary İstanbul at MoCA Shanghai, Contemporary İstanbul Palais de Tokyo Panel 2014, and Contemporary İstanbul London Collector Dinner in 2014 recently. Moreover, the company opened a new “platform” in one of the very popular touristic destinations of the country in Bodrum with the name *Bodrum Contemporary Art Campus* in 2014.

The examples demonstrate the recognition of culture and arts as a business opportunity. The context that made İstanbul the center of attention has been utilized and further strengthened the city’s strategic position. It is also crucial to note that these events are presented not only as the cultural platforms, “exciting” examples of the “dazzling art scene” in a rapidly “changing” İstanbul, but also legitimized through the consideration of contemporary art as part of the manifestation of uniqueness of Turkey in the cultural scenery. Turkey is represented as “a country that has become the centre of Balkans, East Europe, Caucasia, North of Africa and Middle East, a country as a door opening to the Far East” (ibid).

Another example is SALT (2011) and its Director of Research and Programs Vasif Kortun. As I mentioned it was founded by Garanti Bank and incorporated former art institutions of Garanti Bank under its framework. SALT is an important venue for contemporary arts in İstanbul. Most importantly, it demonstrates the networking İstanbul with the international art scene and broader mission of globalizing İstanbul. SALT Galata hosts Ottoman Bank Museum, a library and an archive and exhibition spaces. Salt Beyoğlu hosts a bookstore and an exhibition

space. SALT Ulus has an exhibition space. SALT organizes cultural events, symposiums, temporary exhibitions and open archive and research projects. It is focused on contemporary arts and research. On one hand, SALT is a product of branding the city of İstanbul, on the other; it serves for this mission by focusing on İstanbul through its activities and research projects. For example in 2011 SALT organized the exhibition *Becoming İstanbul*. It exemplifies institution's focus in İstanbul as well: "Becoming İstanbul explores contemporary İstanbul through an interactive database of over 400 media. An up-to-date collection of artists' videos, photography series, documentaries, news reports, cartoons and architectural projects, the database is organized according to 80 concepts that instrumentalize typical discourses relating to the city and suggest new points of view. Its media include the visual productions of artists and researchers who have problematized actors and phenomena typically disregarded in urban discourse, as well as the declarations of decision makers involved in İstanbul's current transformations" (Becoming İstanbul Press Release 2011).

Vasıf Kortun has been an important figure in this respect. He was the founding director of Platform Gallery Contemporary Art Center in İstanbul which was initiated in 2001 and formed the basis of SALT. He was also the founding Director of the Project 4L: İstanbul Museum of Contemporary Art between 2001 and 2003. He directed the İstanbul Biennial and was the co-curator of the 9th İstanbul Biennial organized by İKSV. He curated the 52nd Venice Biennial Turkish Pavillon. Kortun has been associated with the orientation towards the contemporary art within the last two decades or so. One good example of this association appeared in the New York Times Magazine (2012) in an article titled as "The İstanbul Art-Boom Bubble" (Hansen 2012). An image gallery was created to support the claim of article and titled as "İstanbul's Cultural Rebirth". On one hand, these titles emphasized the crucial transformation of İstanbul with its discovery of the potential of "culture". On the other, refer to the recent increase in its cultural and artistic institutions. The author Suzy Hansen was suggesting that İstanbul is in the era of cultural rebirth with respect to its urban life with concentrated art galleries, young artists, newly establishing art platforms,

speculative art market and auctions, “sold-out” art works and “talented” curators.

Hansen (ibid) stated that:

It appears that Istanbul, which went from a cosmopolitan wonderland in the 19th century to, in the Nobel-winning novelist Orhan Pamuk’s words, a “pale, poor, second-class imitation of a Western city” for much of the 20th, is having its moment of rebirth. These newly wealthy corners of the East seem full of possibilities, but what kind of culture will the Turks create? (Hansen 2012):

Vasıf Kortun was addressed as the architect behind this “rebirth”:

The core of Istanbul’s art scene coalesced in the ’80s and ’90s through the efforts of a few prominent figures: curators like Ali Akay and Beral Madra, the artist Halil Altındere, the SALT director Vasıf Kortun. Most artists will tell you that Kortun, who is 53, is the father of Istanbul’s art world. “We can say, there was before and after Vasıf,” one artist told me. In order to show your work home or abroad, said another, “you used to need Vasıf.” And he’s respected internationally. “He seems to be able to predict where art institutions will go,” the Beirut-based critic Kaelen Wilson-Goldie said (Hansen 2012).

Vasıf Kortun embraces the role he has been attributed:

Istanbul is shallow,” Kortun said. “It’s not an intellectual place. It was an old city with Greeks and Armenians and Jews. The Armenians were the intellectual backbone of the city. This place lost its lungs in the beginning of the 20th century. Maybe more than its lungs. It was a crippled place when it started as a nation. The 20th century is the lost century for this city. (...) “It’s not a revolution,” Kortun said, referring to Istanbul’s current phase of cultural production. “It’s a correction (ibid).

Clearly, current phase of cultural production was considered superior to the “lost past”. I suggest, the word “correction” refers to the rediscovery of the city’s cultural potential as an opportunity and an instrument to network the city to the global market. And certainly, privileged actors profit and benefit from utilizing cultural and artistic potential for their personal interests and aspirations. The role appropriated to certain individuals in this process of transformation, marks them as key figures driving the change. DiMaggio (1991, p.273) emphasize the production of experts as an effect of expansion of interest in arts in the case of US Art Museums. I suggest Vasıf Kortun, exemplifies such an effect of expansion of private interest in arts. His profession as a “curator”, and later as a Director of Research and Programs have been produced in parallel with private initiatives in art. Private institutions such as İKSV, SALT gave way to professionalization. His position directs attention to few numbers of other key figures such as Ali Akay,

Levent Çalıkoğlu, Hasan Bülent Kahraman. DiMaggio (1991, 276) also underlines the importance of “increasing the organizational salience of professional expertise” as an important element of professionalization in the art museums. I will discuss the relevance of this in the cases of three private art museums by elaborating on the roles of these figures in the functioning of the museums.

6.4.2. Corporate Sponsorship of Arts

One of the recent studies attempted to reveal the reasons behind arts sponsorship in a quantitative manner. Kösemen (2014) conducted a survey study in 2010 by focusing on Akbank, Borusan Holding, Eczacıbaşı Holding, Efes, Doğan Holding, Garanti Bank, İş Bank, Turkcell, Ülker, Sabancı Foundation, Vehbi Koç Foundation and Yapı Kredi Bank. Kösemen’s findings reveal that all of these institutions sponsor art events. 83 percent of the institutions have partnerships with İKSV, 75 percent of the institutions have museum or an art gallery, 66.6 of them sponsor art museums, and 50 percent of the institutions support art events and arts institutions abroad (Kösemen 2014, p.33-34). Kösemen suggests that all banks listed above have services in arts consultancy. As stated by Kösemen (ibid) the primary reason behind sponsoring arts events is its contribution to the social prestige. Although she refers to Bourdieu’s (1986) concept of symbolic capital, she does not provide a detailed empirical analysis.

Banks are prominent in corporate sponsorship of arts and culture. As I discussed earlier banks support in arts and culture in Turkey is not a recent phenomenon. Yet, banks prevail in sponsorship. For example Akbank sponsors International İstanbul Film Festival organized by İKSV (İKSV Official Webpage 2014). Garanti Bank sponsors International İstanbul Jazz Festival also organized by İKSV and sponsors the education program of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art (Garanti Bank Official Webpage 2014). Their effect in the field cannot be reduced to sponsorship since they own their cultural and artistic spaces as I mentioned above.

“In the 32nd İstanbul Film Festival Akbank is the supporter of all emotions”. This phrase is one of the slogans used in the advertisement of 32nd İstanbul Film

Festival in 2013, which was sponsored by Akbank, as one of the prominent banks in Turkey, and the sponsor of the film festival for ten years (Akbank About, n.d.). The proposal made by Akbank here is interesting in the sense that it emphasizes the “sponsor” rather than the cultural event. Most important however, the advertisement focus is on the major claim which was the definition of the corporation as the “supporter of all emotions”. This claim was also presented with a TV commercial. TV commercial focuses on a customs official who came across with a box of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts placed on his desk. He opens the box and observes the film reel inside and as he observes each frame he is strongly affected by what he sees. By that intimate moment of the character’s affection reflected by his dropping tears, a soft piano melody accompany the scene and the voice over says “32th İstanbul Film Festival begins and Akbank supports cinema with all its heart”. The advertisement takes our attention to a second subject other than the customs official man, which is the bank, narrated as the supporter of all emotions and personified as having a “heart”. This narrative not only builds an image for the company in question but also builds a relationship which addresses the public as being provided by the company, even to “feel”.

Sponsorship transformed into a more profitable, calculative and international visibility seeking activity. Akay (2014, p.7) gives an example as follows:

[I]n 1990s the patronage in arts in Turkey consisted of the support that had been given by certain people that thought: “Let’s do something good. Art is also a social responsibility”. That is to say, when I attempted to do “Globalization- State, Misery, Violence” Exhibition in 1995, it took us more or less two years to find support- Faruk Süren had supported. Another security company gave security services some how, because there were real guns in the exhibition. The space belonged to the artists, and it was also given as a support by the artists. I mean, from a some kind of collaborative environment, in 2000s it has passed to a stage of making profits and thereby we see the emergence as something as Paul Veyne said “show of power”; who is more powerful, who becomes more visible, who is more close to contemporary arts, who will show of more in this field of arts in the international arena? (Akay 2014, p.7).

This shift has also been reflected in the expectations of sponsors from receiving cultural institutions. For example following quotation from a former İKSV sponsorship department assistant (cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p. 364)

demonstrates the emergence of a calculative mind in the sponsors and the material interests such as accessing their targeted consumers:

In the past, the access report was not prepared in the aftermath of the festivals. A certificate was being sent accompanied with a thank you letter. When some sponsors asked for the visuals that document the actualization of the facilities that were provided for them, part by part, there appeared a necessity for these reports. From 2000s and onwards İKSV has started to prepare access reports in all its units of media, marketing and sponsorship. These reports have included the number of prints of catalogs to brochures that the sponsors' logo was used, where and when the prepared panels and flags were used, the details of the screenings of the TV and cinema clips, the number of visitors accessed the website link that the company logo appeared, the newspaper advertisements of thanks and all the details related with festival's promotional work. Therefore, during the course of the festival I used to have a close contact with the photographers, and had given them the list of our requirements regarding in which venue which equipment goods [promotional material] would be photographed. I used to archive the photographs which were related with sponsorship.

Receiving institutions provide various kinds of privileges to the sponsors. For example İKSV provides seating priorities for the sponsors in the cultural and artistic events:

One of the important privileges granted to sponsors were the invitations provided for them according to their support (...) I used to present the list that states how many invitations would be given to which sponsor to the team working on ticket-invitation-protocol, and we used to control these lists with Ömür Hanım (Bozkurt) (Selin Aysal Baykal cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.301).

Corporations' sponsorship is administered under the framework "social responsibility". For example conglomerates such as Borusan Holding, Eczacıbaşı Holding, Yıldız Holding (its prominent subsidiary Ülker), Sabancı Holding and Koç Holding allocated a space for culture and arts sponsorships under the framework of their social responsibility projects on their corporate official webpages. Garanti Bank and Akbank share the same track. Higher executives have an important role in deciding on sponsorship investments. Top level managers and Board Directors are especially important in the decisions taken regarding pursuing of sponsorship. The role of the "corporate elite" in the "privatization of culture" is also discussed in the case of United Kingdom and United States by Wu (2002, p.376-380). In her fieldwork she observed that the crucial actors in the initiatives taken for collecting artworks have been the general managers, board directors, and

in professional corporations the biggest shareholder or shareholders. According to Wu (ibid) the corporate elites have personal roles in starting the collections. In this respect, I suggest that in the case of Turkey, the corporate elite have a crucial role in deciding on the sponsorship. Consecutively, the tastes of corporate elites and their cultural capital are important features in determining what to sponsor. Following examples from Görgün Taner-the General Director of İKSV elaborates my point:

The sponsor of the first Jazz Festival was Oyak Insurance. And that happened through Recai Dalaş who is now the General Manager of Fiba Insurance. Recai Bey was the Deputy General Manager in Oyak by the time, he has been a great jazzlover (cited in Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.259).

Akın Öngör had a role in our transition from the Oyak sponsorship to Garanti. At that time, he said to us: “We know this thing is going to be right and even now we predict the festival will get much bigger, we see it, and therefore we will be in this business, we will be together, I think it is going to be a long-term thing²³ (cited in Baliç and Ermiş, p.312).

Sponsorship is embraced by private museums. Three of my cases, İstanbul Museum of Modern Art, Sabancı Museum and Pera Museum embraced the use of sponsorship for their temporary exhibitions, outgoing exhibitions abroad and education programs which I will discuss in Chapter 8. For example İstanbul Museum of Modern Art defines sponsorship as follows:

Socially aware companies, institutions, and individuals sponsor İstanbul Modern to support the museum’s cultural and artistic activities. Through their support our sponsors contribute to bringing art to wider audiences and to the promotion and development of art and culture in the country. Through the support our sponsors provide to the diverse activities of the museum they also find the opportunity to meet art audiences from different social backgrounds and to increase their corporate reputation in the eyes of the public (İstanbul Modern Sponsorship, n.d.).

²³ Akın Öngör is the former CEO of the Garanti Bank. He was firstly graduated from TED, a reputed high-school and then studied at the Middle East Technical University. Garanti Bank has been the sponsor of the İstanbul Jazz Festival for 16 years and promotes the event as “Garanti Caz Yeşili” (Garanti Jazz Green) and conceives the sponsorship as part of the Bank’s focus on sustainability and social responsibility projects.

(Garanti Bank Corporate Social Responsibility, n.d.)

Sponsorship is represented and justified as part of corporations' awareness of social matters. Corporations act as major providers of resources in the production of art which have some social implications regarding the art produced, and instrumentalisation of culture as part of the promotion of the corporate values. The lucrative character of sponsorship through providing long term recognition has been discovered by corporations as in the cases of United States and United Kingdom (Martorella 1990; Wu 2002). Corporations began to appear more as sponsors in Turkey. Yardımcı (2007, p.10-12) conceptualizes the recent situation in Turkey as "increasing privatization in the fields of culture". Businesses' willingness to support arts and culture can be explained in reference to their interest in emphasizing "their prominence in the city's symbolic economy" (Zukin 1995 as cited in Yardımcı 2007, p.12). Yardımcı (ibid) in a similar line with Martorella (1990) defines sponsorship as "powerful means of building an image" and sponsorship provides "long-term recognition" for the corporations and recognized as a medium that forms an association between the sponsor and the urban culture (ibid).

Most importantly, as I discussed earlier in this chapter, creation of public space by corporations involves mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion of individuals and groups (Yardımcı 2007, p.10).

Private museums that I focus emerged in İstanbul in 2000's in the context of 1980's Turkey. They emerged as philanthropic foundation museums. Therefore, I will now focus on the philanthropic foundations, and actors behind them, where the idea of setting a private museum originated in Chapter 7.

CHAPTER 7

THE ORIGINS of PRIVATE ART MUSEUMS: KOÇ, ECZACIBAŞI AND SABANCI FAMILY FOUNDATIONS

This chapter explores the complicated relationship between capital and the arts and culture by focusing on three interrelated aspects: first, the peculiarities and social class positions of businessmen and their family members, their cultural preferences and interests in art, foundations as institutional forms and manifestations of their cultural interests. Not only the relationship that the foundations have with the founders is given importance, but also the roles of foundations in the making cultural institutions, forming an art market, development of cultural industries are explored.

The founding of private initiatives in the art and the institutionalization of cultural and artistic activities better understood with reference to the developments in the business environment. The influence of key figures, the founders and first generation executives of big businesses in Turkey, play crucial roles in taking first initiatives that set the rules and ways of institutionalization for further initiatives in the arts and culture. Consecutively, this section tracks the origin of ideas, conceptions with regard to the development of “philanthropic activities” undertaken by Koç, Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı Holding Companies by focusing on the autobiographies written by Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and Şakir Eczacıbaşı and key developments in their institutionalization in the form of foundations. Vehbi Koç, among other Turkish businessmen, can be considered as a pioneer in terms of his role in constituting the legal and institutional framework of the commercial as well as social activities that are carried by Turkish businessmen in Turkey. Vehbi Koç was born in 1901 (Koç 1973), Ankara and wrote two autobiographies: *Hayat Hikayem* (My Life Story) in 1973 and *Hatıralarım, Görüşlerim, Öğütlerim* (My Memories, Visions and Advice) in 1987. The first autobiography written in early 1970s not only precedes the autobiographies of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı *Kuşaktan Kuşağa* (From Generation to Generation) written in 1982 and Sakıp Sabancı *İşte Hayatım* (This is My Life) written in 1985, but also

constitutes the very first example of an autobiography of a businessman written with the aim of transmitting his own life stories and business experience as a case of “success” to future generations.

Below I present some initiatives as well as conceptions of Vehbi Koç which I consider critical in the further establishments in Turkey through its influence on other key figures that are active agents in the formation of the field. Then I outline some of the major claims undertaken by Sakıp Sabancı and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. In the last part of this section I will elaborate on the interaction among these key figures and trace the main ways of their networking and their ways of establishing a status group. The descriptions and phrases used by these key actors related to the formation of initial private institutions in the arts are regarded as both the reflection of the social change, the change in the mindset and the factors that create a change in the social life. Main purpose is to elaborate on the initial years of the respective foundations and their establishment histories and founders, yet, at some points such as the connected institutions’ (museums) emergence, following up the second generation family members’ linkages, or to clarify main peculiarities of the foundations that are under examination here. Eventhough, I deliberately emphasize certain issues related with the establishment of museums here, I will refer them and explain in detail in Chapter 8, which is dedicated to the emergence of private foundation museums, focusing on three distinct cases.

The wide scope of activities carried on by the various foundations initiated by these actors are important in relation to the development of civil society in Turkey, especially activities in the fields of education, health and should not be underestimated. Yet my concentration is on the peculiarities of the activities carried on in the fields of arts and culture. Consecutively, the scope of activities taken forward by the Koç Foundation, Sabancı Foundation and İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts are studied in the following section, by referring to the subsequent representatives of the institutions in the aftermath of the loss of these key actors and to the activities carried on in the last two decades. Nevertheless, the interaction among these actors as well as the institutions founded and later administered by these actors should not be overlooked.

The foundations that I focus are Vehbi Koç Foundation (VKV), Sabancı Foundation (SF), Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation and İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (İKSİV). These foundations, except the İKSİV not necessarily established for the sake of endowment to culture and arts. Yet, they share the common characteristic of being initiated by individual actors that had found large family conglomerates in Turkey. The section discusses the peculiarities related to their establishment (founders, the relationship between the founders and the state, inspirations) meanings and values attributed to these institutions by their founders and the society by the time they emerged. Furthermore, the foundations that I consider here are, relevant to the establishment of initial foundation museums in Turkey, as well as closely associated with the establishment, functioning, administration and funding of the cases (Sabancı Museum, Pera Museum, İstanbul Modern Museum) of this thesis in various ways.

These institutions have been the primary examples of setting the framework, both with regard to the establishment of the legal infrastructure necessary for their functioning and the organizational structure for the subsequent cultural institutions established by private capital. Furthermore, they paved the way through the involvement of non-state actors in the field of arts through the organization of cultural and artistic events and incorporating corporate sponsorship to their funding structure which facilitated the private capital to intervene in the funding of arts and culture, as external actors.

Foundations are the most important institutional formations that characterized the civil society work in Turkey. For the purposes of this thesis, they constitute the important institutional actors that functioned in three important ways: (1) establishing the social network of upper class business actors and contribute to the flourishing of a social status group, (2) institutionalize philanthropy and endowment of business actors that have given way to emergence of new actors in the field, (3) constitute the main institutional bodies in which the financial support of arts as well as the private art museums have been emerged and administered. Overall, these three ways contribute to the production and reproduction of social classes and social hierarchies, through the glorification and underlining of the

individual actors by their “socially benefitting” practices rather than economic interests. In this respect I recall Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic capital as a source of symbolic power that is required for legitimization of social positions of individuals and groups.

The major guiding concept in my focus of analysis is Bourdieu’s (1977 and 1990) concept of *habitus*. “Habitus results from early socialization experiences in which external structures are internalized. As a result, internalized dispositions of broad parameters and boundaries of what is possible or unlikely for a particular group in a stratified social world develop through socialization. Thus, on the one hand, habitus sets structural limits for action. On the other hand, habitus generates perceptions, aspirations, and practices that correspond to the structuring properties of earlier socialization” (Swartz, p.103). As discussed by Bourdieu (1977, p.77-95) in the *Outline of a Theory of Practice* and nicely summarized by Swartz (1997, p.103): “Aspirations and practices of individuals and groups tend to correspond to the formative conditions of their respective habitus. What agents judge as “reasonable” or “unreasonable” for people, of their station in the social world stems from habitus. Habitus tends to reproduce those actions, perceptions, and attitudes consistent with the conditions under which it was produced. It is “necessity made into virtue” ”.

7.1. Vehbi Koç-“The Father” of Private Sector

Vehbi Koç was born in 1901 and he was the founder of the Koç Holding Company and often represented with his self-disciplined, programmed and distant personality (Kıraç 1995) and with his life experience which spans over ninety years that witnessed both the last decades of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey. His life and the development of his business experience, overlaps with the history of modern Turkey. He was not an educated man, rather considered as a “self-made” man and regarded as a perfect example which reflects the making of new businessmen under the conditions of Republican Turkey (Buğra 1994, p.76-

77) with reference to his business life that started as a son of a grocery shop in Ankara and turned into one of the prominent figure in the Turkish capital by receiving the advantages of the Ankara as a growing capital of modern Turkey and opportunities provided by respective government projects. While his business activities include involvement as a contractor in government projects, importing and distributing oil, gas and motor vehicles during the course of 1920s, during the World War II, he began importing trucks for the government at a high commission percentage, and in the aftermath of the War, he undertook projects within the framework of Marshall Plan which was regarded as a turning point in his business life (ibid). Although he was politically affiliated to Republican People's Party during the early years of the Republic, in 1950s he resigned the party with the enforcement of the governing Democrat Party. During the time, Otosan factory was established to serve for the assembly production of Ford vehicles. Although the company remained mostly based on commercial activities rather than industrial ones until the 1950s, by the time since foreign exchange shortages were severe, the company was directed to industrial ventures. By 1960's his business was expanded with diversification in the business activities in many sectors. One crucial organizational change that Koç enterprises have faced was the formation of a holding company in 1963 with respect to the need of organizational restructuring with the growing number of educated family members assumed for managerial positions in the company, in addition to the difficulty that was faced with the expanding scope of activities (Buğra 1994, p.77-82). Buğra (1994, p.82) argues that in addition to the diversification of activities, acquisition of real estate is also an important characteristics of entrepreneurship in Turkey, which underlines the reason and rationale behind; the call for financial security and flexibility under the uncertain conditions.

One other important characteristic that the Koç Holding holds from the founding years, has been its affiliations with the foreign companies. During the early years of the company, this was reflected with company's receiving the representative rights of foreign companies in Turkey. While Ford and Standard Oil constitute the first two crucial examples in the company's history in this line, joint venture

established by General Electric Company in 1948 to build a light bulb factory in Turkey, which started production in 1952, can be counted as another important example. International business activities have appear to remained as important aspect of the company since then; now the company has foreign partners in different sectors from countries including Italy, USA, South Korea, Great Britain, Poland. The company has an international network of 24 countries either by group companies or representative offices, including Australia, Germany, Egypt, Spain, France, Italy, Slovakia, China, France, Russia, Ukraine, South Africa, Austria, United Kingdom, Singapore, Romania, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Czech Republic, Iraq, Algeria, Netherlands and Poland. Now, the Koç Group Company, define itself as “The Largest Investment Holding Company in Turkey”, and promote itself with its reputation in the Fortune 500, as being the “only Turkish Company” in the respective list, has 70 companies dispersed in energy, automotive, consumer durables, finance as the major areas of activity and having established companies in construction, tourism, food, information technologies, defense technologies, advisory, retail, air transport and services, marketing and logistic sectors (Koç Holding Activity Fields, n.d.).

Alongside his economic personality which was clearly crucial for the establishment of one of the largest conglomerates in Turkey, the engagement of Vehbi Koç in social affairs as well as the initiatives that were taken in his life time worth considering for tracing back to the company’s investments in arts and culture.

Vehbi Koç was a middle school dropout who started business at an early age, first by assisting his father in his small enterprise in the 1910s, (Koç, 1974) later in 1920s after having his first encounters with the merchants and businesses in İstanbul and his arranged marriage in 1926 with his cousin Sadberk Hanım, he took over his father’s business²⁴ in 1926, and registered the firm after his name as *Koçzade Ahmet Vehbi* (ibid, p.9-40). He had become an ‘industrialist’ during the

²⁴ A small grocery store.

course of his business life which was marked by the establishment of his first enterprise as a trading company later transformed into an incorporated company in 1938 and had become the first holding company of Turkey in 1963. The holding company have been associated with the undertakings such as representating companies of Ford Standard Oil, contracting, establishing a light-bulb company with partnership of General Electric in 1952, and heading to manufacture and industry in 1950s. My main concern here, is not the growing of his business or his ‘success’ that has been awarded by various institutions since the 1960s²⁵, rather I am concerned here with his way of thinking, conceptualization of social activities and some undertakings such as the establishment of Turkish Education Foundation (TEV) in 1967 and Vehbi Koç Foundation in 1969 and Sadberk Hanım Museum in 1980 as described the first “family museum” by Vehbi Koç himself, which I argue, even though not directly address the conceptualization of art and culture, mark the important characteristics of how and through which ways the private initiatives are taken and turn into institutions.

The review of Vehbi Koç’s life history illustrates the case of an economic capital accumulation, reveals the importance of his early socialization in his perceptions, aspirations and practices and accumulation of social and cultural capital through his lifetime. Furthermore, one of the guiding main aims of this task undertaken here is to figure out the ways in which the actors, Vehbi Koç in the first instance here, in concern produce and reproduce their social positions and constitute a field through the struggle over the appropriation of economic as well as cultural, social and symbolic capital.

In fact, the question of transmitting personal experiences bothered Vehbi Koç, in addition to the questions of how to protect his own acquisitions in the future and how to find the best way to preserve the enterprise for future generations in the aftermath of his death. Two important solutions and remarks appear as crucial in

²⁵ For the list of awards he was given see Koç (1987) *Hatıralarım Görüşlerim Öğütlerim*. Including the Award of ICC as the businessmen of the year.

Koç's lifetime: the first one is *müessesleşmek* (institutionalization) and the second one is professionalization. In addition to his influence in this respect, two important initiatives by him are crucial: (1) forming the first holding company in Turkey by developing an organizational model for Turkish system, (2) proposing and adopting the *vakıf* (foundation) as an institutional and organizational model in support of holding company organizational model. In this respect, his personal commitments to the preparation of a foundation law in the 1960s to realize this model are vastly influential in characterizing the form of institutionalization in Turkish business besides the future formation of holding company supported institutions in the fields of culture and arts.

The prevalent themes appear as mostly as “aims” and “visions” in Vehbi Koç's autobiographies. These prevailing themes form the basis of his thinking and presented to be the underlying intentions in his business and social practices. The concepts of *müessesleşme* (institutionalization), *profesyonelleşme* (professionalization) and devamlılık (permanence) are particularly important and have attributed positive connotations throughout the both autobiographies written by Vehbi Koç and assigned with the value of success if maintained and a power of legitimization to the both economic and social activities carried on. Main themes that appear in Vehbi Koç's narrative are: the importance of institutionalization, ensuring prevalence in business, emphasis of the unity of the family and its importance in realizing the mentioned aims, the importance of the professional administrative body, the importance of well-educated and qualified staff in business in particular and in society's development in general. Furthermore, the existence of private sector has been advocated in various ways in his autobiographies by gaining its legitimacy through the emphasis on the criterias mentioned above, namely, institutionalization, professionalization, education and unity of family, besides the emphasis on the roles associated with the private sector. One of these crucial roles attributed to the private sector is the provision of democracy. He states that he believes in the following statement (Koç 1987, p.80) as: “If there is private sector in a country, there is democracy in that country”. What is more important than this emphasis in his narrative, he asserts a significant

role to himself in the sustaining of both the private sector and democracy, which are considered as given rights due to his commitments and life time achievements and experiences, through which, he builds a legitimate stance to give advice. Besides, this grants him the power among the community of businessmen to guide and setting the rules of the community as well as reveals the changing perception of the self-image of businessman towards the guiding and encouraging successor (ibid):

Private sector was born and has grown during the course of my working life and it has gained its identity today. I consider her as my own child. This assigns me some rights. I transmit my experiences to the young people in every occasion, for avoiding repetition of mistakes and for evermore internalization of the role of strengthening economy. Therefore, I am aware that I act a bit preachingly. Nonetheless, I am writing my book with such an aim.

The clear identification of Vehbi Koç with the private sector is crucial in the sense that it shapes the discourse about the economic development while emphasizing the growing of private sector as the essential condition. Most importantly however, the identification ascribes him a power in the field as well as marking his dominant social position in the field of economic production as well as his dominant class position in Turkish society.

7.1.1. Philanthropy as Symbolic Power

Vehbi Koç's position in the private sector was justified by him through mentioning his industrial achievements as well as his definition of himself as a "citizen that has done his duty towards his country"²⁶ which is associated by him as the legitimate stance for the right to live "peacefully" (p.80). His narrative is important in constructing the discourse for the philanthropic activities of the dominant class actors. The way he conceives of himself as a citizen who has done his duty and taken his responsibility for the favor of his country, illustrated the way a businessman legitimize his wealth, as well as secures it in a context where he still finds himself to defend his fortune. The reliance on the claim of "serving the

²⁶ "Memleketine karşı görevini iyi yapmış bir vatandaş"

country” is prevalent in Koç’s narrative. This claim illustrates a way of justification as far as the activities and practices have been separated from material interests. Furthermore, the narrative framed by ‘serving the country’ serves a ground for justifying wealth. This justification is also instrumentalised in the sphere of philanthropy. Vehbi Koç’s narrative illustrates this. I will discuss his perceptions on philanthropy and foundations in the next section presenting the major issues regarding the formation of foundations as organizational forms.

Some examples of philanthropic activities appear in Vehbi Koç’s writings are building dormitories for university students, providing scholarships for domestic education through the initiatives of Turkish Education Foundation, donating the technical devices to the hospitals or founding centers that focus on deadly diseases. These activities are classified by Koç, as non-material or non-economic activities in both of his autobiographies. In his first autobiography (Koç, 1973) social activities were given a place in the third chapter *Sosyal Hizmetlerim ve Bağışlarım* (My Social Services and Donations) of the book right after the second chapter titled as *Endüstriye Girişimiz* (Our Entry to the Industry) and just before the fourth chapter titled as *Politika Hayatım ve İşlerime Etkisi* (My Political Life and Impacts on My Business) allocated to his political engagements. In the second autobiography written in 1987, he focused on the institution of foundation in a separate section titled as *Vakıf Kurmayı Memlekete Borç Ödeme Yolu Bilirim* (I consider establishing foundations as a way of paying my debt to country) and conceptualize the foundations as a way of “paying one’s debt to country” exemplified in Turkish Education Foundation in the next section- *Türk Eğitim Vakfı’nın Hikayesi* (The Story of Turkish Education Foundation).

In his first autobiography published in 1973 (p.115-126) the respective activities were presented under the framing question of “Hayır İşlerine Nasıl Başladım” (How I started charity work?). Following section (p.127-130) titled as “Sosyal Hizmet ve Bağışlarda Kurumlaşma-Vehbi Koç Vakfı” (The Institutionalization in Social Service and Donations) presents the institutionalization of the charity activities as in the form of foundations and the attempts of constituting the legal

and political framework. The major reasons and influences behind the institutionalization of his charity work are presented by Vehbi Koç as follows:

After I had started working and had gained some money, I started to take pleasure by helping the ones in need, in my neighbourhood, in the downtown, and among the public (...) Years have passed. I believed that it was time for businessmen to start doing charity work as a social service and in a systematized way. And, providing some examples in this work, I wanted to be pioneer (Koç 1974, p.115).

Each morning when I wake up and each night, when I go to bed, I thank for the health and other blessings that God has given me, and I pray. And in each prayer, I wish forgiveness for my relatives, friends, and Muslim brothers. When I pass from cemeteries, I send my prayers to those rests in there. It is my habit to pray when I dine and finished eating. I sacrifice. I have already fulfilled my duty of pilgrimage since I have the suitable well-being and power. All these have enriched my spiritual world and have opened the way through helping others and using my opportunities for the good of the society (Koç 1987, p.138).

In the first quotation from mid 1970s, Koç starts out by personal gratification as a reason behind his practices in charity and ends with a proposal addressing ‘businessmen’ for forming a systematic way of charity giving, that reconceptualize it as a ‘social service’. This conceptualization not only gave way to the institutionalization in the organizational form of foundations, but also has characterized the ground for justifications of private sector’s philanthropic initiatives in the sphere of education, health, arts and culture driven by non-material interests. Furthermore, the quotation also illustrates the need of symbolic capital flourishing among businessmen to attain symbolic power. In this case, the accumulation of economic capital precedes the search for strategies and symbolic ways of providing social distinction from inferior social classes.

The second quotation also provides legitimization yet also articulates religious motives with the symbolic activities and practices which provide the ground for ‘misrecognition’ as it deflects attention from the interested character of practices and makes them conceal the fact that they have been originated in material forms of capital.

I argue that foundations are not only for ‘collective social good’ as claimed them to be, rather the idea of ‘foundation’ as an organizational form originated in

association with the material interests of Koç which was directed to sustain beneficiary conditions for the prevalence of his, his families and companies' economic profits, the efforts to adopt the organizational models encountered through international business and personal affairs in a mimetic fashion. For example, the shared ground for the origination of the idea of a holding company and foundation is explicit in the establishment of Vehbi Koç Foundation:

For my accomplishments in life, I owe God, my country, my respected colleagues' cooperation and the love I feel towards working. As the Koç Group companies have been developed, two aims had matured in my mind. One of them was to reorganize our companies, which have been the outcome of various efforts in the direction of facilitating prevalence and efficiency. Regarding this aim, we have established our holding company. And my second aim was to institutionalize our social services and donations and in the way to make them prevalent, after I have gone. And this second aim of mine came true when I established Vehbi Koç Foundation (Koç, p.127).

The second example illustrates the emergence of motives behind establishing foundations which have shaped by the interactions with the organizations in the sphere of philanthropy appearing in the European countries and United States of America:

I have already told that I did my first journey to Europe in 1931 and in 1946 to America. In both of my first trips, I have understood that if someone is determined, and wants to learn, he/she can learn a lot. The shops, libraries, hospitals, the supports that have been given to charity work and the efforts lots of people made to carry on their names had drawn my attention. Two things impressed me when I first went America. The first one was the dormitories of the Columbia University, and the other one was the John Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore. When you enter the hospital building, you see two plates; one on the right and the other one on the left. On these plates it is written that the hospital belongs to a foundation of a businessman named John Hopkins. In America, most of the universities and hospitals are foundations (Koç 1974, p.115).

Elsewhere Vehbi Koç (1974, p.127) emphasizes his encounter with the Ford Foundation, which was established by the founder of Ford company, Henry Ford and contextualizes Ford company as a business affiliate of him since 1928. Ford, appeared as both a business contact and a source of inspiration and as well as the crucial driving force behind the first steps taken forward by Koç to form the foundation. In addition to his justification for establishing foundations in Turkey provided by referring to 'America' and 'Europe', Vehbi Koç, in search for "roots" of this idea, finds the documents that serve as an evidence for his father's and

grandfather's connection with the former foundation established in Ankara (ibid). This linkage also serves for claiming that the charity giving had long existed in his family. Moreover, the recognition of coming from a rooted, noble family here comes to stand as another reason in the formulation of foundation as a legitimate institution. Koç (1987, p.139) presents how he found out that he comes from a noble family with a history of 235 years from his father's side and 600 years from his mother's that even extends to Hacı Bayram-ı Veli, by referring to the research and documentation and of his family roots by retired ambassador Fuat Bayramoğlu as a reason behind his motive to make his family's name subsistent through the assurance of a foundation. Additionally, based on his observation that suggests the companies in Turkey had disappeared in the aftermath of the death of their founders, Koç embraced the aim of rendering prevalence of his company vis-à-vis his family, as well as sustaining the mechanisms that support the existence of private sector.

Having been influenced from the Ford's organizational model, Vehbi Koç's inquiry for the origins of foundations in his family and in the past demonstrates a search for justification. Although the historical roots of the vakıf in the Ottoman Empire was recognized by Koç, he knew that it was not as "institutional" as he intended to be. It was not found systematical enough to adopt by him and necessitates further work and consideration to fit into the model of holding company. He pursued his interests while recognizing the absence of such a legal and institutional infrastructure in Turkey, which led him to work for the building of the infrastructure before establishing the foundation therefore works in this respect. His personal social network and relationship with the state authorities as well as his professional acquaintances (social capital) serve well during the course of constituting such an infrastructure.

7.1.1.1. Constitution of the Legal Infrastructure

The efforts given by Vehbi Koç to form the legal and political conditions necessary for forming foundations is crucial to illustrate, state-businessmen relations, the importance of bureaucracy in the private-sector driven

institutionalization and point to the role of the state in the formation and functioning of emerging institutions and strategies developed by the private sector to negotiate for the implementation of required policies.

During the course of the development of the idea of a holding company as a new organizational form, influenced by Ford company example in United States which was founded as a family enterprise and then had an organizational restructuring, Vehbi Koç (1974, p.100-101) consults experts, representatives and administrative of big businesses from Europe and United States, to keep with the main aim of developing the companies as incorporated companies and gathering them under the umbrella of holding company. In this formulation, foundation serves for the purpose of maintaining the power of the family in the administration, which holds the majority of the shares of the holding company: “In order to balance the family’s majority of shares in the Holding, giving a share to a foundation that is going to be established and assigning a more powerful position to its share would support the aim of prevalence” (p.101). Despite the presented aims based on “serving the country”, providing social services and collective social good, the concealed aim is to maintain the power and the dominant position of the family. Given that, Vehbi Koç’s efforts to constitute the legal infrastructure will not be surprising.

There were two domestic obstacles faced by Koç (1974, p.101) and stated as follows: “For the appliance of this good idea, there were two obstacles. One was the ruling of Corporate Income Tax Law of the time, which stated that both of the companies were supposed to pay tax even one of the companies is a shareholder of the other. The other one was the unclear and insufficient provisions of the Civil Code on establishment of foundations –or “institution” [tesis] used in the meaning of foundations at the time”. While the first obstacle removed with the enactment of law number 192 in 1961 which changed the institutional tax law for the benefit of private institutions (ibid) and consecutively in line with the interest of Koç, the removal of the obstacle regarding the foundations took longer. In the later case, it is seen that Koç’s style of accomplishing an intended task developed in relation to the state and key political figures. The main strategy developed has been, waiting

for the maturation of the context and political and legal conditions that work in favor of the maintenance of economic capital and power unified in a family, before the intended action. The underlying economic interest should not be overlooked in this process.

Having been confronted with the thousands of occasions and possibilities of the world besides allocating important part of my property to the Foundation, I have considered it as a father's duty to make my family benefit partly from this formation in the future. But it surprised us that even with the philanthropic work, the family foundations were not subject to negotiation with respect to Civil Code's rigid conviction (ibid).

Vehbi Koç, referring to his speech on the day of signing the main contract of Vehbi Koç Foundation, witnessed by Hulki Alisbah and Aydın Bolak and his family members, on 17 January 1969, provides detailed narrative of his enduring encounters with the state representatives and authorities during the course of preparation of a law in the Civil Code that provides opportunity for utilization of the intended foundation for the benefit of Koç family that has taken about 18 years (p.127-129). The crucial thing here, has been the social acquaintances that had been utilized during the course and his economic power that pushed the limits of the implementation of such a law. Forming a committee consist of experts to consult the legal status of the foundation, having encounters with the commission consist of professors and members of Supreme Court, that worked for the changing of the Civil Code in the Ministry of Justice in the 1950s, approaching Prime Minister Adnan Menderes in 1950s for number of times, having encounters with the two Ministers of Justice, being in touch with Finance Minister Mr. Ferit Melen in the aftermath of 1960 military coup that resulted nothing concrete but the correspondences were represented as enduring encounters regarding the issue of establishing a foundation (p.128-129). However, the preparation of a bill by Aydın Bolak, to change the Civil Code, had given way to the developments that resulted in the appropriation of the term "vakıf" instead of "tesis" but what was more important than that the law was passed from Senate in July, 1967 (p.129):

As the process confirms, even the economic capital and social capital accumulated in the key actors plays an important role in facilitating a process of social change through the establishment of a necessary legal framework and negotiating the

bureaucracy in this respect. State has been a crucial agency in the actualization of the intended aims especially during the phase of formation. In due course, even though there is certain economic and social power of the businessmen to initiate institutional change, this has been limited and weakened by the late functioning bureaucracy and governments' uncertain responses.

Meanwhile, the efforts of Vehbi Koç in determining the organizational form of the intended foundation exemplify how economic capital and social capital in the form of social networks, converted as sources of motivations and strategies for legitimization for the institutionalization of symbolic practices of philanthropy. Vehbi Koç's social network was at service in providing expertise for the intended for the actualization of his aims:

We have continued our work on developing Foundation's Official Act. We presented it to be examined by a scientific and juridical committee consists of Cevat Fehmi Başkut, Aydın Bolak, Prof. Tahir Çağa, Prof. Nurettin Çuhadar, Ahmed Dallı, Ord. Prof. Ekrem Şerif Egeli, Ord. Prof. Sıddık Sami Onar, Kemal Türkoğlu, Prof. Süheyl Ünver, Bülent Yazıcı. Taking this committee's opinions into consideration we have renewed most of the convictions of the Official Act. We have examined foundations in Europe and America such as Ford, Philips, Thyssen, Rockefeller we have made an effort to evaluate them in our meetings among us (Koç 1974, p.129).

7.1.1.2. Initial Activities of the Vehbi Koç Foundation

Vehbi Koç prioritizes education and health as two important fields to locate his social activity as the first areas dating back to 1950s. For instance one of his very first initiatives is to establish a student dorm for Ankara University in 1950 (Koç 1974, p.116). This example not only reflects the effect of American influence on him, by choosing a university student dorm over building a mosque in Ankara²⁷ (p.115-116) but also underlines the importance of legal framework and the relationship with the political power in the making of intended institution models in Turkey. Although the construction of the dormitory, developed based on the idea of the Rockefeller Student Dorm in New York City, completed in 1950 to deliver to the Ankara University, according to the law enacted in 1949 that accepts

²⁷ Koç (1974, p.115-116) explains how he gave the decision on dormitory rather than mosque.

the unification of whole universities under the body of Ministry of Education, an obstacle appeared for Vehbi Koç to donate the dorm to the administration of University (p.116). While he insisted in donating the dorm to the management of the University to avoid the political peculiarity of the Ministry, in 1950, Democrat Party won the elections and Adnan Menderes became the Prime Minister of the country, who then accepted the request of Vehbi Koç and in 1951 a new law was enacted that provided the required basis for the administration of granted or bequeathed dormitories by the Universities (p.117). Furthermore, in due course Vehbi Koç met Celal Bayar, the then President of Turkey in an occasion and requested from him to open the dormitory which was rejected by Bayar due to the controversial political stance and position of Koç at the time (p.117).

The reason why I am pointing this example case is to demonstrate how members of the economically powerful families such as Koç, Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı have encounters with the political authorities and state institutions during the course of actualizing their social initiatives, which I will be elaborating on the examples encountered in the case of private arts museums in Chapter 7. Similar encounters are observed in the cases of private art museums, which have both negative and positive effects, from the perspective of the actors, varying from museums' founding to the promotion through their activities and ceremonies, as well as in cases such as the establishing of international partnerships.

7.1.2. Vehbi Koç's Sadberk Hanım Museum

In the 1980s, one new form of institutionalization appears on the scene: the family museum with the case of the museum dedicated to the Sadberk Hanım-Vehbi Koç's wife- in the aftermath of her loss. I focus on the respective museum to explore the major conceptions, legitimization strategies, actors and issues related with its formation and administration. I conceive Sadberk Hanım Museum as an important example not only because it is the pioneering private museum that set the organizational form flourished in connection with the foundation but also the narratives build around its formation and the actors involved in the process of its formation and administration (Vehbi Koç and Sevgi Gönül in particular, state

through the agency of Ministry of Culture) demonstrate the origins of the prevailing major issues regarding the private museums in Turkey.

The recognition of family and family members constitute an important part in Vehbi Koç's narrative. This is important in many ways and can be analyzed in many aspects such as the accumulation of cultural capital through the second and third generation's educational acquisitions in well-reputed institutions, as a social unit which provides a legitimate basis for many of Koç's establishments as argued above, and last but not least, the family members constitute an important framework for analyzing the relationship between Koç Family and the fields of culture and arts. Considering the aim of this thesis, I focus primarily on the Sadberk Hanım Museum and its establishment and explore the underlying mechanisms of its establishment and how it is legitimized as an example of first family museum of a wealthy family in Turkey and secondly, the role of women members of the family as actors associated with the arts. I argue that, the themes that raise in this exploration constitute a base for framing the analysis regarding Pera Museum in particular, which was established by Vehbi Koç's daughter Suna Kıraç and his husband İnan Kıraç through the institutional basis of Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation and moreover serve as a basis for the purpose of exploring the place and significance of women and their association with culture and arts, which points at a gendered division of labor, which I argue is also crucial for understanding other cases as Sabancı Museum and İstanbul Museum of Modern Arts, which I will evaluate later.

Vehbi Koç and Koç's aunt's daughter Sadberk Hanım were married in 1926 (Koç 1974, p.39). Sadberk Hanım, referred as "Bayan Koç" (Ms. Koç) by Vehbi Koç, was represented by him as an important figure not only in the making of his family as a supporting element in his business life as well as a sacrificing mother for the raising of their children throughout their 47 years of marriage until her death. They had one son and three daughters who were born in Ankara and studied at Robert

College²⁸ (Koç 1987, p.4) and undertaken responsibilities within the Koç Group Companies in different positions starting from their adulthood. The representation of his wife Sadberk Hanım, the children and grandsons Mustafa Koç, Ali Koç, Ömer Koç carry importance with regard to the significance of generation differences in terms of acquiring education, where second and third generations had the opportunity to have access to reputable higher education institutions in United Kingdom and USA (Koç 1987, p.4-7). Moreover, it pinpoints the dispersion of field of interest among the family members with respect to their gender. While Rahmi M. Koç (born in 1930) raised to be affiliated with the business activities after his education in United States at John Hopkins University and took over the Chairman position of his father in 1984 (ibid, p.5) daughters Semahat Arsel (born in 1928), Sevgi Gönül (born in 1938) and Suna Kırar (born in 1941) were much more represented with their roles in maintaining the family union, supporting the father in the aftermath of the loss of the mother (like in the case of Semahat Arsel), interest in relics and arts (the case of Sevgi Gönül) and with reference to their husbands, Nusret Arsel, Erdoğan Gönül and İnan Kırar respectively, whom had worked for the Koç Group Companies, despite daughters's affiliation with the companies through managerial positions (ibid).

The representation of Sadberk Hanım-Sadberk Koç-as a wife and a mother, and her remembrance, whose name was given to the Sadberk Hanım Museum established in 1980, under the institutional umbrella of Vehbi Koç Foundation serves as a rationale behind such a formation in Vehbi Koç's (1987,p. 4) narrative as well as museum's own presentation of its history. Compared to this thesis' cases it's concentration is not limited with fine arts, rather it is a museum dedicated to Sadberk Koç and her own collection. It is interesting that it is the first private museum that was formed with the institutional body that unites the foundation as the financially connected legal institutional structure and the private museum as

²⁸ Robert College is a private American school in Turkey with a long list of notable alumni. The school was founded by an American philanthropist, Christopher Robert in 1863 in İstanbul and the school is known for its high reputation.

the domain of exhibition and activities. It is not only crucial to discuss its institutional stance since it has been imitated or adopted by other capital groups in Turkey, but also to track the changing legitimizing strategies and mechanisms behind the private museums. Furthermore, the experiences of Sevgi Gönül, daughter and a collector, who directed the Sadberk Hanım Museum from its establishment to until her death in 2003, contribute to the understanding of the functioning of Turkey's contemporary private museums.

First, I should note Vehbi Koç's perception on the Sadberk Hanım museum. He states that the museum was a result of the retaining his wife Sadberk Koç's memories and collections and realizing her will which was not to be forgotten

Her one and the only desire was the exhibition of her collection of Ottoman embroideries and silvers with Sultans' seals in a museum that was dedicated to her name. I could only meet her desire in the aftermath of her death. I think her soul is in peace now since her desire was realized (Koç 1987, p.4).

One day she told me this: "I don't want to be forgotten. I want the historical artefacts that I have collected and gathered with great effort throughout my life to be exhibited to the the public in a museum dedicated to my name. Help me with this (Koç 1987, P.163).

The Sadberk Hanım Museum, reappeared in Koç's narrative as one of the instances to his guiding question "What I have done throughout my life that has given me life-long reputation and a guidance?" (1987, p.95) and he states among other fifteen items that he found worth mentioning which are, leading the establishment of industry in Turkey; formation of incorporated company and holding company; importance given to organization; encouraging economic institutions in declaring their tax payments; his contributions in giving the primary examples of Foundations as in the case of Turkish Education Foundation (TEV), Vehbi Koç Foundation (VKV), Turkish Family Health and Planning Foundation (TAPV); establishing and encouraging institutions to support secure working conditions for employees; institutionalizing social help and social activities as exemplified in the case of student dorms; publications of newspapers and magazines within the organizations, demonstrating that foreign partnerships work beneficiary for both partners; founding leading export companies that believed to

facilitate the expansion of economy to foreign markets; the provision of the enactment of a law for Union of Chambers; writing an autobiography to transmit his own experiences to others; providing opportunities for his daughters as well as his sons for working in the business and making them as the leading examples; choosing new areas of activities in his old age to be beneficial to the country. While he self-evaluated himself, within the framework of above mentioned guiding question and under the title of “If the Businessman is idealist then the country gains” (İşadamı idealist olursa memleket çok kazanır) Sadberk Hanım Museum appeared as the first example of a private “family museum” that is presented as an institution open to public:

I have established the first family museum. I have lead the way through the moving of private collection of Turkish cultural and artistic works and various civilizations’ artefacts from family vitrines to the private museums open for public. Meanwhile, I provided them to be benefitted by everyone (Koç 1987, p.96).

The above quotation well illustrates how Vehbi Koç conceives the museum, how he clearly associates it with the family and how he positions himself in the process. Koç’s emphasis of his role as a “leader” in the process of founding of private museums provides a ground for possession. Additionally his remark on the opening of collection to the public provides him a discursive ground that associates him with the principle aims of museums in providing public exhibitionary spaces. Addressing himself, as the leader, in this respect symbolically provides him a power.

Vehbi Koç, in both of his autobiographies, did not give a special attention to the arts. He just mentioned some of his friends within the artworld (Koç 1987, p.185-186) working in performing arts as well as for cinema, whom he referred as “carrying him to another world” and who provided opportunity for him to learn the public opinion and feelings much more closely. The personalities he referred appear as the artists of the popular genres rather than representatives of high-arts or visual arts. His take on arts was only appeared as an institutional contribution to the public life as in the case of Sadberk Hanım Museum and her wife and daughters’ depiction of personality whom found to be fond of arts. As seen in the

above quote, the primary focus was on the institution-the private family museum-as a manifest of his reputation and consideration as a leading figure, rather than the patronage on arts.

The location of the museum was decided in the late 1970s by the Koç Family and one of the estates of Vehbi Koç, located in Sarıyer, İstanbul named as the *Azeryan Yalısı*²⁹ was chosen to be the museum space. The building was renovated and opened as the Sadberk Hanım Museum on October 14, 1980 by the then Minister of Culture Cihat Baban (Koç 1987, p.163-164). This case is important to demonstrate how the real estate investments turn into cultural investments.

The museum collection, was not centered around a theme, a specific genre of art, or a specific period in history, rather it was scattered around silver objects, jewelry, ornaments, objects from 16-18th century Turkish handiwork, İznik tiles and pottery, Turkish traditional garments, objects from different historical periods and different civilizations including bronze age, Hittite, Frig, Greek, Hellenistic, Roma, Seljuk, Byzantium and Ottoman (Koç 1987, p.164). It is seen that the museum was recognized as an exhibitionary place for the family. Sadberk Hanım Museum, underlines the significance of the Koç Family, and serves as an extension to the economic acquisitions, which's role is to publicize the power of being prevalent. At least, I should note that, during the 1980s, when the autobiography of Vehbi Koç was written, the mindset behind such an undertaking was not primarily on the emphasis on artistic taste, which was believed to be superior to the subsequent classes, rather it was the possessions that need to be showed off and kept on. Repeatedly, Vehbi Koç underlines his wife's will to be remembered and narrates the story behind the founding of the museum via profound obedience of the rest of the family members and declares his

²⁹ Azaryan Yalısı was built in the early 1900s by Merchant Bedros Azaryan and bought by Vehbi Koç in 1950 and was used as a summer house by the family until 1978. It was renovated and restored with reference to a Project by Sedat Hakkı Eldem. For more information: Tas-İstanbul Azaryan Yalısı.

contentment with actualizing the will in concern. Although the main interest behind such an establishment was manifested as the intention of keeping the family name persistent, through remembrance of the initial collector Sadberk Hanım, and providing an opportunity for the rest of the community to enjoy what had been owned, the implicit interest was the symbolic capital acquired through this manifestation, which actually is the source of power.

The emphasis on the Koç family is clear in Vehbi Koç's narrative. Additionally the representations build around the establishment of the museum reproduce the relationship that was established between the power of the family and the museum. In addition to restatement of the museum as the "first private museum" of Turkey and "the first museum that was established by a family" in 1980 (Milliyet Newspaper, 15.10.1980 and Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 14.10.1980) reference to the economic value and the cost of the museum intensify the Koç Family as the major provider. The narrative combines and equates the material wealth with the Family name and objectifies this combination in the museum. In this respect, for the first time, a museum was associated with a family in Turkey, through an emphasis on the monetary value of founding and sustaining an institution, which in turn pinpoints to the underlying power of a social group, a non-state actor.

It is stated that 25 million lira was spent for the restoration of the museum and the value of the exhibited collection is way beyond the money spent. Besides, Koç Family has generated a special fund for meeting the expenses of the museum (Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 14.10.1980).

I argue that this formulation that was presented in the newspapers of 1980s, have been re-utilized for the subsequent examples such as Sabancı Museum, Pera Museum and İstanbul Modern and characterized the narrative, which stress the material values rather than the cultural value or the aesthetic value of the objects exhibited in the museum, which I will elaborate in Chapter 7.

The museum was conceived as an exhibitionary space as well as a space serving for cultural and artistic activities such as holding conferences, temporary exhibitions, concerts, commemorative ceremonies, in addition to participating international exhibitions (Koç 1987, p.164). During the formation years some

examples like commemoration of Mevlana under the framework of Şeb-i Arus ceremonies (Tercüman Newspaper, 19.12.1980) , concert of the Boğaziçi University choir (Hürriyet Newspaper, 11.07.1981), the painting exhibition dedicated to the memory of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, consist of Atatürk portraits from various artists (Tercüman Newspaper, 15.04.1981) can be seen. As it is seen in these examples, museum serves as a venue for the family to intervene in the fields of art and culture through the activities. The name of the family had been associated with the museum, which serves for a venue for İstanbul's cultural life, other than the main aim of exhibiting the collection and consecutively results in prestige and reputation which maintains the family's position in the society.

The international recognition of the museum came later in 1989, by the time it was given the 1988 the European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage "Europa Nostra" for the restoration of a building according to the norms of The International Council of Museums (ICOM) and the construction of the exhibitionary space. By the time being, the museum was recognized as a unified complex that consisted of various departments by the press:

On the ground floor of the Sadberk Hanım Museum there are a large venue for organizing cultural activities, a cafeteria for visitors to rest, an administrative office and shops. Museum is a complex consists of various divisions. For example, in the "Silver Room" number of silvers with seals, precious ewers, glasses, mirrors, porcelains, silver embroidered dowry which are the works of Turkish and foreign masters are exhibited. In the "Jewelry Room" there are items which have great material and intangible values such as watches with precious stones, snuff boxes, gold and enameled cup holders and decorative objects. And some rooms in the museum are devoted to interesting Turkish traditions. And these traditions are brought into life in unique mise en scene by mannequins and unique props and object that were used in their respective periods; such as maternity care room [lohusa odası], circumcision room [sünnet odası], coffee ceremony (Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 17.12.1989).

During the course of the development of the museum collection with new acquisitions and Sevgi Gönül, at the helm, Sadberk Hanım Museum received public attention through Sevgi Gönül's personality and personal commitments to the museum's development until the year 2003 that she passed away. Sevgi Gönül, as being one of the heirs of Koç Family, was actively engaged in the making of the museum and stated by her father as the main responsible person in the process

(Koç 1987, p.164). She was assisted and guided by museologist and librarians Sabahattin Batur and Çetin Anlağan during the formation years. Three years after its foundation, the acquisition of Hüseyin Kocabaş collection in 1983, contributed to the museum's expansion of its collection to include archeological remnants (ibid) which further expanded by acquisitions and donations. In 1988, the building beside the museum was acquired by Vehbi Koç Foundation and renovated to be the auxiliary exhibition space and dedicated to Sevgi Gönül and named as Sevgi Gönül Building (Sadberk Hanım Museum Official Website, 2014).

It is interesting to see that some pioneering initiatives taken by Sadberk Hanım Museum which were undertaken even prior to the state museums. One example can be the earthquake³⁰ risk mitigation in museums. In 2002, prevention to a possible earthquake in İstanbul was taken at the Sadberk Hanım Museum. The museum was presented as the first museum to take the precautions (Hürriyet Newspaper, 23.02.2002). Then museum director Çetin Anlağan expressed the works they had done by referring to the seminar organized by Boğaziçi University Earthquake Research Center and Ministry of Culture in 2001, in which a museum expert from United States, Jerry Podany was invited to give a speech about the damages earthquake could cause for museums and their collections (ibid). There is an interaction in terms of sharing know-how with the US institutions, which influenced the Sadberk Hanım Museum administration at the time. It is seen that, Sadberk Hanım Museum was compared to the Topkapı Palace Museum in terms of determining strategies and rapid application, and by Anlağan, being a private museum was regarded as a chance not only in terms of rapid reaction and developing precautions but also being small in terms of number of collections and size.

³⁰ In 1999 Turkey faced a severe earthquake that hit a wide region and resulted in number of deaths and material losses. İstanbul was affected from the earthquake and the risks related with a possible expected earthquake was in the public agenda following the deadly disaster that resulted in serious socio-economic consequences.

Sadberk Hanım Museum's pioneering activities were not limited with permanent exhibitions, cultural activities that were held in the museum's space, it also included the outgoing exhibitions. One example to outgoing exhibitions was the partnership with Japan museums where Sadberk Hanım Museum collection was exhibited in both 1996 and 2002 (Sadberk Hanım Museum Official Website). The mission of this exhibition was noted by the director Anlağan as "presenting the history of Anatolia in unity" by 621 items were selected by the representatives of Fukuoka City Museum, Shizuoka City Art Museum, Iwaki City Art Museum, Okazaki City Museum (Hürriyet Newspaper, 23.02.2002). International partnerships dated back to mid 1990s as it is seen in this case. The affiliation among the museums was based on the previous attempts and partnerships. From the state institution's perspective this outgoing exhibition in 2002, as I argue in the future examples in different cases, was regarded with its function serving for bilateral relations. The reciprocal holding of "cultural year" of countries served the development of private museums' activities in Turkey. Although, the exhibition in concern here, was one year prior to the holding of Turkish Cultural Year in Japan, it was still appropriated by the Undersecretary of Ministry of Culture Fikret Üçcan as a contribution to the relationship between Japan and Turkey (Hürriyet Newspaper, 9.02.2002).

The opening ceremony of the exhibition hosted Undersecretary of Ministry of Culture Fikret Üçcan, Museum Manager Çetin Anlağan, the authorities from Turkish Embassy in Tokyo, Mayor of Fukuoka and number of guests. Üçcan, in his opening speech held at the ceremony, called attention to the "Turkish Year" that will be organized in Japan in 2003 and stated that "I consider this exhibition as the leading activity of the 2003 Turkish Year in Japan".

Sadberk Hanım Museum, although represented as a primary example of a private museum and consecutively a professional institutional establishment, it is seen that personal ties and attachments reside strongly in its administration. Not only as the personal donations and acquisitions were the revelations of this relationship, but also the accumulation of personal experience in the perception of what is important for the value of the items in the museum. The below example shows two important characteristics which can be regarded as crucial for the functioning of private museums. First, people tended to sell objects of cultural value to the Koç

Family, through the museum, and conceived it as a source of income. Second, how Sevgi Gönül (2001) through her own experiences, conceived the importance of preservation and documentation, which can be regarded as the two important elements of the very existence of a museum:

When my mother Sadberk Hanım died we had given her photographs to many people, so to say not many photographs remained in us. But now they are needed. The sad part is, since the photographs documentary stance, sometimes I buy photographs. We request from those who bring clothes for to sell to the museum and ask them to give a copy of a photograph that depicts the wearing of respective clothing. The values of documented objects are quite high (Hürriyet Newspaper, 16.12.2001).

The founding of Sadberk Hanım Museum was based on the collection of Sadberk Koç as mentioned above. The idea of the museum was not only emerged in relation to her collection of antiquities and her wish to be remembered, but also she was represented as the source of inspiration and the key figure as the source of interest in the antiques in the Koç Family. In addition to Vehbi Koç, who often referred Sadberk Koç as the source of interest in the antiques, Sevgi Gönül also refers to her experiences with her mother in developing such an interest in collecting as a way of life. However, she refers her mother's interest as directed to "eski püskü"³¹(old things) where the main location to collect things were remembered as the flea market rather than an auction house.

My departed mother had been keen on old things for ages. We used to go around the flea markets and old curiosity shops [köteneci]. In these kinds of shops, all those things who thought to be old, and those which were really old, had been exhibited in dust and dirt. It required spending a lot of time and attention to find good old pieces among those things. Very rarely, it was possible to capture some interesting and old pieces. And for very low prices. At those times, the number of antique dealers cognizant of trading, as we have today, was very few. There were no educated flea market keepers. I had so much fun in these kinds of shops (Hürriyet Newspaper, 16.12.2001).

One of the important aspects of the making of a private museum as an institutional organization in the first example of Sadberk Hanım Museum is the relationship with the state institutions. Although as mentioned above the economic capital that

³¹ It is a derogatory way of saying old and old things.

was necessary to establish such an institution was generated by the Koç Family, as in this case, and the collection was gathered through acquisitions and donations, making an exhibitionary space a legally recognized “private museum” has been strongly associated with the laws and regulations that bind such a foundation. At this point, the state institutions, laws and regulations intervene where the main state actor to address is the Ministry of Culture.

State appears to be functioning as an actor where necessary “permissions are taken” and an “inspector” more than an actor that is conceived through its financial or institutional support, or an actor that provides a stable cultural agenda in the case of Sadberk Hanım Museum. Sevgi Gönül’s complaints about the Ministry illustrate the nature of the relationship between the museum and the state institutions:

Thank God, since we do not have many encounters with the Ministry of Culture except taking permissions and being inspected, the change in Ministers does not mean much to us. But, I feel sorry on behalf of my friends working in museology as officers, because while they are getting used to someone, another one comes and approaches to the museums in a very different policies. I honestly congratulate our museologist friends and I say “**Bravo**” to their successful adaptation to new environments (Hürriyet Newspaper, 25.08.2002).

Acknowledging her role in the making of Sadberk Hanım Museum and her engagement within 23 years of the museum, in her column in Hürriyet Newspaper (25.08.2002), Sevgi Gönül points out to the significantly instable character of Turkish politics, which was conceived as incoherent, immature, and superficial by her, referring to her own experience in leading a museum. What is interesting in her judgment of politics in Turkey regarding the evaluation of the relationship between the museum and the Ministry of Culture is that the underlying significance of instability as it is the case in the characterization of the relationship between the state and business in Turkey (Buğra 1994). This instability was reflected in the change of cultural policies, or cultural priorities with respect to the frequent change in the ministers and even in the fields of responsibility of the Ministry from just focusing on ‘culture’ to ‘culture and tourism’ in due course.

In 23 years of my museology life, I have changed 17 ministers in total sometimes referred as minister of “**Culture**” sometimes called as minister of “**Tourism and Culture**”. Put it this way, one minister of culture for each year and a half (Gönül 2002).

While referring to the list³² of Ministers of Culture who worked between 1980 and 2002, Gönül criticizes the absence of cultural policy in Turkey which have become evident through the shifts in the styles of ministers as well as their shifting priorities.

Because CHP has worked on its own for a long time, only the archeological works had been prioritized in this country until 1946. I don't remember the following Menderes' cultural policies however presumably we have recognized the existence of Ottoman art in the aftermath of this governments. Nationalist ministers' searches for culture ended up finding it in Turkic republics. Some other ministers were only busy with Sacred Relics while some others just interested in theater (ibid).

This conception underlines the absence of a coherent cultural policy in addition to the frequently shifting character of the implementation of cultural policies via ministries and political agenda of the respective governing parties. Political instability has been reflected in the failure of providing a coherent and prevalent cultural policy. This has been presented as a cause for confronting difficulties in governing cultural organizations. Even the museum in this case is a private museum, supposedly relatively independent of functioning of the bureaucracy, the experience of the major actor in the museology, directs attention to a continuous call for an adjustment to the shifting policies and the implementation.

What is also important in Sevgi Gönül's narrative is the acknowledgement of her position. While addressing the state as the subject of criticism, referring to the lack of coherent cultural policy, Sevgi Gönül also maintains her difference and distance

³² Tefik Koraltan (12 Kasım 1979-12 Ekim 1980), Cihat Baban (22 Eylül 1980-15 Aralık 1981), İlhan Evliyaoğlu (15 Aralık 1981-13 Aralık 1983), Mükerrrem Taşcıoğlu (13 Aralık 1983-22 Ekim 1986), Mesut Yılmaz (22 Ekim 1986-22 Aralık 1987), Tınaz Titiz (22 Aralık 1987-31 Mart 1989), N.Kemal Zeybek (31 Mart 1989-24 Haziran 1991), Fikri Sağlar (21 Kasım 1991-28 Temmuz 1994 ve 1 Kasım 1995-7 Mart 1996), Timuçin Savaş (28 Temmuz 1994-27 Mart 1995), Ercan Karakaş (27 Mart 1995-23 Haziran 1995), İsmail Cem (7 Temmuz 1995-6 Ekim 1995), Köksal Toptan (6 Ekim 1995-31 Ekim 1995), Ağah Oktay Güner (7 Mart 1996-28 Haziran 1996), İsmail Kahraman (28 Haziran 1996-28 Haziran 1997), İstemihan Talay (28 Haziran 1997-8 Temmuz 2002) and B.Suat Çağlayan (9 Temmuz 2002-?)

from both the state as being a non-state actor, and the ‘public’ while positioning herself superior from the public with a sharp opposition between “we” and the “public”. We denotes to the dominant social class she belongs. This ascribes her right to reveal her opinions. The way she conceives of her position superior in the society was reflected in the audience she was addressing. In this respect, it is interesting how she ends her commentary under the concluding title *Oyunuzu Ona Göre Kullanın* (Give Your Vote Accordingly):

I can write full of pages about the Ministry of Culture and ministers. However, let me neither bore you, nor get myself angry. Thereby, if I could show you how pathetic are the policies and politics in our country, by presenting the picture above, and you could see it, use your vote accordingly. This is, because of these complexities, eventually public becomes miserable just like us (Gönül 2002).

7.1.3. Koç Family Members and the Field of Culture and Arts

Sadberk Hanım Museum’s organizational model for museum establishment was reproduced through the Koç family members’ personal initiatives in museum building in the 1990s and onwards. Regardless of the differentiated focus (archeology, technology, fine arts) of the museums that were established in this respect, I explore how the museum has been described, perceived and legitimized as a field of practice for the individual actors of Koç Family. By doing so, and focusing on Koç family members, I aim to reveal the pioneering conceptions and descriptions of corporate actors about museum. Consecutively, my purpose is to show the linkage between the peculiarities of the respective conceptions with the underlying symbolic interests in social class positions on reproduction of social class structure in society.

In the beginning of 2000s, private museum establishments gained a speed. Sevgi Gönül, by the time was a columnist at the *Hürriyet* Newspaper, in which she shared her experiences and topics of her interest. One of her article dedicated to her brother, Rahmi Koç’s initiation of opening a technology museum in İstanbul. The title of the article was interesting in the sense that it reveals how they

approach to the formation of museum by the family members. The title was “My Fur Money is in My Brother’s Museum” (Hürriyet Newspaper, 15.07.2001). The opening passage of Gönül’s column was reserved for her quest whether her dedication of the column to the Rahmi M. Koç’s Industry and Technology Museum could be considered as an advertisement of the respective museum in a context where “each and every week there is a new museum opening” (ibid). However, in the following sentences she evaluates her “brother’s museum” as “A La Koç” and “perfect” and congratulates the work had been done. She describes her visit to one of the galleries named after her husband “Erdoğan Gönül”. The reason of this dedication, as explained by Gönül was the donations of Erdoğan Gönül’s collection of the “mint condition” cars to “Rahmi Koç’s museum”. The following sentence further elaborates Sevgi Gönül’s conception of the respective collection: “Take it with my blessing but my fur money lined up there like the lambs” (*Helal olsun ama benim kürk paraları kuzu gibi arka arkaya orada sıralanmışlardı*). She acknowledges the reader of their financial “contribution” by donations in the first instance even the final goal of establishing a museum pursued by her brother. By doing so, she becomes a part of this “A La Koç” establishment while attributing a specific prestigious position to Koç Family in general. Furthermore, she perceives the museum in relation to material representations of economic wealth and social status. In this narrative, the owning of fur, old cars, and a museum consolidate the social status of Sevgi Gönül in particular and Koç Family in the broader sense. Her “fur money” obviously spread to the collection of cars by her husband and furthermore donated to the museum, appears as something to be spoken out loud in a newspaper column written by her. While advertising her brother’s new museum, she reproduces the use of visible and material manifestations of economic wealth and high social status and articulates the museum, as distinct but interlinked field, representing their social rank.

The explanation of why Mr. Rahmi M. Koç affiliated himself to such a “work” of establishing a museum had been given by Gönül (2001) in the very same article. As seen in the following exhibition, museum was represented as an area of interest for patrons to “discharge themselves”:

Patrons always struggle with problems. Because clear-cut works do not come in front of patrons. They always solve problems. This is the exchange for being a patron. And usually they end up the day being distressed. Therefore, sometimes they try to release the stress by working on totally different things. That is to say, Rahmi M (fullstop) Koç also (...) has been discharged while establishing the museum. The meaning of discharge is *boşalmak* however since it has multiple meanings I haven't used it³³ (ibid).

On one hand, the museum was classified as something in relation to the social life of the founder, characterized by “high energy” and “the passion to accomplish a goal” , and on the other, it was described as a combination of the founder’s collection habit that proceed simultaneously with his business life, and donations from “acquaintances” and their “institutions”.

We, as a family, now seemed to be slowed down, still are very active. Our husbands have been surprised by our energy. Our social life is very busy and we have a lot of work. We like to drink wine in the evenings. Praise God, Mr. Rahmi’s energy is a lot to make the ones nearby tired. He has been going to flea markets during his business trips to collect objects of his interest while discharging and following his goals (ibid).

Alongside these, there have been a lot of grants in this museum. Blessings to them, friends, acquaintances and many of our institutions have given the unavailing stuff that occupy a place in their storages, and objects that are correspondingly interesting as much as they have been the pioneering examples. When they all came together they have become entertaining, instructive and gained value constituting the museum (ibid).

The representation of the actors in the making of the museum contributed to the making of a “social status group” which was described firstly as “patrons” who are further associated with the characteristics such as “highly energetic”, “interested”, “need a discharge due to the problems in the business life”, “loves to drink wine at nights” and find their escapes in their busy life in their interested fields which were portrayed as “non-economic fields”. The concealed part in this representation, where museum was associated with non-economic interests, is the actual economic interests inherited in these practices as well as the importance of economic capital in the making of such possessions. Furthermore, the symbolic capital formed

³³ She deliberately emphasize the Turkish translation of the word discharge and its multiple meanings among which, one refers to the ejaculation in the aftermath of the sexual orgasm and her rejection to use it. Nonetheless it is interesting how she evokes it by deliberately stating why she didnot use it. Moreover, it connotes to a satisfaction and pleasure gained through the dispositions and practice of establishing a museum.

through such representation of symbolically valued commodities such as furs, cars and so on, and a life-style description, where museums become the showcases of the respective styles of living, contribute to the remaking of their social status and reproducing of power relations.

What is also interesting in this explanation is the underlying formula of making a private museum in Turkey. The first and concealed stance appears as the economic capital that is necessary to acquire objects of interest, second, to have the necessary social capital- identified as acquaintances above, to support the making of the museum with donations of their collections or inventory of which could possibly be conceived as an item to display in the museum as well as fitting the main theme of the museum, third, reutilizing the prior possessions for the purpose and benefit of the museum, which again can be considered as economic capital. All in all, serve the purpose of making a cultural institution of a symbolic value, such as a museum which restates and reclaims the social position of the actors behind its making. Even the naming of the museum as in the example of “My Brother Rahmi M. Koç’s Industry and Technology Museum” is a supportive instrument in emphasizing the importance of ownership, besides the reclaim of the power of the owner and his/her social status.

Another important aspect that needs to be pointed out here is the differences between the perceptions of first and second generation Koç Family members. As it was seen above, Vehbi Koç, provided a basis where the main underlying aim was to constitute a well-working institutionalization to accumulate an economic capital and to establish a systematized way of sustaining it. The foundations, stood above this basis. Even if the Sadberk Hanım Museum was represented as the actualization of the will of a beloved wife, for not to be forgotten-consecutively through a personified conception of a museum with a memorial significance, it still was established under the framework of Vehbi Koç Foundation, which appeared as the best economic rational solution to fulfill the will. Nonetheless, non-profit stance of the private museum was eliminated in Vehbi Koç’s own way of legitimizing it through the building of a personal story behind its establishment. However in the second generation, key figures such as Rahmi M. Koç, Suna and

İnan Kır     portray different perceptions and legitimization mechanisms towards their own founding of private museums:

Apparently, there has been a great interest in establishing a museum in our family. Sadberk Hanım Museum is in Sarıyer, Suna and İnan Kır    's Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations is in Antalya, Rahmi M. Ko   Museum is in Hali  . May Vehbi Ko   rest in peace, he never believed in things that don't gain money (ibid).

Still, the private museum was distanced from the notion of "bringing money" referring to its non-profit character which provides the basis for legitimacy.

7.2. Sakıp Sabancı –The Social Man

Sakıp Sabancı was born in 1933, in a village in Kayseri as the second oldest son of Sabancı Family. The Sabancı Family moved to Adana in 1921 where Hacı   mer Sabancı started working as a cotton trader. His business developed by becoming a shareholder in a cotton ginning plant, and later becoming a shareholder of a vegetable oil plant in the 1930s and 1940s. Some of the important companies founded by Hacı   mer Sabancı until his death in 1966 has been the Akbank in 1948, Bossa Flour 1950, Bossa Textile 1951, Oralitsa Construction Materials, Aksigorta Insurance Company in 1960 (Sabancı Holding Official Website, Milestones, n.d.).

Sakıp Sabancı was raised in Adana and studied until his high school years, which he could not finish due to his health problems and left the school in 1950 (ibid, p.41-42) meanwhile he was trained in his father's business. At the age of 24 in 1957 he got married with his cousin from mother's side T  rkan Civelek and had become the father of three children: Dilek Sabancı born in 1964, Metin Sabancı born in 1970 and Sevin Sabancı born in 1973. In the aftermath of his father in 1967, Hacı   mer Sabancı Holding was founded. Sakıp Sabancı was elected as the first Board of Director among his brothers (Sabancı 1985, p.99). He served as the President of Sabancı Holding from its establishment in 1967 to his death in 2004 (Sakıp Sabancı Official Website, n.d.). During the course of his presidency, Sabancı Holding has been expanded with joint ventures with transnational companies such as Bridgestone, DuPont, Toyota, Philip Morris, Kraft Foods

International, Danone, IBM, and Carrefour as well as operating and marketing its products worldwide (The Sabancı Group in Brief, n.d.). Currently, Sabancı Group companies operate in 18 countries and market their products in regions across Europe, the Middle East, Asia, North Africa, North and South America and in 2013 the consolidated revenue of Sabancı Holding was TL 24.2 billion (US\$ 12.7 billion) with operating profit of TL 4.9 billion (US\$ 2.6 billion). The Sabancı Family is collectively Sabancı Holding's major shareholder with 57.7% of the share capital (ibid). "Sabancı Holding's consolidated revenues rose by 25 percent to 13.48 billion Turkish liras year-on-year in the first half of 2014. In the same period, the holding posted consolidated net profit of 979 million Turkish liras and non-bank consolidated operating profits of 465 million Turkish liras, with a 35 percent rise year-on-year Sabancı Holding's total assets reached 220.39 billion Turkish liras and total consolidated shareholders' equity 18.27 billion Turkish liras as of June 30, 2014." (Sabancı Holding Press Release, 15.08.2014).

The Sabancı Group, operates in various business units such as energy, banking, insurance, cement, retails, and industrials as well as has been associated with Sabancı University and Sakıp Sabancı Museum through the Sabancı Foundation.

I mainly focus on Sakıp Sabancı's autobiography *This is My Life* written in 1985, more specifically to the fourth chapter of the autobiography titled as "My Spiritual World and Things I Value". In this specific chapter Sakıp Sabancı presented the story of forming the Sabancı Foundation, his social activities, his views on art, his views on public relations and politics, the building blocks of his personality. I aim to explore how he conceptualizes the foundation, his inspirations and influences, his perceptions on arts.

7.2.1. The Emergence of Sabancı Foundation

Sabancı Foundation was founded in 1974 by the members of Sabancı Family: İhsan Sabancı, Sakıp Sabancı, Hacı Sabancı, Şevket Sabancı, Erol Sabancı and Özdemir Sabancı with the support of Hacı Ömer Sabancı's wife Mrs. Sadıka Sabancı. The Overview of the Foundation presents the history of the emergence of

the Foundation in relation to Sabancı Family's attempt to institutionalize their philanthropic activities and address the members of the family as the "prominent figures in various charitable initiatives" while stating their mission as: "To promote social development and social awareness among current and future generations by supporting initiatives that create impact and lasting change in people's lives" (Sabancı Foundation Official Website, n.d.). Currently, The Sabancı Foundation presents its scope of activities as building institutions (Sabancı University, educational institutions, dormitories, teachers centers, health care centers and hospitals, libraries, sports facilities, cultural centers, social facilities) in addition to contribution to other institutions and non-governmental organizations, providing scholarships, giving awards in education, arts and sports, supporting festivals and contests in the sphere of arts and culture and programs developed with the "aims to enable social inclusion by promoting an equitable environment in which women, youth and persons with disabilities have access and equal opportunities to actively participate in society". The Foundation entered a process of restructuring that was facilitated by moving it to İstanbul from Adana in 2006 (Ms. Koyunsağan 2014, pers.comm., 26 June) and determined the focus areas as "women, youth and disabled". I will turn back to Sabancı Foundation's current focus and activities later in this section which I view important to capture change in focus yet, I want to first present views of Sakıp Sabancı on philanthropic activities and foundation.

Sabancı (1985, p.217) opens his narrative on the story of Vaksa-then the name of the Foundation, in which Vak stands for the abbreviation of *Vakıf* in Turkish and SA stands for the abbreviated use of Sabancı as used in many of the conglomerates of Sabancı Group- with a reference to Muslim belief:

Muslim belief states that we come to this world naked and go away as naked. The wealth from property stays in this world and human beings go to ahiret (life to come) with a spiritual wealth. Spiritual wealth appears with humanity, helping with each other, giving to the deprived and knowing sharing. Behold, the institution what we call as Foundation, according to our Muslim Turkish belief, is rendering the whole or part of our property into God's property. That is to say, it is, giving the property to its real owner, while providing it to the service of the deprived voluntarily (Sabancı 1985, p.217).

When you establish a Foundation what you say is: “ Oh People, oh The Citizens, Oh the Muslims! Thank God I have worked, strived, earned and possessed commodity and property. My spouse, my children have reached wealth. Now I intend to give others.” The real happiness, glorifies the human if only if it comes with others (ibid).

As it is observed in above quotations, Sakıp Sabancı’s description of Foundation is based on the religious motives behind charity giving. This safe ground provides and ensures him the possibility of distancing the establishment of foundation from material interests. His narrative was supported by the notions such as “we give our wealth in service of our public and country”; “it is in our tradition”; thinking about the “social justice” while searching the roots of philanthropic activities in the Ottoman Empire and Turkish tradition and attributing a leading role in charity giving:

Today some countries have become the flagships of social services and social justice. However, we Turks, had been on the way and had succeeded a lot, long before them. While we were establishing the order of Foundation and were thinking of the orphans, widowed and humans and were giving edicts that satisfied the birds’, untended dogs’ hunger, remember, the calendars were showing the ends of 1453. In those years, the existence of America was even not known. Since America was discovered in 1492, 40 years after we had this vision, the importance of our leadership in this matter increases (Sabancı 1985, p.218).

As in the case of Vehbi Koç’s presentation of foundation, Sakıp Sabancı was aware of the foundations in United States of America, yet emphasize the Ottoman roots of philanthropic giving serves him a kind of legitimization that suggests that, this is not new, we already had this in our tradition and in our history. Contextualizing the foundation in a historical as well as religious axis provides him to conceptualize the foundation as an old phenomenon which was recognized by him, while separating the role of the private sector and material interest embedded in establishing this organizational form. Nonetheless, as I put forward in section 6.1.1. Vehbi Koç clearly defines the foundation’s economic purpose and function. And Sakıp Sabancı (1985, p.221) states that he was influenced from Vehbi Koç, not only in establishing the holding company but also from Vehbi Koç’s organizational model of foundation. The first direct inspiration happened to

be in an occasion in which Sakıp Sabancı and his wife Türkan Sabancı and his mother met Vehbi Koç and his daughter Semahat Arsel in London. Sakıp Sabancı invites Koç Family to a “luxurious” dinner. Nonetheless, the restaurant that Sabancı invited them appears to be closed and they end up eating sandwich at the airport which had become an anecdote for Vehbi Koç later. In that occasion Vehbi Koç’s daughter Semahat Arsel, repeatedly suggests Sabancı to establish a family foundation. In addition to this informal social relations and interactions among two powerful families and especially the direct encounters with Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı, Vehbi Koç was named as “Pir” by Sakıp Sabancı, referring to his leading role in the industry and his pioneering initiatives (1985, p.333). Not only Sabancı (1985, p.333-343) dedicated two sections on Vehbi Koç and his influences on him in his autobiography, but also he refers to him as a source of inspiration and sometimes as source of conflict whereas Sakıp Sabancı appears in Koç’s autobiographies with his colorful personality and with shared incidences that reflect the competition among them. In this respect, autobiographies, as texts also in dialogue and in competition like their authors. Nevertheless, let me quote Sakıp Sabancı here to illustrate how he was inspired and took his formulation of foundation as an organizational model:

Because of Koç’s legendary name, the generation which was raised in Anatolia like us, always follow what he has done and have been in search for whether we can grasp the good parts. As how we adopted the Mr. Vehbi’s Holding example on us, I requested from Prof. Dr. Memduh Yaşa whom I knew from Akbank. I asked him to examine Koç Foundation and to start a preparation for a Foundation for us. I have sent the draft which professor Memduh had prepared, upon his consult, to deceased Hulki Alisbah, whom we heard that had worked on Koç Foundation. He examined the draft and returned to us (Sabancı 1985, p.221).

Following this procedure, Sabancı establishes the Foundation and named it Vakfa. The first organizational structure was formed based on the nine members of Board of Trustees who administered the Foundation. Three of the members, Governor of Adana, Mayor of Adana, The President of Çukurova University were the ordinary members, and the other two comes from the Sabancı Holding companies and were the Board Directors of the two leading companies considering their revenues and the remaining four members were come by elections (ibid).

As this first organizational structure reveals, local authorities and representatives of local administration were prioritized alongside the representatives of companies in the administrative structure of the foundation.

Other source of inspirations and motives appearing in Sabancı's narrative are also interesting to reveal the "interested" character of his philanthropic pursuits. First, he refers to his family's understanding of philanthropy by exemplifying it through his father, mother and brother engaging in philanthropic activities and charity work especially in religious occasions such as bayram (feasts) besides the ordinary days (1985, p.219). This serves to emphasize that this philanthropic practices had existed in the "family" and his ancestors and tradition before this organizational form and asserts a status to the family. On one hand, it associates the family with philanthropic activities and on the other; it separates the sphere from economic interests in gaining profit and expanding the business.

Nonetheless, he also refers to expansion of his ideas on philanthropy by his international encounters in which he states that he learned that big corporations act in bifurcated way in which companies also engage in social matters through their family foundations (ibid). This demonstrates a process of interaction between institutions acting in the similar field. Furthermore she refers to former Turkish Ambassador in Japan in mid 1940s and his recommendations:

In 1944 I went to Japan as the Vice President of Chamber of Commerce. Our Ambassador Melih Esenbel gave me two advices. His first advice was this: "A successful businessman, who is doing well have some social responsibilities. He cannot get rid of the social responsibilities suggesting that he's doing well in business and saying his main responsibility is being successful in his business. The first of these responsibilities is struggling for those people who deserve to sit in places and be in positions that are determined on the basis of elections. The successful businessmen in Japan are interested in the presence of most deserving individuals in the positions primarily in professional organizations and secondly in local administrations and lastly in the parliament." (...) The second golden advice was; "The businessman should not content with expanding his business, he should establish schools, dormitories, libraries and works that have social content". Melih Esenbel told me about the things Japanese businessmen had done in this matter and recommended me: "Sabancı, you will do such kinds of works. After you have done these, you will write your own name on top of them

without a hesitation. Because this seal will invite others. Society forms like this (Sabancı 1985, p.219).

Clearly, this quotation indicates an interaction among the former establishments in different societies. Moreover, the rationality provided here is associated with the development of the private sector and the role of the corporate owners in advanced capitalist society in forming civil society organizations and cultural institutions which reproduce and maintain their dominant positions in the society.

Given the influences, motives and rationality that shaped the establishment of Sabancı Foundation, the primary initiatives of the institution included activities such as building cultural centers, libraries, dormitories, primary schools, middle schools and high schools and the field of education prioritized among other areas of interest.

In the aftermath of economic capital accumulation, in the case of Sakıp Sabancı, there has been a period of recognition that the just economic wealth is not enough to sustain his social position, upon his encounters with the models applied and individuals that constituted the pioneering examples. The emergence of Foundation in Sabancı Family is clearly a symbolic manifestation and strongly associated with the collective corporate rationality which has prioritized the institutionalization in social and cultural matters in accordance with and in support of economic interests.

7.2.2. Sakıp Sabancı and his Encounters in the Field of Arts

Sakıp Sabancı, wrote a chapter on arts in his autobiography titled as “Art Nourishes the Human Being” (1985, p.291-297) and he introduced the flourishing of interest in arts while positioning himself as a member of a village-rooted family. He acknowledged the lack of exposure to the arts in a village-rooted family, where according to him the only artworks were embroidered pillows, colorful rugs and on the contrary, the non-Muslim family houses had decorated

ceilings and full of paintings in which he was affected in his childhood (1985, p.291).

Unlike Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, whose appreciation of arts developed through his family socialization and in education institutions he attained that I will discuss in section 6.3. Sakıp Sabancı had neither exposed to higher education nor got acquainted with the arts during his family socialization. His only reference was his father, who started collecting antiques by his old age and was described by him as an “Anatolian man”, self-educated, trade oriented and characterized as a frugal personality:

Everyone knows about my father’s life style, and his poverty in his initial years. However, the interesting thing is this. When he moves on to industry and develops his business, my father suddenly had started to be interested in works of arts, which was not very normal in those times. Since he did not have any expertise on it, he found someone who does. For example, in İstanbul, father Portakal was my father’s consultant. My father made him buy paintings, vases, sculptures. He did not keep away from paying to these. He collected those works of great value that reside in our Emirgan House now, like this (Sabancı 1985, p.291).

Sakıp Sabancı, in his autobiography, refers to his father’s practices in his old age as “My father often visits his friends in government offices or wanders in the antique shops in İstanbul, collecting antiques” (1985, p.93) Unlike his father, who collected European artists work, by the consultancy of Portakal, Sakıp Sabancı described his own interest in art as focused on Turkish work of arts (p.291). His evaluation of his interest in arts divided into three stages in which first he collected the “well-known” paintings of the Turkish painters then collected Turkish artists’ calligraphies, and then his interest was shifted towards the handwritten Qurans, *tesbih*, marble fountains and sculptures (p.291-292). There are various sources of inspirations that led him to collect calligraphy, handwritten Qurans, and *tesbih*. His interest and taste in the respective forms of objects developed by time and through his personal encounters with experts in the field. This is important because Sakıp Sabancı acquires knowledge on forms of Islamic arts and Turkish painting through his acquaintances. In this respect his social capital in addition to the economic capital enables him to accumulate cultural capital by time. It appears as an effort to increase the volume of cultural capital to struggle for power and status, among the

dominant classes. Bourdieu (1984) argues that there are differences among the same social class with respect to the volume of different forms of capital and cultural capital in this respect is the crucial form of capital which constitutes the social status differences among individuals. In Sakıp Sabancı's case, the lacks of educational attainment as well as the upper class way of life and cultural practices during his early socialization have led the conversion of economic capital and social capital into cultural capital in his later years through expanding his knowledge on arts and forming collections.

I was interested in calligraphy. However my interest was limited. In 1982, I went to a calligraphy exhibition at the Süleymaniye Library. The exhibition was very nicely organized. Additionally, in the exhibition hall they were playing religious music that was recorded with ney. I was impressed. And when the museum manager and other officers told me about the story of Şeyh Abdullah from Amasya, my interest in calligraphy and handwritten Quran has grown (Sabancı 1985, p.292-293).

Aydın Bolak who is interested in Turkish culture and who has a deep knowledge on these issues one day invited me to a dinner. He showed me his rich tesbih collection. Aydın Bey explained me the religious value and importance of tesbih besides other features of it. (...) He told me that tesbih work, also means to encourage and patronize those artists who make them. My love for tesbih grew. I started to collect tesbih and some time later there appeared an important collection (Sabancı 1985, p.293).

One day, a friend of my father's, antiquarian Mehmet Sevsevil called me. He told me that there was a fountain that remained from Mahmut's period, in his antiquarian shop in Grand Bazaar Kıtırcı Han and stated that an acquaintance told him that I might be interested. I went. Fountain was really beautiful. After I bought that, I have bought similar works whenever I come across. In addition to fountains, I collected old marble well tops and marble columns. I preserve them in the lawn of house in Emirgân³⁴ (ibid).

Sakıp Sabancı explains his interest and involvement in arts with reference to complementary, yet not related subjects: first defining arts within the non-material, moral sphere which "matures", "glorifies" and "completes" life, second, as a way

³⁴ When the autobiography was written by Sabancı in 1985 the Sakıp Sabancı Museum had not been established yet. Nevertheless, the Emirgan Mansion appears as the place where the collected objects and works of art were kept. It is noted in the autobiography that many of the pieces collected by Sakıp Sabancı's father was kept in the Emirgan Mansion of the family (Sabancı 1985, p.291). Today, as I will discuss in Chapter 7, the mansion hosts the Sakıp Sabancı Museum since 2002.

of satisfying the moral needs, third, brings the issue to the Turkish people, which is a nation according to him, “pay importance” to fine arts (Sabancı 1985, p.292). His narrative also historicizes the development of the painting as a form of fine arts by referring to Ottoman sultans and their arts patronage. As seen in the following quotation, while Sabancı offers a conception of the history of visual arts in Turkey, he presents himself as the continuation of the arts patronage that had been existed in the Ottoman Empire and carried on by Sultans and explains and legitimizes his interest in arts in reference to recognition of its contribution to humanity:

The art of painting is the branch of arts perhaps Turks focused as the latest. However, Ottoman Sultans had placed great importance on painting and had invited the period’s well-known artists to İstanbul and patronized them. Later, the laying of the foundation of Fine Arts Academy had provided the ground for the development of Turkish painting. In the aftermath of the imitation period that was characterized by Europe affectation, it was seen that, in the works of Turkish painters exploring themselves, courtiers had contributed by painting canvases. Our painters’ efficiency and creating more valuable works are dependent on showing an interest and facilities of evaluating their works besides their education and creativity. The duty of those citizens as like us, who admire, appreciate and believe in the contribution of fine arts to humanity, is to support arts in accordance with the level of opportunities and to encourage it. Behold, I respect and I am interested in arts and under the effect of these feelings, I support all fine arts artists (Sabancı 1985, p.292).

Another important aspect that I want to point at is the relationship between Sakıp Sabancı and Vehbi Koç in which, the competition between Koç Holding and Sabancı Holding has also been reflected in the field of arts. Their material interests have been represented symbolically. In this respect the acquisitions of work of arts demonstrate the relationship between the two capital owners. An incident was given a place in Sabancı’s autobiography, as a “sad” event within the framework of explaining their competition to establish polyester fiber factory in which Sabancı was against Vehbi Koç’s initiative KEK (Chemistry Industry Institution). In the aftermath of Sakıp Sabancı’s challenge in a related meeting Vehbi Koç writes a memorandum and adds a note stating that, similar to Sakıp Sabancı, his dad had caused him to buy a statue of a deer expensively in an auction sale, while he himself bought a sculpture of horse (Sabancı 1985, p.120). While that horse sculpture is the one that is placed in front of the Sabancı’s Emirgan house (which is still there at the front garden of the house which turned into the Sabancı

Museum) the “deer” was the one placed in front of Divan Hotel, which is owned by the Koç. As this case demonstrates, the works of arts symbolic value, besides their monetary value is crucial to represent the competition among the actors. Upon this brief note, Sabancı (ibid) states that he got much more “sharpened” to be against Koç’s initiative at the time.

7.2.2.1. Brief Notes about the Recent Situation

Headquarter of the Sabancı Holding was moved to İstanbul from Adana in 1975 (Sabancı Holding Official Website, History). This is important in many aspects. On one hand, it indicates to the geographical focus of the Turgut Özal’s economic liberal economic program which was also represented as his insistence on Sabancı to move the headquarter to İstanbul (Sabancı 1985, p.143) and on the other it points to the newly constructed loci of capitalist contestation. As the subsequent developments clearly show, İstanbul, has been the arena for the private capital to manifest their economic as well as cultural capital. Similarly, Sabancı Foundation was moved to İstanbul from Adana in 2006 and has faced a phase of restructuring which shaped its new areas of focus and indicates to a new organizational structure (Sabancı University Press Release, 14.07.2009 and Ms. Koyunsağan 2014, pers.comm., 26 June) which was shaped in accordance with the corporate governance structure in which rather than conceiving the activities in the scope of philanthropy, the notion of “social investment” have been put forward, the notion of “human resources” has been adopted, the name of the foundation has changed from Vakıf to Sabancı Foundation, strategies have been developed to implement in the prioritized project areas such as women, youth and the disabled; and the new direction towards more interaction with the non-governmental organizations has been adopted, the notion of “sustainability” has been introduced; the administrative key professionals has been changed. Sabancı University was found under the framework of the Foundation in 1994. Sakıp Sabancı University Sabancı Museum is in fact an institution directly linked to Sabancı University and through it to the Sabancı Foundation. Among the responsibilities of the Foundation there are the preparation of the main regulations and the election of Board of Trustees of the Sabancı University (ibid). Although Sabancı University and Sabancı

Foundation are two distinct juristic personalities they are associated financially since the Foundation transfer resources to the University and the Sabancı Family perceives the university as the “crowning” of the Foundation’s investments and philanthropic activities while The Chairperson of the Board of Trustees Güler Sabancı prioritizes the University and its ‘sustainability’ and ensures the provision of additional resources if necessary (Sabancı University Press Release, 14.07.2009). The rationality of the corporate governance has been adopted in the governance of Sabancı Foundation.

Sakıp Sabancı was known for his colorful and social personality in which Adaklı (2001) views him as a popular icon in her critical review of the popularization of capitalists as icons in Turkey during the course of 1980s with the use of extensive media and the effect of TV. Since 1964, he was a member and President of the Chamber of Industry and Union of Turkish Industry and Trade in Adana and Kocaeli for 25 years. He undertook several roles in various foundations; chaired the Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen in 1986; served as President of the High Advisory Board from 1987-1990; received 15 honorary doctorates from various universities, was chosen business person of the year in 1993 and 2001; received orders and awards from the governments of Japan, Belgium, and France for improving Turkey’s relationships with these countries, he also received the “Meritorious Service Medal” and “Culture and Art Grand Award” for his services in art, education and culture. Moreover, when Sakıp Sabancı passed away in 2004, he ranked 147th in Forbes’ list of billionaires (Sakıp Sabancı Official Website,n.d.). Alongside these special attributions, his nickname “Sakıp Agha” served for the construction of a popular, sympathetic, icon while concealing the interested character of his symbolic practices.

Recently in April 2014, Sakıp Sabancı Museum, organized a launching event for the artwork that they commissioned in 2011, from artist Kutluğ Ataman (Afiş, CNNTürk, 28.04.2013) for the commemoration of Sakıp Sabancı’s death in 2004. While the Museum’s director Ms. Nazan Ölçer’s presented the work of art that was done by Kutluğ Ataman, she stated that, there have been several events to commemorate Sakıp Sabancı and the usual way of commemorating important

figures in society is through endowment to education or other institutional donations, yet besides the Family's extensive activities in this regard, why they preferred to remember him with an artwork is because it fits his "modern" and "contemporary" personality. Kutluğ Ataman, standing next to her underlined that he was not an artist that works on commission basis, yet when the offer came him in 2011, he did an extensive research and prepared his work. He suggested that even he had no intention of "praising anyone", and he had no personal experience with Sakıp Sabancı, his work based on the perception of Sakıp Sabancı in public and his work end up the inquiry of the question "who is a leader?" and claimed that public, makes the person as a leader, if and only if the person "touches the public with his hands" (Afiş, CNNTürk, 28.04.2013).

7.3. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı-The Cultivated Man

Another family that calls for recognition for their foundations and initiatives in the sphere of arts and culture is Eczacıbaşı Family. After briefly introducing the Eczacıbaşı Holding, I will first elaborate on the founder of the group Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, and his perceptions on arts and philanthropy while discussing his significance as a key actor and a businessman in the development of Turkish civil society. Alongside his initiatives and roles in the civil society, I view him as one of the key figures shaping the formation of a businessman identity in Turkey that has been represented by the engagement in social work and initiatives in the field of culture and arts. Second, I will focus on İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts. I will explore the characteristics of foundation and its significance in Turkey, but more specifically deal with two important issues, namely funding characteristics and the foundation's relationship with the state institutions which I conceive as important, pioneering as well as prevalent areas of negotiation, struggle and compromise among the private sector's cultural institutions, capital owners and the state. Furthermore, İKSV is important for the origins of the idea of building a modern art museum in Turkey and in this respect can be regarded as the ground which the idea of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art emerged in the aftermath of the attempts of establishing museum taken forward by the Foundation.

The main sources of information for this section are the two autobiographical books written by Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı (1982 and 1994) titled as *Kuşaktan Kuşağa* (Generation To Generation) and *İzlenimler, Umutlar* (Experiences and Expectations) and the biography written by Can Dündar (2001) *Bir Yaşam İksiri Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı* (An Elixir of Life Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı) . The second main source of this part is the publication of İKSV. In 2013, İKSV published the book *İ-KA-SE-VE*³⁵ in which forty years of foundation was presented through the gathering of interviews done with 370 people that are affiliated with the foundation. This book is important in its own right since it demonstrates the perspective of the foundation in representing its own history of institutionalization. The book was written by İlkay Baliç and Didem Ermiş and presented to be offering an alternative history of the foundation other than the official history which has been recorded and stored in the foundations's own archives, catalogs and official website. However, this book's contribution in its authors' conception "is build around an aim of answering the question how things have been done in the foundation in its forty years" and consecutively focused on the experiences of the individual actors of whom have a say about the foundation and regarded as the contributors to the making of the institutionalization of the foundation by participating in various ways in the respective process of institutional structural transformation (p.VI). Yet, as with the autobiographies considered here, I critically elaborate on the interviews and quotations that were used in the respective book, and the textual analysis that I offer here, lays importance to the "geneology of who is speaking" (Foucault). I lay emphasis on "who is speaking and on behalf of whom?" and most importantly, what makes it crucial is the power relations that is inherited in the speech itself. Consecutively, the processes related to the subjectification of social classes, constitute the important task of the below analysis.

It is important to note that Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı positions himself in opposition to those private entrepreneurs who approached the social, political problems from a

³⁵ The title of the book symbolizes the prevalent way of reading foundations' name.

material perspective conceive “money as the ultimate solution” and represent himself as *tarafsız* (neutral)- and *ılımlı* (moderate) as well as *topluma dönük* (society oriented). (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.149) As in the cases of Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı’s autobiographies, a separate section was dedicated to social activities in Eczacıbaşı’s (1982 and 1994) books. Categorically, he differentiates social activities from economic activities.

7.3.1. Eczacıbaşı Holding

Eczacıbaşı is one of the leading industrial groups in Turkey with 41 companies and over 12,000 employees and a net turnover of 6.7 billion TL in 2013 (Eczacıbaşı Group Profile, n.d.). The founder of the group is Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı (1913-1993), who was born in İzmir and son of Süleyman Ferit Bey. Süleyman Ferit Bey was a pharmacist in İzmir and was the first university-educated pharmacist in the city and distinguished himself with a long career of public service during the early years of the Turkish Republic (Eczacıbaşı Group Founder, n.d.). He was given the honorary title and then surname of Eczacıbaşı, meaning “chief pharmacist” in recognition of his continual efforts to improve the health of his community (Eczacıbaşı Group Profile, n.d.).

After being graduated from Robert College in İstanbul Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı completed his undergraduate degree in chemistry at Heidelberg University in 1934 and his master’s degree in chemistry at University of Chicago. Choosing biochemistry as his field of expertise he earned his PhD degree at Berlin University in 1937. Until 1939 he was an academic assistant at Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Medical Research in Heidelberg, which would be re-founded as a Max Planck Institute in 1948 (Biography.Net Nejat Eczacıbaşı, n.d.).

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı returned to Turkey in 1942 and established a pharmaceutical laboratory in İstanbul, whose first product was a vitamin capsule (Eczacıbaşı Group Milestones, n.d.). Following investments in ceramic products the Scientific Research and Medical Award Fund was founded by Eczacıbaşı in order to promote and reward successful research in the area of medicine, chemistry and

pharmaceutical science in 1959. The group expanded its activities to health-based consumer goods, welding electrodes, ceramic sanitary ware through 1970s. In 1973 he led 16 businessmen and philanthropists and found İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (Eczacıbaşı Group Milestones, n.d.) which I discussed in Chapter 5, section 5.3.

In 1977 the group's "VitrA" brand in ceramic sanitary ware was established with its new plant in Bozüyük, Bilecik. In 1978 Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation was established to promote culture and the arts, scientific research, education and social development. The group established Interna brand on high quality kitchen and bathroom sets in 1978. 1982 was the year when the group established an active pharmaceutical ingredient and parenteral solution plant in Ayazağa, which would become a joint venture with Baxter International in 1994. During 1980s the group established Artema brand on modern sanitary fittings and also entered to information technology industry. After 1990 when one of the affiliations of the group Eczacıbaşı Pharmaceuticals Manufacturing was offered to the public the group, the year 1992 was an important benchmark for the group with the establishment of its new the pharmaceutical plant having annual capacity of 150 million in Lüleburgaz; and also with the establishment of new international ventures with foreign companies like James River, Procter & Gamble, American Standard of USA and Marazzi of Italy. In 1996, as a result of new investments in ceramic tiles, group's VitrA brand became one of the largest producers of ceramic sanitary ware in the world. Those new investments and international joint ventures in pharmaceuticals, ceramics, health care and information technology through 1980s and 1990s followed by passing away of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı in 1993.

In the aftermath of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's death, Şakir Eczacıbaşı, the brother of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, had become the Chairman of the İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts and stayed in this position for 16 years until his death in 2010 and became the Chairman of the Board of the group until Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's son Bülent Eczacıbaşı take the lead in 1995. Bülent Eczacıbaşı, later became the chairman of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts in 2010 in the aftermath of Şakir Eczacıbaşı's death.

7.3.2. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, Philanthropy and Arts

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was referred as a philanthropist in the biographical information provided by the Eczacıbaşı Holding and the man of arts with reference to his philanthropic activities and practices through civil society organizations in the field of arts and culture (Eczacıbaşı Group Founder, n.d.). He engaged in civil society organizations which he had been the leading actor behind their formation or member of the board, or both. He contributed to the sphere of arts and culture by being the major initiator of the İstanbul Festival in 1973 and the establishment of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, which shaped the artworld and cultural life of İstanbul through the organisation of international İstanbul Festivals diversified in music, jazz, film, theatre and making of International İstanbul Biennale, as well as have had considerable impacts in the emergence of cultural industries and cultural actors in the aftermath of its establishment as I discussed in Chapter 5, section 5.2.5.1.

The aims of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı in engaging various fields, including culture and arts is presented by the Eczacıbaşı Holding. It is suggested that “Throughout his life, Dr. Eczacıbaşı saw to it that every new business venture was complemented by an additional contribution to culture, science, arts and education. Today, the Eczacıbaşı Holding has become a unique symbol in Turkey of the bridge that can be forged between culture and private enterprise.” and “In all that he did, Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı endeavoured to improve the standard of life for future generations and had the satisfaction of seeing his life's achievements contribute to these high aspirations”(ibid). In this presentation however it is claimed that “Eczacıbaşı Holding has become a unique symbol in Turkey” and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı is addressed as the contributor in “high aspirations”. Alongside the contribution of these representations to the corporation and the social status of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, I am interested in how this interest in culture and arts, besides the mentioned other fields come to exist and how the rationality behind forging culture and private enterprise has been produced in relation to social class and the enterprise culture.

Alongside İKSV which focused on arts and culture, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was also affiliated with various prominent civil society organisations (foundations, think-tanks, Chambers) that specialize in business, industry and scientific research on social and economic issues, in both by administrative and founding roles. Furthermore, he was also associated with the field of education in various respects. Unlike, Vehbi Koç and Sabancı he did not prioritize and realized the establishment of a Foundation University in Turkey, yet through the visionary and initiative roles his presence had been prominent in the field of education. In 1950s, he lead the formation of Institute of Business Economics in İstanbul University, in which professionalization of the workforce through this institution was intended, alongside his council membership in the Science in The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (Dündar 2003, p.96). Since the 1960s, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı played an important role in the founding and administration of some important organizations. In 1960, he became the member of Board of Trustees of newly- establishing Middle East Technical University and remained on duty until his resign in 1969 (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.147-148), while he was also the Board Member of İstanbul Chamber of Industrialists (ibid). Following the 1961 constitution, the activities in the civil society have increased. Among the consecutive developments of the period one of the important establishments that crystallize the dynamics of the time, Economic and Social Studies Conference Board (ESEKH) was the initiative of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, which then gained its current institutional structure in 1994 as TESEV. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, was also one of the co-founders of the Turkish Industry and Business Association (TÜSİAD) together with Vehbi Koç (Koç Holding A.Ş.) and Sakıp Sabancı (Sabancı Holding A.Ş.) and other businessmen from various domestic firms and conglomerates³⁶. Moreover, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was the first president of the

³⁶ Selçuk Yaşar (Yaşar Holding A.Ş.), Feyyaz Berker (Tekfen A.Ş.), Hikmet Erenyol (Elektrometal San. A.Ş.), Raşit Özsaruhan (Metaş A.Ş.), Melih Ozakat (Otomobilcilik A.Ş.), Osman Boyner (Altınyıldız Mensucat A.Ş.), Ahmet Sapmaz (Güney Sanayi A.Ş.), İbrahim Bodur (Çanakkale Seramik A.Ş.), Muzaffer Gazioğlu (Elyafı Çimento Sanayi A.Ş.).

Turkish Educational Foundation, established in 1966 to provide scholarships for university and graduate students and was the member of the Board of Directors of the Turkish Scientific and Technical Research Institute in the 1970s (Eczacıbaşı Group Founder, n.d.). Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, had also established a foundation dedicated to his name in 1978, namely The Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation which serves by providing scholarships for talented musicians, annual cinema and graphic arts awards and grants to public schools and institutes for scientific research besides publishing books by distinguished authors and developing a collection of modern Turkish paintings (ibid).

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı constituted one of the first examples of businessman identity associated with the non-economic activities in Turkey. In this respect, I trace the symbolic cultural practices and dispositions of him throughout his autobiographies. The narrative that he builds about himself reflects upon his identity, by focusing on the seemingly non-material and non business activities, which reveal the social production of his taste in fine arts, music and culture and his engagement with philanthropic institutions. I conceive his affiliation with various organisations mentioned above and clubs and societies such as the Turing Automobile Club, Rotary Club, in which members of the upper class families join, as arenas of struggle for social distinction as well as being the markers of his social status.

Recalling Bourdieu's concept of *habitus*, the fundamental conditions in the stratified society, is internalized through socialization. The socialization process is recognized as a class-based process. I will elaborate some of the examples that demonstrate the effect of family socialization in the internalization of some ideas, conceptions and tastes which are incorporated into various dispositions pursued by Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. Various studies underlined the importance of the association between the social class and the family, content and form of socialization practices and the differing of the latter in relation to the former. The forming of aesthetic tastes in person is also shaped by family during the childhood and adolescence and "[t]hus once social classes evolve distinctive cultural preferences, family socialization will be a powerful mechanism in ensuring that such class-related

artistic traditions are maintained from generation to generation” (DiMaggio & Useem 1978, p.142). Another determinant of the class differences in appreciation in arts and art consumption was speculated to be exposure to education, which have a role in individual propensity to prefer one art form or another (ibid). Both of the prepositions here are relevant to the biography of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, who was raised in a high-class urban family in an urban settlement of İzmir. Not only the oldest son of Ferit Eczacıbaşı, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’s, but as the autobiography of his youngest brother Şakir Eczacıbaşı (2010) also reveals, the members of the family have had encounters with the works of art, consumed high-arts (theater, opera, ballet, classical music concert) and have also experienced the European and American cultural and artistic performances in their vacations or stays in abroad.

Compared to Sakıp Sabancı and Vehbi Koç, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was highly educated, and received his graduate degree in Germany, and had been enrolled in daily life activities in the sphere of arts. He was often regarded as the man of culture and his name was associated with the arts. The main interests behind his practices that are considered to be in the fields of arts and culture can be explained in reference to his cultivation in Europe, educational attainment and his socialization in his family and their symbolic representations.

First of all, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı contextualizes his “year of birth” very interestingly and the emphasis that he lay on the İzmir, in the early 20th century Ottoman Empire where the city recognized as “Gavur İzmir” (Non-Muslim İzmir) with reference to the dominance of non-Muslims in the economic activities (merchandise, banking and insurance) and administration (Kıray 1971, p.16-17 cited in Eczacıbaşı 1982, p. 15) and highly diversified ethnic population around 250 thousand, and the distinctive characteristic of his family such as employing a German governess are important elements in understanding Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’s personality and social class position his family holds. In this respect his description of early stages of his life is important:

However, Ferit Bey had a personality which was ahead of the times, considering his views. For example, even if I was born in an environment where Muslims renew their ablutions when they touched “non-Muslims”, I was born in the hands of a German governess. Even if it is possible for those

who have opportunities to consider any kinds of solutions for their children today, in 1913 it was not that easy to give a place to a German nurse (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.18).

He refers his father, as well as her grandmother from father's side as important and "farsighted" personalities and also in the introductory part of his autobiography he starts out by differentiating himself and his family not only in reference to "farsighted" practices but also the acquaintances they have such as the former President Celal Bayar, portrayed as a family acquaintance from İzmir, respecting the elder family members (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.17). His father Süleyman Ferit was regarded as one of the first Turkish-Muslim pharmacist in İzmir, who owned his pharmacy-Şifa Eczahanesi- in the first decade of 1900s and onwards and produced medicine as well as cologne, lotion, essence, creams, powder and cosmetic goods (Dündar 2003 p.10-17). The narrative that was build around İzmir, Eczacıbaşı family, and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı in his autobiography (1982) and the biography which was written by Dündar (2003), underline the interaction with the "Western culture" and the impacts on Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's practices, entrepreneurship not only in business but also in establishment of think-tanks, associations and foundations. Raised in such an urban, cultivated and educated family, the educational attainment served as one of the major influences providing him the cultural capital and social capital which sustained him through his lifetime and has been the products of the fundamental conditions of the distinctive social class position of his family.

In addition to the family, and the social class he was born into, the other significant characteristics peculiar to Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, in relation to the businessmen considered above, is his education and education institutions he had participated. As Bourdieu (1984) asserts in his study on education and social reproduction education attainment is a crucial component of cultural capital. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı who was raised by German governess, studied in an Italian primary school, attended American International College between 1924 and 1927, and became the student of Robert College in İstanbul which provided him a considerable social network of professionals (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.22 and p.31).

Especially in Robert College, based in İstanbul, which only the privileged students could attend, he was not only interacted with the American culture through the extensive education program of the college and its foreign instructors (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.26-34) but also developed the skills of foreign language capability that further provided him a higher status where the knowledge of English is itself a source of social distinction in Turkey, at the time being. Access to the respective education institutions, as well as the habitus, as Bourdieu use the term, is crucial for constituting his social position and status.

Unlike the industrialists Sakıp Sabancı and Vehbi Koç, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı had been portrayed as a man with an interest in arts (Dündar 2003, p.38) and this interest was based in his Robert College years, where he participated as the violin player in the school orchestra and interested in music, as well as publicizing college's Herald Newspaper in 1930-1931. The Robert College, in this respect, provided the opportunities to develop interest and taste in arts. Evidently, these opportunities were not equally distributed in the society and only available to those were privileged economically.

Following the privileged education in Turkey in prestigious institutions, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı completed his higher education in Heidelberg University in Germany and studied chemistry in. The preference of Germany for higher education was explained in relation to the cultural milieu he was raised where Germany stand out as the best options due to the extensive economic relations between Turkey and Germany, for those who had the economic resources and the intention of studying abroad, in addition to the higher education standards in chemistry (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.35). He had the advantages of the accumulated cultural capital through educational attainment and educational credentials received, to conceive, appreciate and consume arts. The period that he had spent in Germany, during the years of Hitler's rise, has important contributions to Eczacıbaşı's social position not only in terms of educational acquisition but also to the development of his taste in arts as well as being influential in terms of his attempts in cultural entrepreneurship in İstanbul, in the following years.

I suppose it is because of my musical training, during the course of my education in Germany, I'd love the organization of a festival in Turkey. During the time I had lived in Germany, I used to go to the Salzburg Festival, and I'd like to have such a feast in İstanbul (Eczacıbaşı 1994, p.274).

Both the autobiography (Eczacıbaşı 1982) and the book written about him (Dündar, 2003) highlight Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's education as streams of thought that had influenced him. Among the educational institutions that he had attained, Chicago University in United States and the time he had spent there stand out in relation to the influences on him (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.47-51). The American experience was framed with reference to Roosevelt and Keynes' economic perception, New Deal, by N. Eczacıbaşı and conceptualised as "modern social understanding". Although, his own reflection of the one year he had spent in United States characterised by the impact of Roosevelt in American economy and its influence on him.

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's privileged position can be seen from his own reflection of his status in United States, where he (1982, p.50-51) emphasized his position in United States, in which few Turkish citizens exist and Turkey was rarely known and raise speculative expectations about the look of a "Turkish person". It is seen that he explains his own position and the context with reference to an experience in Eczacıbaşı's (1982, p.50) autobiography which passes in a special meeting organised at the Chicago University by 1935, where he was the only Turkish student:

During the course of a gathering, a lady whom I met that night told me the good news that, as she had learned from the host a Turk would be coming to the meeting. The American lady was in enthusiasm for meeting a Turkish person. For the sake of a joke, I requested her to show me whenever the Turk arrives to the meeting. She said: "Well, what is the point of showing? I told you he is Turkish. Whenever he comes, you will see and understand by yourself!" I cannot forget the moment how astonished she was when she had learned that the person she was speaking was the expected Turk to be seen. This is how we were known during those years.

Above anecdote inherits important implications: First, the importance of symbolic dispositions (the physical features, clothing) in communicating national identity, and second, its power in revealing social position of the actor in concern. Furthermore, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was clearly interested in building a modern

image, articulated with the Turkish national identity and gaining an international recognition.

His perception of philanthropy and philanthropic activities, inherit the interests, ambitions, aspirations formed by his habitus. And his practices in the philanthropic field, corresponds with the structuring properties of his family socialization, educational attainment and social networks:

My extraprofessional activities took my time. However, these initiatives have made me happy. If I had just spent my time on my business, certainly, this situation could have been personally more beneficial. I cannot evaluate what has driven me to pursue extroverted activities. This could be a personal disposition or a family cultivation [aile görgüsü]... My father had also interested in nonbusiness issues. For whatever reasons, I believed in the necessity of dealing with the problems of our society. Establishing an institution without expecting any material gain, has made me contented as if I had established a new facility (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.143).

The symbolic values attributed to the social activities, or in other words non-economic activities, are represented with affection of *happiness*, explained in relation either to personal interests and family. Nevertheless, as Eczacıbaşı's own evaluation also remarks, his interests have been developed in relation to his social class position, his family's social position and the opportunities that he could have accessed by those through his education in reputable institutions such as Robert College, Heidelberg University and Chicago University (Eczacıbaşı 1982). Consecutively, other than the happiness, the non-economic activities summarised in his autobiography, can be regarded as part of the struggle for social status and power, eventhough the interest in the engagements counted above were explained in terms of creating benefit for society and often represented as disinterested in economic terms.

The involvement in the fields of art and culture was represented by Eczacıbaşı, as part of the identity of an industrialist. The social identity of the industrialists was not only described and explained by Eczacıbaşı (1994, p.297-303) but also a prescription was provided for industrialists to build that identity.

His description is as follows:

It is seen that the notion of an industrialist has changed in economically advanced societies which have been matured in its social problems. In advanced countries, not only the industry is referred as a wealth generating organ of society but also that wealth or property is considered as part of society. The Western World could only save the private enterprise order from the conflicts of the last century as soon as it appropriated this understanding. Either in Europe or in America, no sane institution ever says, "Let's give up those investments, let's spend whatever we have". Even if they ever wanted to, no one let someone say this... Moreover, if someone once enters the field of industry, not sustaining the investments means the perishing of that industrial institution. With the earnings received through industry, the entrepreneur, shall lean on the social and cultural problems of society, after he/she fulfilled the requirements of investment, tax and the rights of shareholders (Eczacıbaşı 1994, p.298).

Eczacıbaşı refers to the advanced capitalist societies as a model not only for sustaining the private enterprise order, but also conceiving industrialist as curical part of this order. Furthermore he suggests strategies for partşcularly industrialists and private sector in general to involve in the field of arts (Eczacıbaşı 1994, p.298-303) under the title *Özel Kesim ve Sanata Sağlayabilecekleri* "Private sector and the things it can provide to arts". He outlines 13 items and provides a list of suggestions. His suggestions supported by examples from Eczacıbaşı Holding include the followings: First, "The private sector institutions can allocate a space for arts in the interior and on the exterior of its buildings". Here he gives the example of the sculpture by Meriç Hızal, acquired through an arts competition that Eczacıbaşı organized that is placed in front of Eczacıbaşı Pharmacy's Lüleburgaz facility and the exhibition of the collection of Turkish Painting of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation in the interiors of holding's Levent buildings. Second, "Private institutions can establish galleries, museums, concert and theater halls" where the suggestion was supported by examples such as Destek Reasürans' concert hall in Maçka, İstanbul opened in 1984, Koç Foundation's Sadberk Hanım Museum in Sarıyer, Yaşar Education and Culture Foundation's S. Yaşar Museum established in 1985 in İzmir, Eczacıbaşı Holding's Feshane project in partnership with İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality which resulted in the formation of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Art Museum, and Sabancı Holding's Aksanat (arts center) in 1993. Third, "Supports can be given to the private theaters, opera and ballet" to facilitate flourishing of new groups, while he suggested to expand the initiatives of banks in

Turkey from the limited scope of supporting children plays. Fourth, initiating awards and competitions is suggested and gives the examples of İş Bank, Yaşar Holding's awards. Fifth, support in documentary and cultural films and photography is suggested and he gives the example of Eczacıbaşı Holding's initiative in 1960's- support given to the making of five films- which was awarded by European Council. Sixth, according to him, the private sector can support the restoration of historical buildings, where he emphasized Beyoğlu and Boğaziçi regions. Seventh, supporting institutions that serve in art education by contributing to their equipments is suggested. And he undertakes the further suggestions under the special section on the gains of international festival. Consecutively, the suggestion eight is supporting international festivals by bringing famous artists in Turkey. At this point, he makes a remark which direct attention to the internationalization of arts and cultural dialogue and gives the example of İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts and states that: "Art, in the modern era, cannot be considered as a restricted field which calls only the limited number of people with sophisticated and advanced tastes. Rather, arts belong to the society as well... Our life becomes beautiful and purifies with arts. We can find our real selves, our emotions and longings more in arts, than in any other things" (Eczacıbaşı 1994, p.301). Furthermore he suggests the dissemination of supports of design and applied arts as the nineth suggestion on the list while exemplifying it with Eczacıbaşı Ceramic productions. The tenth item on the list is devoted to the expansion of the relationship between the private sector and arts by facilitating the use of private institutions' meeting halls for the purpose of exhibiting performing arts and sending of employees to relevant events, which are regarded as part of the mission of expanding the consumption of art in a wider public. His last three suggestions are on the expansion of arts domestically. He suggests initiating culture and art festivals in underdeveloped areas supported by local authorities and local private institutions such as chambers of industry and chambers of commerce. Additionally, he makes an interesting suggestion which underlines the importance of cultural capital in the employees. He suggests to add an "evaluation criteria" while evaluating the employees on the basis of "personal interest in arts". And he concludes with the last and the thirteenth suggestion, to increase the volume of

publications in arts and culture by the supports given from the private sector, while emphasizing the role of the publications of banks such as İş Bank and Akbank and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation.

These suggestions are important for revealing Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's perceptions of art and private sector relationship. His suggestions clearly indicates the support given to arts and culture with the social stance of the private sector in which the financial supports allocated to the artistic field, secures the legitimacy of the private sector and the wealth and property gained through economic activities. Alongside widespread conceptualization of cultural and artistic sponsorship with an emphasis on its role in marketing, building image and gaining social recognition and prestige, here, it also appears as a mechanism to maintain the power of the private sector and legitimize the enterprise culture. What is more important is that in the concluding section of the suggestions provided in his book, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı draws a conclusion that the industrialists and artists are the two creative segments of the society. He attributes "creativity" to the industrialist and equates artists and entrepreneurs and makes use of the well-established prestige of creativity and arts in building businessman identity, while identifying both the artists and the entrepreneurs as the "leaders" of the society:

Perhaps establishing and enhancing the dialogue between the art and artists and entrepreneur, form the first step towards actualizing the aspirations... Both of the segments are the areas of activity which create and produce value.(...) Artists and entrepreneurs, not only required to be in peace but also they are the leaders that need to understand eachother (Eczacıbaşı 1994, p.303).

Goffman (cited in DiMaggio & Useem 1978, p.143) stated that the symbolic behaviours, such as the cultural consumption patterns, "provide the cue that is used in order to discover the status of others and, from this, the ways in which others to be treated". The "whole mode of life of those from whom the symbolic act originates" where the individual's "structure of experiences" on one sphere are repeated in other spheres of life as well, "induces solidarity in the group"(ibid). Nevertheless, the three major cases of this chapter: Vehbi Koç, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and Sakıp Sabancı portray different cultural interests and preferences where, exposure to class position of the family and socialization, exposure to education

(foreign language education, education institutions attended) life experience in abroad in European countries and United States as well as the place of birth appear as important factors that bear on individual propensity to have an interest in arts and cultural preferences. The upper classes in Turkey do not constitute a homogeneous entity and divided into distinct fractions in relation to their cultural and educational background. The internal distinctions especially among industrialists and high level executives, especially in the first and second generations of the family enterprises, in relation to their cultural preferences are important markers of status differences, where educational credentials appear to be important instruments in this regard (DiMaggio & Useem 1978)

There are cultural differences among the upper strata of the society in terms of educational background, cultural and artistic taste and life style. By looking at the three key figures whom knew eachother by 1960s and onwards joined eachother for certain causes such as the establishment of TÜSİAD, founding of Turkish Education Foundation³⁷, and in some activities of ESEKH (Eczacıbaşı 1982, p.157) and hold an opinion about eachother, as well as having an experience on eachother in terms of business activities and social causes, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı stand out among the other two actors, with his urban and well-educated background in well-established European and American schools and way of life with high cultural and artistic taste compared to Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı. Most importantly his life style and cultural tastes that were shaped by his cultural socialization as well as social and cultural capital not only places him in a distinct place and in a in the society, but also among the other businessmen, as in the case of Vehbi Koç and Sabancı. I suggest that both of the actors admit his difference, produce and reproduce through neutralizing it in certain ways. In this respect, I find, Sakıp Sabancı's evaluation in the aftermath of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's death, as a clear indication of how life-style differences have been observed, appreciated

³⁷ For the establishment of TÜSİAD and Turkish Education Foundation Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and Vehbi Koç worked together. It's been said that (Kıraç 1995, p.350) Vehbi Koç had used to call Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı as his "close friend".

and recognized and symbolically works for distinction among actors, even in the same social class positions:

I was in Adana. In my heart and in my view, he was like Monte Kristo. In Adana, they were saying to me that ‘Nejat Bey rides horse, he makes girls admire him. Whatever he does, he does it well’. With these feelings, I had gone to one of Turgut Özal’s invitation in State Planning Organization. Vehbi Koç was there, Jak Kamhi was there, and some other people as well. Something auspicious will be spoken there: the development of the East. When I saw Nejat Bey, suddenly an excitement came to me and I said ‘How are you elder brother?’ Though, I should call him ‘Gentleman, the gentleman of gentleman’ but with that enthusiasm in my heart I said ‘Brother Nejat’. A life has passed together with him, calling him ‘Brother Nejat, Brother Nejat’. Since I have grown together with children of the farmers or children of tradesmen, I have a special admiration towards Nejat Bey... He wore shoes of brown and white, of dark blue and white; he impressed me. I have too, shoes of brown and white, which I still wear. We have collected rugs for years; I have learned to collect paintings from him. He was such a distinct person with his elegance and all things he had (Sabancı cited in Dündar 2003, p.188).

This quotation is full of symbols and oppositions which reproduce the social class positions. Sakıp Sabancı’s narrative builds a direct association between symbolic practices such as clothing, collecting artworks, use of language and the social conditions in which individuals have been raised. For example, he is impressed from Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’s style and practices and wants to pursue them. While finding his way of calling him as “brother” inappropriate due to status differences between them, he also implies that he has gained the opportunities and advantages of the individuals that he considered as inspiring and higher in rank. Admitting his internalization of the cultural dispositions exemplified here, he implies he now shares similar class positions with the ones once he admired. Through symbolic practices, he struggle for distinction. Yet, at the same time, Sabancı reproduced the Eczacıbaşı’s social status, portraying him as an unreachable, elegant and perfect fictional character; he attributes him a symbolic power. In the last analysis, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’s cultural dispositions and practices are legitimized.

For Vehbi Koç as well, while Sabancı was referred as the “artist” with reference to his colourful personality, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı represent the “artistic” (Kıraç 1995, p.275) referring to his “elegant” personality. Furthermore, he advised his son to take Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı as the model:

I started working in Ankara, in those days my father told me ‘Take Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı as a model’. I said ‘Why?’. He said: ‘Because he’s a versatile

person; he speaks there languages as a native speaker, he is well educated, and he has both industrial and social activities (Koç cited in Dündar 2003, p.187).

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's cultural capital formed the basis of differences among the founders of large conglomerates in Turkey and these differences are naturalized. The outcome of this is the, leading role of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, in the structuration of the foundations which specialize on arts and culture, as organizational field. I also want to underline the role of the other family members in sustaining the functioning of the foundations, as well as maintaining the distinct social position of the family, not only among other family holding companies but also, in the field of cultural production.

I suggest that the extent of the impact of the Koç, Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı Families on the field of culture and arts should be evaluated not only on the basis of individual practices of collecting, but also the activities and initiatives of their philanthropic foundations and conglomerates. In their initial years, Vehbi Koç Foundation and Sabancı Foundation concentrated on education but also have developed programs on culture and arts. Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation explicitly focused on arts and culture as the main area of activity. Currently, Vehbi Koç Foundation's art and cultural initiatives include: Sadberk Hanım Museum, Vehbi Koç and Ankara Research Center (VEKAM), Koç University's Research Center for Anatolian Civilizations, Koç Family Galleries on Ottoman Art at the Metropolitan Museum initiated in 2011, Vehbi Koç Foundation Contemporary Art Collection (initiated in 2007), Contemporary Art in Turkey Monograph Series at Yapı Kredi Publishing (2007-2011), ARTER-space for art 2010, TANAS (contemporary art space in Berlin initiated in partnership with Edition Block Berlin in 2008). The projects supported by the Vehbi Koç Foundation include: Venice Biennial Turkish Pavillion (along with other 21 sponsors) for the period between 2014 and 2034, Istanbul Tanpınar Literature Festival Sponsor in 2013, International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Research Symposium (initiated in 2010 and continuing), and the main sponsorship of İstanbul Biennial (together with Koç

Holding) for the period between 2007 and 2016 (Vehbi Koç Foundation Culture, n.d.).

Sabancı Foundation's initiatives include Sakıp Sabancı Museum (2002), Mardin City Museum and Dilek Sabancı Art Gallery (2009), International Adana Theater Festival, National Youth Philharmonic Orchestra, Mehtap Ar Children's Theater, International Ankara Music Festival, Metropolis Archeological Excavations, Turkish Folk Dances Contest, supporting of State Museum of Painting and Sculpture in Ankara. Sabancı Foundation has total 16 cultural centers in Mardin, Adana, İstanbul, Antalya, Ankara, Edirne, Kocaeli, Malatya, İzmir and Kahramanmaraş (Sabancı Foundation Culture-Arts, n.d.).

Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation has a “Modern Turkish Art Collection”, offer music scholarships since 1987, has been supporting İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts, İzmir Culture, Arts and Education Foundation, has been publicizing Eczacıbaşı Photography Artists Series since 2010 and has been giving Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Design Awards since 1988 (Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation, n.d.).

The group companies of Koç Holding (ex: Arçelik, Aygaz, Yapı Kredi Bank, Tüpraş), Sabancı Holding (ex: Akbank, Enerjisa, Çimsa, Teknosa) and Eczacıbaşı Holding (ex: Vitra) also participate in arts and culture sponsorship.

These expand the diffusion of the rationality behind the private support in arts and furthermore, maintain the dominance of the respective three families, and their affiliated philanthropic foundations in the field.

CHAPTER 8

EMERGENCE OF THREE ART MUSEUMS IN İSTANBUL: SABANCI MUSEUM, İSTANBUL MUSEUM OF MODERN ART AND PERA MUSEUM

This chapter examines three cases of private art museums: Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum (Sabancı Museum), İstanbul Museum of Modern Art (İstanbul Modern) and Pera Museum. The shared particularity of these three museums is that they are philanthropic foundation museums. I will examine the establishment of philanthropic foundation museum model in Turkey in these three pioneering cases. I will base my comparative analysis on analytical categories of control, missions, building and funding.

I already discussed the importance of İKSV in Chapter 5, private cultural and artistic institutions in Chapter 6, and philanthropic foundations founded prior to the establishment of private museums in Chapter 7 as central agencies supporting the structuration of the field (DiMaggio 1991). Before focusing on these three cases, I will briefly elaborate on the major agencies that offered pivotal support to the professionalization and structuration of the private museums as a field. I will outline their relevance in the three specific cases which construct an organizational field. I will analyze the cases in four major categories: missions and strategies, building, organizational structure and funding.

The analyses in the sections based on the data collected through various documents and expert in-depth interviews. I conducted an online archival research by focusing on official web pages, published interviews of respective museums' founders, administrative key figures and chairman. I collected documents such as catalogs, posters, commercials. I have conducted expert interviews with the Director and Chief Curator of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art, Incoming Exhibitions Manager of Sabancı Museum in 2013.

8.1. Structuration and Professionalization

Private museums that I focus here emerged as separate organizational forms in 2000's. Consecutively they are very recent forms. On one hand, they constitute the pioneering examples and this makes them important in setting the model for future establishments. On the other, supposedly, they consolidate the organizational field of private museums. They owe the precursory institutions for constituting the setting for their establishment. In this respect, I will briefly summarize the role of Vehbi Koç Foundation, İKSV and banks which I find relevant with their contribution to the processes of structuration and professionalization which form the infrastructure for the emergence of private museums.

8.1.1. Vehbi Koç Foundation

As I discussed in Chapter 5, the 1967 legislation was formed with the influence and efforts of Vehbi Koç. Vehbi Koç Foundation constituted the pioneering example of philanthropic foundation formed by a large conglomerate (Koç Holding) under 1967 legislation. 1967 legislation enabled the foundations to become direct recipients of companies' realized profits and it gave way to the direct relationship between the companies and foundations (Çizakça 2000, p.96-97). Owing to Vehbi Koç and professionals that worked for the preparation of legislation, philanthropic foundations that are founded in the aftermath of 1967 legislation gained the possibility of tax-exemption (Çizakça 2000, p.101). Vehbi Koç first entrusted to the coming generations of Vehbi Koç's heirs and this enabled the perpetuity of family (Çizakça 2000, p.100) although the primary focus of the foundation is charity. Vehbi Koç Foundation model has been an influence for capital owners that found conglomerates. It set the model to be adopted for future entrepreneurs. As I discussed in Chapter 7, especially Sakıp Sabancı was influenced from the model of Vehbi Koç Foundation and formed the similar organizational form for Sabancı Holding and established Sabancı Foundation. Thus, Vehbi Koç and Vehbi Koç Foundation by forming the example model, contributed to the structuration of philanthropic foundations. And structuration of philanthropic foundations is directly associated with the establishment of private

museums. First, the organizational form of philanthropic foundation under the 1967 legislation allowed the establishment of autonomous institutions in accordance with the missions of the philanthropic foundation. Second, philanthropic foundation model allows the coming generation members of the family to expand the assets of the foundations with donations and interfere and manage the foundation. This also enables them to take part in the decision process on forming autonomous institutions. Third, the funds accumulated in the foundation serve as the major financial resource for private museums. Fourth, family members' collections can be donated to the foundations and philanthropic foundations can form their own collections. These collections can form the basis of the collection of private museums that will be established under the framework of philanthropic foundations. These factors directly supported the infrastructure of establishment of private museums by providing a funding resource.

Another major contribution of Vehbi Koç Foundation is the establishment of first foundation museum in 1980. Sadberk Hanım Museum forms the first example in this respect. It is further adopted by second generation family members. It is crucial to note that the founder of Pera Museum, Suna Kıraç is the member of Koç Family who reproduced the form in the field of art, by forming another foundation with her husband İnan Kıraç as I will discuss in the following sections.

8.1.2. İKSV

As I discussed in Chapter 5, İKSV is one of the central agencies that shape and structure the field of arts and culture. İKSV was founded in 1973 under the leadership of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı. It turned into a prominent institution in the following years and “developed into an authority” where groups and other institutions would consult (Yardımcı 2007, p.5). It facilitated the development of cultural industries by its activities. It formed and legitimized the sponsorship program which constitute a web of domestic capital and reinforced the capital that they are a part of collective project of making İstanbul a global-city by focusing on culture and arts. It supported professionalization by forming the ground for the networking web of international agencies, festivals and curatorial structures

(Yardımcı 2007, p.5). Especially organization of International İstanbul Biennial facilitated the consolidation of professions such as curatorship. DiMaggio (1991, p.276) outlines “creation of a body of knowledge” and “increasing the organizational salience of professional expertise” as dimensions of professionalization. I suggest İKSV contributed to this dimensions of professionalization by being the pioneering example of organizing cultural events and defining areas of expertise as public relations, sponsorship, curatorship, marketing and promotion which further established into different organizational departments. I also suggest that İKSV contributed to the structuration processes by providing “flow of information” (DiMaggio 1991, p.277) by networking individuals under the framework of its cultural policy orientation and funding the publication of books on cultural policies, institutional history and arts. These characteristics of İKSV, make it one of the central agencies in offering support for the infrastructure that facilitated the emergence of private museums.

It has also a direct relationship with Istanbul Modern. First direct relation is the key founding figure Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı who was the first to consider the idea of establishing a modern art museum. Second, 1st International İstanbul Biennial organized by İKSV gave way to the emergence of this idea as I will discuss further. Third, İstanbul Modern was initially founded under the framework of İKSV as an initiative of Eczacıbaşı Family later disconnected and formed a separate philanthropic foundation as the major controlling institution.

8.1.3. Banks’ Cultural and Artistic Institutions

Prominent banks in Turkey established cultural and artistic institutions in İstanbul over the last two decades or so, which focused on contemporary arts. Garanti Bank, Akbank and Yapı Kredi Bank form can be counted as pioneering examples in this regard. Garanti Bank initiated Garanti Platform Contemporary Art Center (2001) and later developed into SALT (2011) for example constitute the important grounds for “organizational salience of professional expertise” (DiMaggio 1991, p.276) by emphasizing contemporary art and “empowering the staff” were capable of developing programs. As I discussed earlier in Chapter 6, Vasıf Kortun is a very

good example to demonstrate this argument. Akbank initiated Aksanat (1993) primarily focus on contemporary arts and placed professionals in its advisory board (Aksanat Official Webpage, n.d.). This enhances the prestige of limited number of key figures and the contacts among professionals and corporate capital owners. Yapı Kredi Bank contributes to dimensions “flow of information” and “the density of interorganizational contact” (DiMaggio 1991, p.277) of the structuration processes by funding and facilitating series of talks and publications. One good example that demonstrates this contribution is Çağdaş Sanat Konuşmaları (Contemporary Art Monograph Series) organized in the second half of 2000’s. Through series of monographs interaction among professionals (directors, curators, art historians), representatives of contemporary art institutions, artists are facilitated. The series of monographs were edited by Levent Çalikoğlu (art historian, art consultant and curator) turned into four volumes. Çağdaş Sanat Konuşmaları 1 (2005) focused on concentrates on contemporary art, Çağdaş Sanat Konuşmaları 2 (2006) focuses on Civil formations and Initiatives in Contemporary Arts (2007), Çağdaş Sanat Konuşmaları 3 (2008) focuses on Contemporary Arts in Turkey in the 1990s, and Çağdaş Sanat Konuşmaları 4 (2009) concentrates on collection, collectors and museology. This series of books not only gathered artists, arts professionals and art historians with the aim of concentrating on contemporary arts, but also demonstrated the interest in constructing a field of interest. The banks contribute to the structuration and professionalization of the field of culture and arts. This is directly associated with the establishment of private museums, which fall into contact with professionals as a result of banks investment in cultural and artistic institutions and publications. For example, the editor of these volumes, Levent Çalikoğlu is now the Director of İstanbul Modern.

8.2. Establishment of Philanthropic Foundation Museum Model

Sabancı Museum was founded in 2002. It is the official abbreviation of the full name Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum. This is because the museum was established under the institutional framework of Sabancı University in 2002. Sabancı University is a synergic institution and was founded in 1999 by a decision given by Sabancı Holding in 1994 and in the aftermath of the conference

organized in 1995 to design its structure. It was founded under the umbrella institution Sabancı Foundation. Therefore, it is a philanthropic foundation museum. The museum is located in Emirgan, İstanbul in a building that hosted the Sabancı Family in the past. Therefore it is also considered as a “house museum”. Sabancı Foundation was founded in 1974 by the Sabancı Family members in Adana, later in 2006 the foundation was moved its headquarters to İstanbul and its name was changed from Hacı Ömer Sabancı Foundation to Sabancı Foundation. The aims of the Sabancı Foundation range from development of facilities in areas of health, education, science and culture and arts, by providing scholarships and education opportunities, establishing institutions such as student dorms, education institutions and supporting non-governmental organizations (Sabancı Foundation Charter & Bylaws).

Following Sabancı Museum, İstanbul Modern was opened in December 11, 2004 with the claim of being the first museum of Turkey dedicated to modern and contemporary arts (İstanbul Modern Official Webpage, 2013). It was founded under the framework of İKSV by the initiative of Oya and Bülent Eczacıbaşı. Its name is often abbreviated as “Modern” in the art world or “İstanbul Modern”, or “Eczacıbaşı’s Museum” because of the museum’s affiliation with the Eczacıbaşı Family. İstanbul Modern was separated from İKSV after its establishment. This rupture was made possible by founding a separate philanthropic foundation in 2006: *İstanbul Modern Sanat Vakfı* (İstanbul Modern Art Foundation). The trustees of this new foundation are: Eczacıbaşı Holding, Ethem Sancak, Ferit Bülent Eczacıbaşı and Oya Eczacıbaşı and total amount trusted is 650.000 YTL³⁸ (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, 02.07.2006). It is stated by Zaman Newspaper (09.12.2005) that the reason behind this disconnection is the disagreement between the parties of İKSV and İstanbul Modern. Then Chairman of the İKSV, Şakir Eczacıbaşı suggested that İKSV provided the funding for İstanbul Modern therefore they defended İstanbul Modern to abide by the İKSV’s corporate identity and management principles since it was compromised to

³⁸ Approximately \$USD 450.000 in 2006 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

establish İstanbul Modern under the framework İKSV. The main reason behind disagreement was presented as İstanbul Modern's enthusiasm to grow rapidly and act freely.

The official founding aims of the İstanbul Modern Art Foundation appeared in the *waqf* deed are: contributing Istanbul to become one of world's culture and art centers, contributing to the preservation and development of national and universal cultural and artistic values, creating an effective and dynamic environment for the dissemination of national and global art in public, sharing contemporary and universal values with public through art center or museum offering world-class standards, developing artistic production, creativity and arts education and organizing all kinds of activities in this respect and expanding these activities nationwide³⁹ (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, 02.07.2006).

Pera Museum was founded in 2005, under the framework of Suna and İnan Kır   Foundation. Suna and İnan Kır   Foundation was founded in 2003 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, 14.11.2003). The trustees are Suna Kır  , İnan Kır   and İpek Kır  . And total amount trusted was 5.000.000.000.000 TL⁴⁰. The aims of the foundation are: providing material and non-material conditions and opportunities agreed by the Board of Directors, to individuals and institutions for raising beneficial and patriotic citizens for the Turkish society, contributing to the social life by activities in direction of these aims.

Suna Kır   is the daughter of Vehbi Ko  , the founder of Ko   Holding (Ko   1987, p.5) and is married with İnan Kır  . Suna and İnan Kır   Foundation founded the

³⁹ “Binlerce yıl   nceye giden sayısız uygarlı  n ya  andığı T  rkiye’nin simgesi olan ve y  zyıllardan beri   e  itli k  lt  rleri bir arada barındıran İstanbul’un d  nyanın sanat ve k  lt  r merkezlerinden biri durumuna gelmesine, benzer faaliyetlerin T  rkiye’nin de  i  ik y  relerin de yaygınla  tırılmasına, ulusal ve evrensel k  lt  r ve sanat de  erlerinin korunması ve geli  mesine katkıda bulunmak, ulusal ve k  resel sanatın toplumla bulu  masına ve yaygınla  masına elveri  li dinamik bir ortam yaratmak ve sahip oldu  umuz   a  da   ve evrensel de  erleri d  nya standartlarında hizmet sunan sanat merkezi ve m  ze vb. ortamında toplumla payla  mak, sanatsal   retimi, yaratıcılı  ı ve sanat e  itimini geli  tirmek ve bu konularda her t  rl   faaliyetlerde bulunmaktır”

⁴⁰ Approximately \$USD 3.330.000 in 2003 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

AKMED (Suna-İnan Kır   Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations) in 1996 (AKMED Official Webpage, 2014) before the establishment of Pera Museum which is associated with the birth of the idea of Pera Museum besides the collections that the couple owned (H  rriyet Newspaper, 19.12.2004).

As stated by Kır   (H  rriyet Newspaper, 19.12.2004) the enthusiasm to open a private museum have in fact emerged while the couple were returning from the opening ceremony of the museum on technology and industry, that was established by Suna Kır  's brother Rahmi Ko   in Hali   in 1994 (Rahmi Ko   Museum Official Webpage, History, 2013). Suna and İnan Kır   acquired the building. They, acquired a second building in Pera site, in association with the Pera Museum project, to serve as İstanbul Research Institute. The institution was founded in 2003 (İstanbul Research Institute Official Webpage, About, 2013) prior to the Pera Museum. İstanbul Research Institute concentrates on İstanbul's history from Byzantium to today and aims to facilitate research through collaborations with universities and providing scholarships.

Meanwhile, the allocation of the TRT building in the site to Suna and İnan Kır   by the Beyo  lu Municipality was on the agenda. Then Beyo  lu Mayor Kadir Topba   offered the building to İnan Kır   to initiate a Palace of Culture. İnan Kır   suggested that one should manage the place that he/she initiated by himself/herself. Otherwise things cannot be completed. Having these ideas on mind, they had founded the Suna and İnan Kır   Foundation. As suggested by Kır  , foundation was necessary for holding the managerial control in these kinds of initiatives since the enterprises in this kind do not generate revenues and should be operated with the foundation's revenues (H  rriyet Newspaper, 19.12.2004).

The private museums operate under the Regulation on Private Museums and Their Supervision (1984). They are subject to supervision of public museums appointed by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Sabancı Museum is supervised by İstanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art's Management, Yıldız Palace Museum Management supervises İstanbul Modern and Pera Museum is supervised

by İstanbul Topkapı Palace Museum Management (General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums List of Private Museums, n.d.).

The three philanthropic foundations are all beneficiaries of 1967 legislation. The dominance of the founding families in the control of the philanthropic foundations is maintained by the managerial structure of the foundations and participant of family members in the Board of Directors. Three major controlling institutions of Sabancı Foundation (1973), İstanbul Modern Art Foundation (2011) and Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation were granted tax exemption by the Council of Ministers, in 1973, in 2011 and in 2005 respectively (The List of Foundations Granted Tax-Exemption by the Council of Ministers, n.d.). The benefit of the philanthropic foundations for individuals is to maintain the power of the families in broad range of areas including culture and arts. For museums, as autonomous organizational forms, philanthropic foundations contribute to their structuration in various dimensions: broader missions of the philanthropic foundations form the basis for museum's missions, they provide the funding and structure the funding mechanisms, provide know-how, expertise and networks by regulating and controlling the institutions. For conglomerates, the philanthropic foundations are represented under "social responsibility" projects and utilized for gaining domestic as well as international social recognition and prestige. The private museums formed under the framework of philanthropic foundations, have become the major concrete institutional manifestations of economic capital and economic power towards the market and competitors.

Affiliation with Conglomerates

Sabancı Holding, Eczacıbaşı Holding and Koç Holding are three prominent large conglomerates in Turkey. These industrial conglomerates are competitors in the market. Especially, as I discussed in the case of an acquisitions and auctions the competition between the respective Families' members is clear. As Buğra (1994, p.84-85) suggests especially the areas of competition between Koç and Sabancı range from industrial sector to the shares in the commercial banks to the purchasing of art objects. As I also discussed earlier the differences among the

social backgrounds of the three businessmen Sakıp Sabancı, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and Vehbi Koç had been reflected in their orientations, perceptions on culture and arts and the institution of museums. Three private museums that were founded tend to follow different lanes by focus of their collections; however they try to maintain their “difference” in the field. DiMaggio (1991, p.268) suggests that in the case of US “the diffusion process not only legitimated the museum as an organizational form, but at the same time legitimated the conflict over the interpretations of the museum’s missions”. Similarly, I suggest that these three museums diffuse the model of philanthropic foundation museum and legitimize it as an organizational form and at the same time, they compete in possessing the field. This competition is explicitly observed within the boundaries of these three museums. Private museums serve as an extended area of conflict over power. I suggest this has not remained within the boundaries of the three museums that I focus here. Rather, the affiliation between the conglomerates and private museums established through the synergic institution of philanthropic foundation facilitated the expansion of interest in opening private museums among the corporations and the capitalist class. Respectively, within the last decade we observe the emergence of new actors that seek to open private museums out of their private collections.

I will now give examples from my cases that demonstrate the affiliation between the private museums and respective conglomerates and individuals associated with these conglomerates.

The story behind the emergence of Sabancı Museum was presented by Emin Mahir Balcıoğlu (2002, p.117-133) in a book published by the Sabancı Museum. Emin Mahir Balcıoğlu was the founding director of the Sabancı Museum. As he presents the history, the preparation to set up a private museum was initiated in 1998. The founding principles were discussed in a workshop organized in 1998 whereby over twenty experts from Turkey and abroad, including directors of major museums and foundations such as The Getty and MoMA participated (Sabancı Holding Press Release, 2002). This workshop facilitated the gathering of international experts and professionals. As I discussed earlier, in the emergence of

foundations international examples form the base for domestic initiatives. And in the case of Sabancı Museum this has continued.

In a context where the large conglomerates compete for utilizing culture for their aspirations, Sabancı Holding announced the opening of the museum on 11.06.2002 with a press release titled as “Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum, is opening its doors with two superb exhibitions” and emphasized the two exhibitions: “Selected works from the Sabancı Calligraphy Collection” and “Selected works from the Sabancı Painting Collection”. Sabancı Holding Chairman Sakıp Sabancı, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Sabancı University, Güler Sabancı, Sabancı University President Prof. Dr. Tosun Terzioğlu and then Museum Director Emin Mahir Balcıoğlu delivered opening speeches. These speeches emphasized the role of Sabancı Holding and Sabancı Family behind the establishment of the Sabancı Museum and underlined the museum’s contribution to the public.

Sakıp Sabancı, addressed the Sabancı Museum as part of the undertakings of Sabancı Holding which “aims to contribute to the development of the country”. The association between the company and the museum was formed right from the beginning. Sakıp Sabancı is also associated with the museum, as the museum’s name suggests and benefited from the reputation of opening a private museum:

During my business career extending over fifty years, my group pioneered in many fields and realized many project that contributed to the development of our country. We established partnerships with leading foreign companies. During all these developments, I realized that the success and contribution of an institution cannot be solely judged by economical criteria. In fact I observe throughout the years an individual acquires greatness to the extent that he/she contributes to the developments of the arts, culture and education. With this in mind, I have decided I came to the conclusion that the best way of seeing Turkey advanced in the world arena, with its unique attribute of acting as a bridge between Europe and Asia, would be to share its rich cultural and artistic heritage with a wider audience worldwide. Today, I have finally the opportunity to share our collections with the public (Sabancı Holding Press Release, 2002).

Sakıp Sabancı places the museum in a non-economic domain. Still, he defines the museum as a contribution to the “success” of an institution. In this case, it is the Sabancı Holding in concern. Moreover, Sabancı legitimizes the museum as

“contribution to the development of the country” and emphasize that opening a museum is an act of sharing a private collection with the public. He contextualizes Turkey in the world market and the aim of globalizing Turkey is explicit. Sabancı Museum, serves at its best in this respect through establishing networking with the international art circles, art museums, organizing temporary incoming exhibitions by international partnerships and extensively using promotion and marketing.

Sabancı Museum appears in Holding’s Social Responsibility Reports and Annual Reports. It provides the opportunity for international recognition for Sabancı Holding and Chairman Güler Sabancı. The following quotation is from the press release (Sabancı Holding 2010) that announces the receiving of a state order by Güler Sabancı. It demonstrates the prestige and international recognition gained through the Sabancı Museum:

As being one of the top-selling newspapers of Austria, Kurier, introduced Güler Sabancı as the “most powerful woman and art supporter in Turkey” in its news titled as “East met West in Albertina.

News journal, as well announced the award of state order to its readers with a title of “Turkey’s most powerful woman” while Neues Volksblatt magazine gave issue a place in its economy page. In the news that was given with a title of “Big Award” it was reported and stated that alongside Sabancı’s contribution in the field of economy, the cooperation between the Sakıp Sabancı Museum and Wiener Museum für Angewandte Kunst (MAK) have also affected the giving of the award.

İstanbul Modern appears as an extension of the Eczacıbaşı Holding. It is represented as part of the Group’s social responsibility projects (Eczacıbaşı Group Official Web Page, 2013). It is given a significant place under the heading of culture and arts together with other affiliated institutions İKSV, İzmir Culture, Arts and Education Foundation and Vitra Ceramic Arts Studio. Eczacıbaşı Holding states its affinity with the İstanbul Modern as the “founder and core collection donor”. It presents İstanbul Modern as “Turkey’s first private museum of modern and contemporary art” that “is committed to advancing the Turkish public’s appreciation of modern and contemporary art” and “contributing to the production of new work, sharing Turkey’s artistic creativity and cultural identity with global audiences”. This representation of the Museum in Eczacıbaşı Holding’s official webpage demonstrates how İstanbul Modern is recognized as a prestige element.

The founding of Pera Museum is associated with Koç Holding and Koç Family. The main reason behind this, as I suggested above, Suna Kıraç is a member of Koç Family, and her husband İnan Kıraç affiliated with Koç Family by marriage and worked in higher level of executive positions at Koç Holding for several years.

An auction before the opening of Pera Museum demonstrates the representation of the affiliation of the museum with Koç Holding and Koç Family. Furthermore, it exemplifies the representation of contestation between museums as a power struggle between the Koç and Eczacıbaşı Families.

Although, Sabancı Museum and İstanbul Modern were founded prior to the establishment of Pera Museum, the auction of the painting “The Tortoise Trainer” by Osman Hamdi Bey⁴¹ marked the collective recognition of the field by its competing participants. The auction marked an important moment for the establishment of Pera Museum. Most importantly, it was significant in reflecting the change in the art market in Turkey whereby acquisitions of artworks by certain actors meant more than adding the items to the collection. It has started to mean as a contestation over adding a work to the collection of a museum.

Osman Hamdi painted two versions of the Tortoise Trainer, one in 1906 and the other in 1907. Today, both of the paintings are owned by two distinct private collections. One of the versions was sold in 2004 to Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation for 5 trillion TL, which was approximately \$ 3.5 million at the time, after a harsh bidding among the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation and Eczacıbaşı. Bidders participated in the room and on telephone in the auction organized by

⁴¹ Osman Hamdi Bey, lived between 1842-1910; he was a statesman and one of the first students sent abroad –to Paris in 1857- by the Ottoman Empire to have a law education. However, his interest in culture and arts lead him to study painting and archeology which made him “the person” who is associated with the establishment of museum in Turkey later on. This association stems from many initiatives taken by him. After his return from Paris, he worked as a civil servant in various positions, and participated in the World Exposition in Vienna as the first commissar (İstanbul Archeology Museums Official Website, Osman Hamdi Bey, 2013). This World Exposition affected the history of Westernization in the Ottoman Empire as well as the establishment of modern institutions through the interaction formed (Shaw,2003).

Antik A.Ş. The competition over Eczacıbaşı and Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation increased the price of the painting forty two times. This made Tortoise Trainer, the most expensive work ever sold in an auction in Turkey until then. Ahmet Keskiner- participated in the auction on behalf of Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation- fainted because of the respective harsh competition with İstanbul Museum of Modern Art.

The representation of the auction in the newspapers demonstrates how two powerful Families behind the formation of private museums are represented as competitors and how the aspirations of possessing the field have been legitimized. The title chosen for the news (Ergün and Özlüer, Sabah Newspaper, 13.12. 2004) best represents the affiliation between conglomerates and the family. Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation was referred as “Koç”. The title was *Koç Rekor* (Koç Record) and the spot headline was “Tortoise Trainer” sold for 5 trillion, Eczacıbaşı and Kıraçs [Kıraç Family] mercilessly competed for buying Osman Hamdi Bey’s famous painting and to make the work part of the collection. The “victory” was Koçs [Koç Family]”. The contestation was justified as if it was a competition over “sharing the art works with the Turkish public”:

In order to buy the “Tortoise Trainer” which was put on sale in number 189 on the auction list, there was a big contest among the Eczacıbaşı’s İstanbul Museum of Modern Art participated in the auction by phone and the representatives of Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Pera Museum who were available in the hall. In the rough-passing auction, the price given to the painting very much surpassed the expected price, and could not be reflected to the electronic screen. The Antik A.Ş. employees, who didn’t expect the price of the painting to reach 5 trillion, tried to show the selling price by their hands. The giving of 5 trillion to the painting by Pera Museum at last, was acclaimed by the participants. Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Art Consultant Ahmet Keskiner, who participated in the auction on behalf of Pera Museum, declared in his press statement that they bought the work that belonged to a private collection in order to share with the Turkish public. Keskiner said: “All our aim is to gain this masterpiece to Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Pera Museum and to share it with the Turkish public”. The İstanbul Museum of Modern Art, which was opened by the Prime Minister on the previous day, lost the contest for the “Tortoise Trainer” but, bought the collection of 20 paintings by Fahr El-Nissa Zeid for 800 billion lira, Nejat Melih Devrim’s abstract composition for 56 billion lira, a painting by Ömer Uluç for 30 billion lira, Ferruh Başağa’s oil painting for 50 billion lira and Burhan Doğançay’s “Magnificent Era” for 87 billion (ibid).

The interview given by İnan Kır   (H  rriyet Newspaper, 19.12.2004) in the aftermath of the acquisition is important for revealing the association of individual aspirations and interest in possessing the symbolic values inherited by an artwork and attributed to the painter:

Suna gave a very right decision because we already had four Osman Hamdi paintings. The reason why Suna desired that painting is very interesting: “We have the paintings of the same *ecole* but in the Turkish art who have the state of a patron is Osman Hamdi. We have the smaller ones and it has to be here and say that he’s here to become the elder brother of the others. Therefore I want this painting” said Suna. I came from abroad for the auction. I was not expecting İstanbul Modern to confront me, it may be the Sabancı Museum. But they had the right reasons too. We participated in the auction unaware of we are both participating, it should be like that. I don’t know whether the price is right or not but if you ask me why you’ve increased the price, I had no limit for what Suna wants. If they continued to increase the price, I could have increased. I believe that it came to a right place. There should be certain conditions to preserve these kinds of paintings and these conditions are met in the building that we’ve made.

As I discussed earlier, Osman Hamdi appeared as a crucial figure in forming the pioneering art institutions in the 19th century and setting the framework for future establishments. The painting *Tortoise Trainer* depicts an old man in red Ottoman costumes, holding a *ney* at his back, in an attempt to train the tortoises at his feet, looking from a window. Painting has often been associated with Osman Hamdi Bey’s own position and his role in the Ottoman society (Germaner & İrankur 2002; Shaw 2003). He had multiple roles as an educator, a museum director, and a committed statesman to change the Antiquities Law for benefit of the Empire. Thus, both the tortoises and the “trainer” had given symbolic meanings. Germaner and İrankur (2002) associated the tortoises with the characteristics of “hard-shell”, “slowness” and “hard-learning” and interpret the tortoises as the “society” and associate the man with a “dervish” that uses the *ney* – interpreted as the arts- as the only means to educate a society. Thus, as Suna Kır  ’s narrative well demonstrates, the acquisitions of artworks for extraordinary prices, forming collections and establishing museums are underwritten by the personal ambitions to be considered as elite in society and conflict over appropriating the social roles of elite in society.

The following example also supports the ambition to be considered as elite in society. Kırac organized a press meeting and introduced the museum that was planned to be opened in Suna Kırac's birthday on June 3 and gave an interview about the Museum (Hürriyet Newspaper, 19.12.2004) and stated that as of December 2004, they spend about 15 trillion TL not including the purchase of Tortoise Trainer. Furthermore, his statements on the collection and the Museum are important for revealing the association of these actors with the conception of private museums in Turkey:

Pirelli had a very beautiful book collection and a library. In a dinner, Milano University President says to him: "Let us perpetuate your name in the university and build a new library and move your books there". Pirelli accepts this offer and gives 5 million dollar and they make the building. And then moving the books there is the next. Pirelli looks at his books and cannot sacrifice them and leaves 20 of his books aside. When he thinks that it cannot happen this way, he calls the University President and says: "You made me a man that steals his own books. Let me give you 5 million dollar more and you get new books there. When I die, you take mine as well". We have ceramic tiles and orientalist paintings at home. I ask Suna what will we do now, they are leaving us and she says "We move the bed to the Museum".

The timing of the auction was very crucial because it was just a day later than the opening of the İstanbul Museum of Modern Art, which was also in the process of collection building for the means of announcing its establishment. The affiliation between the private museums and well-established families behind large conglomerates, attributed museums a special status. Private museums are represented as "extension" of their founders. DiMaggio (1991, p.273-274) suggested that before 1920's- before the enhancement of professionalization- in the case of US, foundations associated such as those associated with Rockefeller and Carnegie "served as extension of their founders" and later under new leadership they oriented towards activities in search for scientific solutions to social problems. In Turkey, there has been a competition between Koç and Sabancı families in a parallel manner to Rockefeller and Carnegie. I suggest that, in the Turkish case, philanthropic foundations have served as extensions of their founders for a long period of time. As I discussed in the case of İKSV in Chapter 5 for example, the foundation have been referred as an "extension" of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı and this hindered the foundation from pulling over different financial resources for a while. I suggest that the rupture in İKSV took place in mid 1990's

with the new professional leadership, in Sabancı Foundation it took place in 2006 with the moving of Foundation to İstanbul and focusing on different projects and professionalization. I suggest that in the case of private museums, since the museums are comparatively very recent formations, this extension issue is still relevant. However, it is crucial to note that incorporating professional staff and departmentalization are still important strategies adopted to give these organizational forms a professional character which I will discuss in section 8.2.3 when focusing on organizational structure of museums. I will now discuss missions and strategies of private museums.

8.2.1. Missions and Strategies

Three missions are prominent in these three cases: exhibition, education and contributing in the making of İstanbul a global city. I will discuss how these missions are realized by the collections, activities and undertakings of museums. The museum model portrayed by these three museums concentrates on permanent collection, incoming temporary exhibitions, education programs accompanying temporary exhibitions, separate education programs, outgoing international exhibitions.

Exhibition

Exhibition mission is realized through permanent exhibition and temporary exhibitions. Permanent collection functions as the main exhibition of the museums and organization of their exhibition spaces. The collections of the museums mostly formed by affiliated families' members' donations. Sabancı Museum's permanent collection is comprised of works from Sakıp Sabancı and Sabancı Family's collection. It is comprised of three main categories: (1) The Collection of the Arts of the Book and Calligraphy (pieces and works from 500 years of Ottoman calligraphy including Korans, kıtas, albums, panels, hilyes, edicts, endowments deeds and menşurs) displayed in the Ottoman Calligraphy Halls section of the mansion, (2) The Painting Collection (including works of art produced between 1850 and 1950; examples of early Turkish painting from the Republican Period

and late Ottoman period, besides the paintings by foreign artists who lived in Istanbul during the late Ottoman Empire) and (3) Furniture and decorations collection displayed on the ground floor of the mansion in family rooms (including the furniture and decorations used by the Sabancı Family during their residency) in addition to the stone works collection exhibited in Museum's garden (consisted of Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman pieces) (Sabancı Museum Official Webpage, Museum Brochure).

In Sabancı Museum, there is a significant interest in getting familiar with the Islamic art forms and most importantly with the artistic practices in the Ottoman Empire alongside the artworks produced in the Republican Era. One of the determining elements is the collection formed by Sakıp Sabancı prior to the opening of the museum. Sakıp Sabancı, followed his father and received consultancy from the art dealer and connoisseur Portakal Family and formed the collection that concentrated on Ottoman calligraphy, during late 1970s and onwards (Sabancı 1985). The second factor behind this interest is the right choice of Nazan Ölçer as the manager of the museum. Ölçer had a valuable experience with the Islamic arts during her course of duty in İstanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Arts. It is also crucial to note that, the rise of Neo-Ottomanist nostalgia in Turkey in the recent years, the change in the perception of the past which have found clear expression in popular culture, fashion, architecture and media and political life (Çolak 2006) have also contributed to the public perception of the museum as an institution that is close to the Turkish and Islamic and therefore “familiar” compared to the İstanbul Museum of Modern Arts.

Permanent collection is given special importance by Sabancı Museum's manager Nazan Ölçer. According to her the museum has a twofold mission actualized by exhibitions:

We stand on the pillars of a special collection. Our collection is comprised of majorly by calligraphy and paintings; there are decorative pieces, European porcelains and furnitures. The perspective that these two collections have is our mission. Ottoman calligraphy collections necessitate us to become acquainted with the Ottoman history and Islamic arts, whereas our painting collection requires us to be close to the Western art... We have two arms facing both the East and the West. While we are choosing our exhibitions,

acting in this direction, meeting the Turkish art lovers with the masters of Western art is part of our mission (Milliyet Newspaper, 2014).

İstanbul Modern collection consists of works from Turkish and foreign artists. It has a painting and a photography collection, including works from 20th century and onwards and living artists' works. Its explicit focus on contemporary arts is justified as the main difference from other two museums. Major collection donors are Oya Eczacıbaşı, Bülent Eczacıbaşı and Ethem Sancak and they are at the same time referred as the founders of the museum. İstanbul Modern has two main exhibition halls. The exhibition at the main floor is used for exhibiting the collection while the exhibition hall on the ground floor is used for temporary exhibitions hosts photography gallery and hosts exhibitions from variety of interdisciplinary areas such as architecture, design, video and new media and that part of the ground floor is considered as the "Pop-Up Exhibition Area" by the museum (İstanbul Modern Exhibitions, n.d.).

Nazan Ölçer underlines the permanent collection based on Ottoman and Islamic works and introducing Western art as two underlying elements for their exhibition mission. Oya Eczacıbaşı, the Chairman of İstanbul Modern, however, emphasizes introducing the "contemporary":

When Istanbul Modern opened, we promised to offer our audiences an opportunity to witness, learn about, enjoy, and appreciate and to continually become updated with the evolution of contemporary art. In order to establish museum visits as sustained leisure activities, to increase Museum attendance on a cumulative basis, and to constantly capture the public's attention, we aspired to create a dynamic and evolving structure. We believe that we have achieved this goal (İstanbul Modern Official Webpage, 2013).

Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation collection includes Orientalist Painting collection, The Anatolian Weights and Measures Collection, Kütahya Tiles and Ceramic Collection and Old İstanbul Photographs Collection. Pera Museum organizes long-term thematic exhibitions of this Orientalist Painting collection at the Sevgi and Erdoğan Gönül Gallery which consists of works by European artists inspired by the Ottoman world and Ottoman artists influenced by them (Pera Museum Official Webpage, Collections, 2014). The second collection of The Anatolian Weights and Measures is comprised over 8000 pieces dating from prehistory to those used in present day Anatolia, which are presented as "illustrating relations between

measuring systems of different periods and regions, illuminating various changes and continuities” (ibid). Selected works from the collection of Kütahya and Tiles Collection which have been formed from 1980s and onwards and consists of over 800 pieces from 18th to 20th centuries are exhibited in the Museum as well (ibid).

The collection belongs to Kıracı Family. Besides the competition among the private museums in terms of adding items to the collection, conflicts also occur within the same family. I consider the following example crucial for revealing how acquisition of paintings symbolize power struggle. When it was asked İnan Kıracı (Hürriyet Newspaper, 19.12.2004) whether there is a painting that he wishes to add to his collection he responds: “From time to time, when I see very powerful orientalist, there have been such paintings that I wished I could buy. But then, there were artworks which I could not afford as a Kıracı, and Suna could not purchase them not to oppress me (...) until now, I haven’t used a consultant. However, for 20 years Ahmet Keskiner helped us for forming our collections. At the same time, he worked as an advisor for Sadberk Hanım Museum. Keskiner has an importance. He did not make us confront with each other as a family. The deceased Sevgi for example had collected İznik tiles, we collected Kütahya. He might have sold expensive pieces but now if they look, there is never a fake piece in the collection.”

Private museums’ underlying function is to serve as formations to preserve the private collections of these large families’ members. Exhibition mission justifies the stance of private museums. Furthermore it is incorporated with the education mission since the main guiding principle is presented as meeting the public with the arts.

Philanthropic foundation framework allows individuals to donate works from their private collections to the museums. It also prohibits the selling of the painting by the forthcoming generations and secures permanence. And, it is the main resource of funding for establishing a collection. Tax exemption granted to these foundations and donators further serve as a beneficiary factor.

Kıraç suggested in 2004 (ibid) the acquisitions would continue and gave insights into the institutionalization as in the form of foundation.

The life of a painting or a antique if it stays in a family is 30 years. In fact, this is the maximum duration. If the incoming generation does not like the painting, whether they don't hang it or sell it. If it is a property of a foundation then the painting cannot be sold. However, a fund is required to sustain foundation's functions. And the amount of such a fund is one to one. That is to say, you need to leave a fund which is equal to the fund allocated to the foundation including the artworks in the collection. That is how you can meet the expenses and purchase new works of art. We may generate such a fund while we are alive but when we die our assets will be the foundation's.

In addition to the permanent collection, temporary exhibitions further serve for the exhibition mission. As I compiled from the official webpages and formed a list of incoming exhibitions, Sabancı Museum, since its foundation from September 2002 until February 2014 organized 32 temporary exhibitions, İstanbul Modern since its establishment in December 2004 until December 2014 has hosted 78 temporary exhibitions and Pera Museum from June 2005 until February 2014 organized 56 temporary exhibitions (see Appendix). Temporary exhibitions are the main fuel to attract public and to create the habit of visiting museums. Especially Sabancı Museum's temporary exhibitions that focus on masters of Western art, explicitly oriented towards this mission. Alongside the permanent collection, organizing temporary exhibitions is the main axis of competition among private museums. The contestation is over bringing popular names and number of visitors. The private museums rely on internationally well-known museums, collections and popular artists and hope that these temporary exhibitions would bring recognition, acclaim and would facilitate increase in museum visits. Temporary exhibitions are accompanied by promotional activities and marketing arrangements.

As part of the mission-introducing the wider public with the masters of Western visual arts- stated by Ölçer, Sabancı Museum organized exhibitions on Picasso, Rodin, Dali, Miro, Rembrandt during the last decade. The underlying mission attempted to be accomplishes is the education of the public. This is not so different from the missions of the modernizing elites in the Republican Era, which aimed to facilitate ways of educating and secularizing the public through developing encounters with the Western forms of art.

Big promotional campaigns have utilized for attracting the public and receiving recognition and acclaim. This in fact, contributed to the progress in visiting museums especially during the highly promoted events. Most of the news that focus on the Sabancı Museum in the press, use the word *kuyruk*- referring to queuing lines that are formed in front of the Museum during the respective exhibitions to emphasize and express the extreme popularity of the exhibition in the public. This situation can be regarded as a success of the promotion and marketing applied by the Sabancı Museum regardless of the value of the works of arts presented as some have criticized. Yet, it is also important to note that it indicates to the emergence of a consciousness, awareness and a learning process in society. I find the following example interesting to depict the reaction of public to incorporate the interest in arts and eagerness to “see an exhibition” in daily life activities:

You will remember. During the course of “Picasso İstanbul” exhibition in the Sabancı Museum, the drivers of the minibuses which run to Emirgan from various places in the city were calling people as “To Picasso! One, two... To Picasso one two...” and when the buses stop in Emirgan bus stop the drivers were asking as if “Is there anyone getting off in Picasso? (Zeynep Oral Personal Webpage, 2006).

As in the case of popular exhibitions, people waiting in lines in front of the museum and using the common transportation to reach the Museum with the eagerness to see the exhibitions, the Sabancı Museum has altered the ways of perceiving museum visiting procedures by determining visitor policies in a didactic way. Nazan Ölçer states:

Those who come wait in very long lines outside. I know, myself waiting in the line for two hours under the rain to see a Modigliani exhibition. But, it cannot be entered next to the artworks with wet clothes. We say them leave your coats. When you explain them people are persuaded. The humidity of the exhibition halls is very important. We report to the museums that send the paintings and the Picasso Administration by weekly reports. For instance, everyone should leave their coats and bags. However sometimes we experience funny incidents. For example, a woman once shouted “I won’t leave my four thousand dollar Louis Vuitton bag here”. And another visitor left her very valuable fur coat without saying a word. All of these are for exhibition’s convenience and works’ safety. Among more than 90 thousand visitors, just 10 persons may have objected (Arkitera, 2006).

The number of visitors is also an important component of the representation of the museum in the press and media. It is crucial to note that especially, throughout the history of the museum, extensively promoted exhibitions, promoted through incorporating big masters' names with İstanbul, such as Picasso in İstanbul, Rodin in İstanbul, Dali in İstanbul have contributed to the awareness in public for visiting museum. The media coverage of the events, presentation of the press meetings on special TV programs on cultural and artistic events, showing part of the exhibition alongside a guided tour by Museum's manager Nazan Ölçer, outdoor campaigns have been used as tools for promoting the exhibitions.

Pera Museum followed a similar track in the temporary exhibitions. The past exhibitions include works from artists such as Jean Dubuffet, Henri Cartier-Bresson, Rembrandt, Niko Pirosmeni, Josef Koudelka, Joan Miró, Akira Kurosawa, Marc Chagall, Pablo Picasso, Fernando Botero, Frida Kahlo, Diego Rivera, and Goya (Pera Museum Official Webpage, 2014).

What is understood from the accomplishment of exhibition mission is therefore, organizing temporary exhibitions and bringing in the collections of Western counterparts' collections and receiving public attention.

Education

As discussed above exhibitions serve for the education mission. For Sabancı Museum, since the museum was constructed a "university museum" from the beginning, education is incorporated to the missions of the museum since its establishment. A workshop was organized to determine museums' missions before its establishment. This workshop aimed at determining the founding principles and museum's missions and functions. It is stated by Balçioğlu (2002, p.119-121) the museum model was debated among the participants and driving subject was to "differentiate" the museum that would be established among the other museums in İstanbul. Various models were offered by participants, such as "a laboratory of ideas instead of an open museum", "an industry museum", "a museum focusing on contemporary art", "a museum that exhibits loan collections" and the risk of

failure due to the similarity between the collections of Sakıp Sabancı and İstanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art Museum's collections was pronounced. Nonetheless, importance of prominence, the association and harmony between the museum's content and Sabancı Museum and education mission was emphasized. The role of the Sabancı University was discussed, forming an advisory board from the university members was suggested, and the importance of determining museum's education mission in accordance academic staff was underlined (Balcıoğlu 2002, p.121-122). The examples of Rhode Island School of Design Museum, Harvard Art Museums, Anthropology Museums in Denmark Louisiana and Mexico City were given. In this respect the education mission in the case of Sabancı, is in harmony with the missions of Sabancı Foundation and Sabancı University.

As the rising themes in the opening speeches of Sabancı Museum reveals, the museum was presented as "A villa full of works", as an institution "belonging to public", "contribution to city, history and the university" and a "contribution to the development of the country" and suggested as an "educational institution" which is open to public.

The claims that can be summarized as the museum "belongs to the public" for educating the public, appearing in the opening speeches of the strategic actors involved in the process not only serves as a contribution for the development of a rhetoric that suggests accumulating wealth is important for sharing with the wider public and for its development but also legitimizes the stance of the museum as an autonomous institution.

It is emphasized by Nazan Ölçer in various occasions and the interview that I conducted that the Museum not only makes exhibitions but also "educate" people. This claim is supported by conferences, seminar and film screenings simultaneously happening with the respective exhibitions. Especially during the course of Picasso exhibition, which can be regarded as the first blockbuster exhibition of the Museum, followed by Rodin exhibition, this feature is emphasized. Nazan Ölçer stated in an interview appeared in a newspaper

(Arkitera reporting from Akşam Newspaper, 2006) that “We are intended not to send those who come here back without learning Picasso”.

Sabancı Museum initiated education programs such as “neighborhood days” that invite “neighbors” to visit the museum, special project designed for taxi drivers that drive customers to the Museum, to make them visit the Museum, with the claim “learn the inside of the place that you drove”, state school students free group visits, free boat service and sea transport from the Asian side for those intend to visit the Museum, hosting of events such as Jazz in Ramadan, Jazz at Breakfast are designed in accordance with Museum’s education mission besides some of them being commercial activities.

The education of the public appears as one of the salient missions in the case of İstanbul Modern. İstanbul Modern carried on free education programs, summer art workshops, social projects such as Mother & Child Art Workshops, We Meet, The Color I Touch and Mobile Education, with the help of external funding of the sponsors. The main target of the education programs are the children and youngsters. Compared to Sabancı Museum, the Audio guides are not free of charge, and free guided tours are limited on certain days and should be reserved in advance. The Museum also offers paid tours. Education Department also produces publications for children such as practical learning of artists and colors (İstanbul Modern Official Webpage, Education, 2014). Above all, İstanbul Modern’s permanent collection exhibition and incoming temporary exhibitions emerged as the claims of educating the public and developing the country. Eczacıbaşı Holding refers to its founder, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’s statement in this respect: “Every investment in the arts and culture directly contributes to the development of society's wealth, to the economy and politics and to the whole fibre of society” and justifies the claim with his social position, represented as a “responsible businessman” in various places (Dündar 2000).

Education mission gave way to the development of a department in the organizational structure of İstanbul Modern. Educational programs of İstanbul Modern are supported by the local government:

One of our missions is education. We have a separate department on education and we are providing free education. We have only one program that has a fee, except that all our education programs are free. And private schools can take the children very easily. However, we are in collaboration with the Directorate of National Education which gives an official paper to schools that says “yes you can go to the Museum” yet the schools have no vehicles to transport children here. (...) In this case we go to the municipalities and they provide those vehicles for us for free. As in this case, especially in the developing areas, for example housewives have some programs that they do with the support of municipalities, we invite them absolutely to the Museum and show them around, give them guided tours, and give them education. That is to say, we can have support of municipalities in issues as such (Ms. Güniz Atis Azrak, pers.comm.,20 January).

The Pera Museum conveys its missions as “offering an outstanding range of diverse high quality culture and art services”, “diffuse the aesthetic beauty” of its collections to public, “create dialogue with the public concerning the values and identities that they encompass” (Pera Museum Official Webpage, n.d.).

The Pera Museum is the part of Suna and İnan Kırac Foundation therefore shares the mission of the Foundation. In fact there is no clear differentiation between the Museum and the Foundation in terms of missions and organization. It is institutionally integrated. The general aim stated by the Foundation is “to provide a lasting legacy for the Turkish population by promoting the domains of education, healthcare, culture and art” (Suna and İnan Kırac Foundation). The fields of education and culture and arts are integrated in the conveyance of the missions. The Pera Museum in this respect appears as the institutional brand name that demonstrates the presence of the Family in these integrated fields.

Contributing in the making of İstanbul a Global City

Harvey (2002, p. 103) extends the use of Bourdieu’s concepts symbolic capital and distinction by using the terms for places rather than limiting the use of the terms for individuals. He argues (ibid) that “the power of collective symbolic capital, of special marks of distinction that attach to some place” is at stake when concerning its drawing power upon the flows of capital. He suggests that places like Paris, New York, Athens, Berlin are provided with the economic advantages since collective symbolic capital is attached to those places as well as being the grounds

for claims of uniqueness, marks of distinction and consecutively yield monopoly rent. Thus, Harvey views for example Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao with signature Gehry architecture and the willingness of major financial institutions to finance this project as the struggle for collective symbolic capital and consecutively basis for monopoly rents. Moreover, the question is who benefits most from the collective symbolic capital, is of significance. Harvey (2002, p.107) claims that capitalists who are well-aware of the association between the accumulation of collective symbolic capital by cities and the fashion and aesthetics, and always desire monopoly rent and according to him seek to gain it through interventions in the field of culture, history, heritage, aesthetics and aesthetics is of great importance for capitalists and can be considered as a potential weapon for class struggle.

In a similar fashion, cultural policies were oriented to brand İstanbul to integrate it to the global capital and capitalists in Turkey are well aware of city's symbolic capital. This became more explicit especially during the last decade, as I discussed earlier in Chapter 6. "Major business conglomerates, along with their cultural foundations have been competing one another for suitable spaces to build arts and cultural centres" and "[c]orporate philanthropists stress that they undertake such large commitments in arts and culture in the spirit of making gift to the city" (Aksoy 2012, p.102).

Private museums that I focus here form the best examples of this commitment. During the formation of Sabancı Museum, the salient missions conveyed through the statements of Sakıp Sabancı, Güler Sabancı and former museum manager Emin Mahir Balcıoğlu and former President of the Sabancı University Tosun Terzioğlu (Sabancı Holding Press Release, 2002). The prominent aims pronounced are "contributing to the developments of the arts, culture and education", "contributing to the history, university and history" and "promoting and fostering our cultural heritage with a universal vision thus taking on a leadership role in interacting with national and international bodies in order to become a place where all cultures are embraced".

Sabancı Museum shares the mission of promoting Turkey with its unique cultural heritage and geographical and symbolic position, through international partnerships in the incoming exhibitions and its activities. Museum's choice of exhibitions and partner institutions are important in this respect. Most importantly İstanbul has been highlighted through temporary exhibitions. It has worked in two levels: First, Sabancı Museum has been addressed for the success of bringing important masters' work in İstanbul which provided social recognition and prestige. Second, İstanbul has been emphasized as the center of arts and part of the broader art world. For example the incoming temporary exhibitions which have contributed to the domestic and worldwide recognition of the museum and highlighted İstanbul were: Picasso in İstanbul (2005) Salvador Dali: A Surrealist in İstanbul (2008), İsfahan, Delhi Three Capitals of Islamic Art in (2008), Anish Kapoor in İstanbul (2013) Venice and Istanbul during the Ottoman Period; Love, by any other name (2009) and Legendary Istanbul - From Byzantion to Istanbul (2010).

In the Sabancı Museum's case, technical infrastructure was developed in accordance with this mission. For example the exhibition halls were expanded in 2005 and equipped with the "international state of the art technical structure". This has served the museum for providing opportunity for international partnerships and facilitated the actualization of incoming exhibitions. It is important to note that the museum was also represented by the state institutions. One of the particularities in this respect is the reference given to the museum in bilateral agreements between Turkey and other countries as an appropriate space and institution to establish cultural exchange through professional exchange and exchange of collections to organize exhibitions and cultural events. For example in 2007 Sabancı Museum was addressed in the bilateral cultural exchange agreement between China and Turkey, as having the suitable infrastructure to host important exhibitions that would be coming from China (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, 28.10.2007). In the same year, in a bilateral agreement on educational and cultural partnership between Spain and Turkey, Sabancı Museum once again appeared as an institution willing to host incoming exhibitions from Spain and

sending its collections to Spain for an exhibition (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, 08.12.2007). In 2008, Sabancı Museum was referred again in the bilateral agreement between Italy and Turkey on cultural partnership (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey, 06.01.2008).

In private museums, incorporating additional attractive activities, restaurant and a conference space further supported the mission of contributing to making of İstanbul as a global center for culture and arts.

Sabancı Museum benefits from the recreational activities such as dining, sight-seeing and incorporating them to Museum's environment and activities. It was conceptualized as a recreational place by its Manager with the claims of offering an integrated place with a restaurant. An avangard famous restaurant that was opened in Taksim, İstanbul, called Changa, has been integrated to the Museum's complex, by incorporating the "museum" in its name: *Müzedechanga (Changa at the museum)*. The formation of this integrated conceptualization of the museum is associated with the claims of making the museum an "international museum". This claim has been apparent since the "Picasso in İstanbul" exhibition between November 2005 and March 2006 which have not only reached over 90.000 visitors (Arkitera 2006) but also increased the interaction between the museum and the public.

Nazan Ölçer in an interview she gave to Arkitera in 2006 stated that: "The responsibility of the museum is to expand people's horizons. When people come to a museum they should be happy. People have to have joy all in all; with the artworks they have seen, with its conference, the music they listened, the food they have eaten. I have eaten most joyful dinners in museums' restaurants. Therefore, it is so important that Müzedechanga is in this concept." The below quotation is important for exemplifying how Güler Sabancı is effective in visioning and taking decisions in the Museum, and the association between the integration of a Restaurant and the intended "international standards". It is in fact a strategic decision that was developed long before the Picasso exhibition by Güler Sabancı.

It was stated by Tarık Beyazıt, the founder of Changa Restaurant, that Güler Sabancı took the initiative:

Three and a half years ago Güler Sabancı came and said “Let’s do something here”. But then, we couldn’t trust on ourselves. (...) Although Güler Hanım repeated this from time to time we couldn’t make an attempt. When Sakıp Bey died, we went for a visit for offering our condolences. She called us aside and said: “Museum is my uncle’s will. We will take steps to fulfill international standards”. Then, she became the Chairperson of the Holding, and the issue was suspended. However, during the preparation of the Picasso exhibition, they called us on June 20, and Nazan Hanım asked whether the space they thought for receptions was suitable for us and we said yes, sure. We presented them the concept on the 23rd. They decided very quickly; trusted on us and left us independent.

Private museum, gave way to other business opportunities. It is common to use the museum space for other than hosting exhibitions. One of the common ways is opening the space available for other business opportunities and using the space for hosting events. Events can vary from hosting national or international events such as concerts, recitals, conferences, gala nights, receptions, launching events, or prize-giving ceremonies. One example of this can be found in Sabancı Museum as well. The museum building is located in one of the well-known districts of the city and views the Bosphorus from a nice perspective. The museum administration not only uses this as an attraction for its possible visitors, but also for creating business opportunities. In 2009, an event center called “The Seed” was opened in Sabancı Museum. It is described as the “multi-purpose event center”. The center has been operated by the French company GL Events Group, which declared itself as “international” and experienced to share its accumulation with the sector in İstanbul. In a newspaper article (Sabah Newspaper, 14.06.2009) titled as “*Bu tür projeler kenti birinci lige çıkarıyor*” (These kinds of projects elevate the city to the first league) The Seed introduced itself to the public. Once more, the partnership and the necessity of such space were justified by a well-recognized emphasis: “if İstanbul claim to be a “world city” in real terms, it requires the international know-how to operate the hosting of special culture and arts events”. The Seed was represented as a gift of Sabancı to İstanbul.

As I discussed above, contributing to İstanbul is explicitly listed in the founding aims of İstanbul Modern Art Foundation that control the İstanbul Modern. The museum even incorporated İstanbul in its name and the philanthropic foundation behind it. İKSV, which was directly affiliated with İstanbul Modern during its establishment clearly focused on contributing İstanbul. Thus, the mission is shared among the different initiatives affiliated with the Eczacıbaşı Family and Eczacıbaşı Holding. The difference of İstanbul Modern is its focus on contemporary art to highlight the city, rather than rediscovering its “oriental” or “Islamic” past. In this respect, İstanbul Modern shares the global trend of corporations’ interest in contemporary arts. As I discussed earlier, Wu (2002) associated the corporations’ interest in contemporary art with its avant-garde and innovative character and emphasized the intention of corporations to reflect their own images by supporting contemporary arts. This argument is very relevant in the case of İstanbul Modern and Eczacıbaşı’s undertakings and commitment. İstanbul Modern, concentrates on interdisciplinary areas (video, design, architecture) and hopes to integrate with the global art world and gain recognition and acclaim. And among the three museums, the issue of tourism and contributing to the tourism of İstanbul are salient issues in İstanbul Modern.

Kıraç Family was represented among the “Families who make İstanbul ‘The İstanbul’” (Akgüneş 2012) in a newspaper article that focused on families that contributed to İstanbul. İstanbul Research Institute and Pera Museum that were founded by Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation were referred as main contributions. Pera Museum is an extension to accomplish the aim of highlighting İstanbul of the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation. First of all the name of the museum is a powerful symbol of highlighting İstanbul and its most symbolic district of *Pera*. Pera stands for the “civilization”, the “Europe” in İstanbul, “West” and as the entertainment center for the secularists (Bartu 1999, p.45-54).

Another example from the Pera Museum’s case is the exhibitions on İstanbul. İstanbul in Pera Museum: Old İstanbul Photographs. In 2006 and in 2012 Pera Museum organized “From Konstantiniyye to Istanbul Photographs of the Rumeli Shore of the Bosphorus from the mid XIXth century to XX century” and “From

Konstantiniyye to İstanbul Photographs of the Anatolian Shore of the Bosphorus from the mid XIXth Century to XX Century” exhibitions respectively. In 2010 it organized “Hipodrom and Atmeydanı: A Stage for İstanbul’s History” exhibition. Another past collection exhibition was titled as “İstanbul: The City of Dreams” that focused on scenes of İstanbul and daily life in the Ottoman world from 17th to the early 20th century. These examples reveal the efforts to highlight İstanbul and branding the city.

It is crucial to note that all three museums are all located in strategic locations which can be suggested as city’s touristic attractions. Now I will discuss the element of building and its importance in institutionalization of three private museums.

8.2.2. Edifice

The physical structure (building) necessary for the establishment of a museum is an important element of the institutionalization process of the private museums. Ownership of the building by the philanthropic foundation that establishes the museum is an advantage for the permanency of the private museum. It enables more freedom for the museum’s operations. Besides, it serves for the unity of the founding family, philanthropic foundation and the private museum. Among the three museums, Sabancı Museum and Pera Museum own the museum building, while İstanbul Modern’s building is allocated to the museum by the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality. This places İstanbul Modern in a risky position. I will discuss the implications of these differences.

The building that hosts Sabancı Museum museum was transformed into a museum from a villa that had been a residence for Sabancı Family for over fifty years, prior to the opening of the museum. Building’s acquisition history demonstrates the transformation of the country and the wealthy individuals that reside in İstanbul. The villa was designed in 1925, by an Italian architect, Eduard de Nari, for Prince Mehmed Ali Hasan of Egypt. This historical building accommodated Prince Mehmed Ali Hasan’s sister, Princess Iffet Hasan, for a short period of time,

beginning in 1944. Later in 1951, Hacı Ömer Sabancı bought it to become the family's summer residence. Although the villa was accommodated by Sakıp Sabancı and his family in the aftermath of the death of Hacı Ömer Sabancı in 1966, it was sold to Sabancı Holding and in 1998. Sabancı Holding allocated the building, its contents and garden to Sabancı University. This facilitated the transformation of the building into a museum with necessary renovations and equipment for technical infrastructure. The exterior appearance was kept entirely same and an additional building was built for the running of the museum.

The building is renamed after the placement of a sculpture in the garden as the “Atlı Köşk” (Equestrian Villa). The bronze horse sculpture, sculpted by Louis Daumas in Paris in 1864, and casted by Vor Thiebaut was bought by father Hacı Ömer Sabancı when the “Marble Villa” at Moda, formerly owned by Mahmut Muhtar Pasha was sold. There is an interesting story behind the acquisition of the respective sculpture which symbolizes the competition between two large conglomerates Koç and Sabancı. An incident was given a place in Sabancı's autobiography (1985, p.120) regarding the harsh competition among Hacı Ömer Sabancı and Vehbi Koç. The auction of the sculpture turned into a power struggle between two families. The auction resulted by the acquisition of the horse sculpture by Hacı Ömer Sabancı, while Vehbi Koç left the auction with a deer sculpture with an unforeseen high price. Hacı Ömer Sabancı placed the horse sculpture on the grounds of his villa as the distinctive symbol of his victory, while Vehbi Koç placed the deer in front of Divan Otel owned by the company.

The past of the building attributes Sabancı Museum a particular position. Since the building hosted the Sabancı Family and Sakıp Sabancı lived in the building, a “house museum” character was attributed to the museum. This quality serves in many ways. First, some of the exhibition halls in the building kept as original. This enables the visitors to “visit” the house of a capitalist dynasty and justifies the Sabancı Family's social position in the social class structure. It serves for Sabancı Museum to promote the museum as a house museum which enables them to “invite” visitors to experience the life-style of Sakıp Sabancı. Second, it allows the museum to allocate a special exhibition hall for Sakıp Sabancı, as the founder.

Recently, the exhibition hall is renovated and audiovisual elements are included. Visitors can interactively view Sakıp Sabancı's life history, Sabancı Family's social and cultural initiatives, and photographs taken with his extensive social network ranging from presidents to artists, personal belongings such as Metropolitan Museum of Art Membership Card, state orders and awards. Thus, the building serves both the museum and Sabancı Family for social recognition.

I want to discuss the İstanbul Modern's founding history which I consider directly related with acquiring the building required for establishing a private museum. The history of the establishment of the İstanbul Museum of Modern Art, is important in two levels. First, it is a case of institutionalization of a private museum in Turkey in which all contradictions occurring from economic, political and social changes in the country within the last two decades are embedded in its formation. Second, how the building necessitated for the formation of a museum acts as an axis of institutionalization and appears as an area of tension.

Prior to the 1st İstanbul Biennial (1987), İstanbul was under transformation with regard to major urban restructuring project lead by then Mayor Bedrettin Dalan. The historical city had been connected to Galata and Pera districts in order to lead the tourist traffic to this area. As Kortun states (Baliç and Ermiş, 2013, p.192) in the aftermath of the major transformation, the removal of industrial structures and destruction of almost all buildings in the Golden Horn and its two shores, the potential of the Feshane's major building, Sötlüce Slaughterhouse, Silahtarağa Power Plant have become visible. This led to an expansion of interest in utilizing these buildings among the private capital. Meanwhile, the Chairman of the İKSV, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, was influenced by the impact of 1st International İstanbul Contemporary Arts Exhibition on İstanbul's cultural scene and the vitality that was brought by the exhibition to the city's artistic life. As suggested by Oya Eczacıbaşı (Baliç and Ermiş, p.192) he was thinking of establishing a permanent institution hosting contemporary arts exhibitions. Furthermore, the first two Biennials organized in 1987 and 1989 respectively, yielded the importance of a permanent place. This is because, İKSV encountered problems for finding a place for its

organizations. Particularly the case of Biennial contributed to the ideas of having a permanent place and establishing a contemporary art museum.

At this point, in the aftermath of the first two Biennials, the request of a permanent place from the Municipality resulted in the allocation of Feshane building for the purpose of transforming it into a permanent museum (Baliç and Ermiş, p.215).

In 1991, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı attempted to find support for taking an initiative in establishing a museum of modern arts and renovating the building. Beral Madra explained it as follows:

First two Biennials opened the way for the organization of the third one in Feshane. I had already left İKSV but still I was in contact. Yahşi Baraz, Bedri Baykan, Vasıf Kortun, I and Adnan Çoker organized a big meeting in Ramada Hotel. Nejat Bey invited bulk of businessmen to that meeting. We told them “There is a need for a modern arts museum,”. The Municipality allocated Feshane. Feshane was a wreck during the time. Oya Hanım (Eczacıbaşı) asked me “Beral Hanım, who should we construct this building?” And I suggested her the architect that made Musée d’Orsay, Gae Aulenti (cited in Baliç and Ermiş, p.215).

The Feshane building was built by the imperial edict of Sultan Abdülmecit in 1839 in Eyüp Defterdar district, in order to meet the need of fez and clothing of Ottoman army and worked as one of the first textile institution in the Ottoman Empire. The goods it had produced were awarded in Chicago in 1893 in an International Fair. In 1939, in the Republican Turkey, the factory then named as Feshane Mensucat A.Ş. was closed and turned into Sümerbank Defterdar Factory and in 1986 the factory was emptied by Dalan Municipality in 1986 in the framework of restructuring Golden Horn area (Mimarizm 2008).

Following the meeting initiated by Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, the project found recognition in the newspapers (Milliyet Newspaper, 11.06. 1991 cited in Baliç and Ermiş, p.215). Then director of İKSV, Aydın Gün, justified this new project referring to projects in Berlin and Paris which turned the factories into modern art museum. He suggested that if they attempted to construct a building, it would take more time. He stated that: “We will immediately start working tomorrow and we will cover this big shame of İstanbul. This should not be forgotten, this is an age long service”. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı stated that he will allocate 14 billion for the

beginning but it is difficult to estimate the total amount. The physical arrangement would be done by two experts from Paris and Berlin. And they would try to finish the project by the opening of Biennial on plastic arts.

Feshane was rearranged by architect Gae Aulenti but the efforts only resulted by the use of the place for the 3rd Biennial in 1992, because of changes in the local government of İstanbul. Welfare Party's İstanbul candidate Recep Tayyip Erdoğan won the municipality elections in 1994. This had important consequences on the history of the project. Oya Eczacıbaşı explained the reason behind this by suggesting that the project was rejected due to the disagreement between İKSV and the Municipality with regard to Museum's administrative model and they could not "overcome bureaucratic obstacles" (cited in Baliç and Ermiş, p.227).

Almost ten years later after this disagreement, the establishment of the Museum was possible. The fourth warehouse building on the Galata Pier, near the historical building of the Mimar Sinan Academy of Fine Arts served as the main venue for the 8th İstanbul Biennial in 2003. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, this time being the Prime Minister, "gave his approval for the permanent use of the site" and the 8.000 square meter dry cargo warehouse owned by the Turkish Maritime Organization, was converted into a modern museum building (İstanbul Modern Official Webstite, 2014).

It is ironic as Kortun states (cited in Baliç and Ermiş, p.226) that Erdoğan was the person who cancelled the project and later became the person who opened the Museum. This situation can be conceived as the convergence of interests in 2000s where the government strongly advocated the neoliberal policies (Öniş 2004) and consider the marketing of İstanbul through cultural activities that attract international attention as part of the neoliberal political agenda (Aksoy 2012). İstanbul Modern served as a "showcase" in İstanbul. For example İstanbul Modern was opened four days prior to the "16-17 December European Council Meeting" and it was stated that Prime Minister Erdoğan asked for a word for the opening of the Museum prior to the Council Meeting (Arkitera, 15.01.2005).

In the midst of December 2004, the newspapers were covering the news of the opening of İstanbul Museum of Modern Art, as the first private museum of modern art in Turkey. Radikal Newspaper, which was founded by the Doğan Media Group, proudly announced the opening of the museum to its readers on December 12, 2004. Because another subsidiary of Doğan Media Group, Milliyet Newspaper's Editor in Chief, Mehmet Y. Yılmaz received a plaque from Prime Minister Erdoğan for Group's "contribution to the arts" as in the form of sponsorship in the "vigorous" opening ceremony of the Museum. It was stated in the news that in the opening ceremony, the congratulatory greeting messages of the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, French President Jacques Chirac, and Germany Prime Minister Gerhard Schröder were read. Turkey's Minister of Culture and Tourism, Erkan Mumcu, the Chairman of İKSV Şakir Eczacıbaşı and İstanbul Modern's Chairman Oya Eczacıbaşı delivered their opening speeches. According to the Radikal Newspaper there were 3000 invitees from the "art circles" to see the opening. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan delivered a speech at the opening ceremony of İstanbul Modern. Erdoğan stated:

I am proud of the opening of İstanbul Modern, as being someone who administered this city. I think that politics end up with detriment from the gap it has with the arts. As a part of institution of politics and being the Prime Minister of Turkish Republic, I should note that the culture and arts are not taking adequate place among the values that determine politics. We have to do this self-criticism. The new museums will be established like this. In the period where we have been taking new steps in every respect, politics has to pay its debt to the arts (Radikal Newspaper, 12.12.2004).

Erdoğan appeared fully devoted to the opening of İstanbul Modern and other private museums. His stance reflected the cultural policy orientation in branding İstanbul through utilizing culture and arts.

Ten years after its opening in 2004, the problems regarding the place have not disappeared. İstanbul Modern encountered the risk of closing first in 2012. The Galata Port Project was announced as a project aimed at restructuring the port and planned to demolish port buildings. There had been news regarding the closing of the Museum during the period. This time state authorities defended the position of the İstanbul Modern and appeared as the warrantor of İstanbul Modern's existence.

Minister of Culture and Tourism Ertuğrul Günay stated in a panel on “Culture Tourism and İstanbul” that: “There are other buildings of top priority that need to be demolished in that site. Among these, İstanbul Modern is the structure that has contributed most to the cultural life of İstanbul. Therefore, as I said before, without finding a permanent solution for İstanbul Modern, our Ministry cannot give any official indorsement as such” (Sıcak Gündem, 12.4.2012). Prime Minister Erdoğan, one week later in a speech he delivered for the opening of Trump Towers Mall, stated that: “There is no such thing! İstanbul Modern will not be destroyed. As long as I live, İstanbul Modern will survive” (En Son Haber, 19.4.2014) and elsewhere it was reported as:

Recently, I have read in newspapers something like İstanbul Modern’s removal and demolishment. I have no news as such. Where did it come from? I am surprised. Apparently, there have been speculators in this business as well. They are making these things up, and taking steps as such, in order to prompt a negative development. Last night, I told the administration [İstanbul Modern] as well. As long as I stay as the Prime Minister of this country, İstanbul Modern will stay in its place, because we are the ones that made this promise (BirGün Newspaper, 16.07.2014).

More recently there are rumors about the moving of the İstanbul Modern with the Galata Port Project to another building Paket Postanesi in Karaköy and building of a new Museum to the port site whereby the Doğuş Group (which won the tender on operating the İstanbul Salıpazarı Port Site in 2013) will be effective in the rearrangement of the site as well as being anticipated to open a restaurant on the top level of the planned building (BirGün Newspaper, 16.07.2014).

Unlike the case of İstanbul Modern, Pera Museum’s building is owned by the Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation. The Museum is located in a historical building in Tepebaşı, Beyoğlu, İstanbul. Formerly, the building was conceived as Bristol Hotel and it was restored by architect Sinan Genim and equipped with the infrastructure necessitated by a museum while preserving the exterior façade (Pera Museum Official Site, About, 2014). The establishment of the Pera Museum can be associated with the urban restructuring projects that aimed to transform İstanbul into a metropolis (Keyder and Öncü 1994 cited in Bartu 1999, p.47) and create an image of the city suitable for the international recognition (Robins and Aksoy

1995 cited in Bartu 1999, p.46) initiated during the course of Bedrettin Dalan's governance that highlighted the business potential of old buildings.

Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation intended to initiate another cultural center project in Tepebaşı İstanbul. Although the Project regarding the taking over the Tepebaşı Building that houses TRT was on the agenda during the formation years of the Museum, as of 2009, the project was "put on hold" whereby the "municipality decreased the allocation period from 49 to 30 years and demanded nearly 100 percent increase in payment" followed by an economic crisis in 2008 which worsened the conditions (Hürriyet Daily News, n.d.). Besides the İstanbul Modern example, this also reveals that property deals are very crucial among the local and central governments and capitalist entrepreneurs.

8.2.3. Organizational Structure

Organizational structure is an important dimension of institutionalization. In the cases of three private museums, the professionals are incorporated into the organizational structure through administrative organs. The employment of professional directors is a crucial strategy in three of the cases. The administrative structure of the philanthropic foundations behind the formation of museums is effective in planning and organizing the museum's administration.

Sabancı Museum's administrative structure consists of organs such as Board of Trustees, International Board of Overseas and Museum's administrative departments. The chairperson of the current Board of Trustees is Güler Sabancı. The members of the board are Sevil Sabancı, Dr. Nazan Ölçer (Manager of Sabancı Museum), Prof. Dr. Hasan Bülent Kahraman (Vice Director of Kadir Has University), Pınar Kılıç (Public Relations and Marketing Counselor), Raffi Portakal (Chairperson, Portakal Art and Cultural House), Prof. Jean-Francois Jarrige (Former Director of Musée de Chantilly, Paris), Dr. Mahroukh Tarapor (Former Director of International Affairs, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) Bülent Bankacı (General Secretary of Sabancı University Sakıp Sabancı Museum) and Prof. Ayşe Kadioğlu (Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,

Sabancı University). Sabancı Family members are effective in the administration of the museum. Two members of the family are in the Board of Trustees. However, as the list of actors reveals, Board of Trustees is the combination of representatives of strategic institutions and areas of interest, for example public relations and marketing. This list also reveals the engagement of few actors in converging fields such as the business, arts, education and museumification. Furthermore similar organizational structure appears in the associated institutions these actors are affiliated. It forms a symbiotic relationship between different institutions' key actors and facilitates an interorganizational communication. This can be explained with DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) emphasis on "institutional isomorphism" and "collective rationality" with regard to professionalization and organizational structure.

The members of the advisory board during the formation years included scholars, artists and museum professionals from Turkey and abroad who contributed to the development of governing principles of the museum. Among the members of the Advisory Board announced in the press release for the opening of the museum (Sabancı Holding, 2002) there were Esin Atıl (Art Historian), Nazan Ölçer (Director of the İstanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art), Erdağ Aksel (Artists- Member of the Faculty at Sabancı University Art and Social Studies Division), Glenn Lowry (Director of MOMA), James Bradburne (Director of the Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Frankfurt), Gülsün Karamustafa (Artist), Ferit Edgü (Author), Oya Eczacıbaşı (Museologist), Talat Halman (Former Minister of Culture), Oleg Grabar (Art Historian-Professor), Betül Mardin (Public Relations expert), Makrukh Tarapor (Metropolitan Museum of Art, Associate Director of Exhibitions) and Filiz Çağman (Director of Topkapı Palace Museum).

The founding director of the Sabancı Museum was Emin Mahir Balcıoğlu. He has a Ph.D. in architecture. In the aftermath of working for academic positions, he served as Turkey's General Coordinator of Tourism Promotion Services between 1983 and 1986. He took charge within the administration and coordination of various programs in Aga Khan Trust for Culture between 1988 and 1995 and started working with Sabancı in 1997 as an adviser for Sabancı University. From

1998 until 2003 he worked as the founding manager of the Sabancı Museum. The employment of Emin Mahir Balcıoğlu for Sabancı Museum reflected a feature of recruitment process: interorganizational exchange. His previous experience in the Sabancı University enabled him for the undertaking of the directorship of Sabancı Museum.

Nazan Ölçer, who was already the member of the Advisory Board, took over the management from Emin Mahir Balcıoğlu in the aftermath of her retirement from the İstanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art in 2003, where she worked as the director for twenty five years. The Museum's Manager Nazan Ölçer is a graduate of Ethnology, ancient history and history of art from Ludwig Maximilian University, Germany. During her years of residence in Germany she worked at the collections of the University and Museum for Ethnology in Munich. She became the curator of state museum, İstanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art in 1972 and she was appointed as the Director of the İstanbul Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art in 1978. Throughout her curatorship and directorship in the museum, Ölçer organized and co-operated various international exhibitions, as well as participating and directing research projects and lecturing at the Yıldız Technical University, for postgraduate programs at the City Planning and Restoration Department between 1976 and 1984. Nazan Ölçer's case demonstrates the moving of professionals in and out of the cultural and artistic institutions. Ölçer also served as a member of the Board of Directors at the İKSV, she worked for the coordination of Europolia project initiated by the same institution and she curated exhibitions such as "Turks" in London, "From Byzantium to İstanbul" at the Cultural Season of Turkey in France in 2009 (Baliç and Ermiş 2013, p.623).

Buğra (1994, p.85-86) suggested that "[t]he transfer of managerial personnel from the public sector forms a very important aspect of the business development strategy in Turkey. In the case of the Sabancı Group, there have also been many prominent statesmen who became the company's employees at some points in their professional lives". I anticipated seeing such a strategy in the Sabancı Museum since the institution is directly affiliated with Sabancı Holding. And as the case of Nazan Ölçer clearly demonstrates, the transfer of a professional

experienced in a public museum well served for the Sabancı Museum. Former state experience is important in the sense that it provides familiarity and proficiency in the working of bureaucracy and state institutions. Especially continuous professional experience in a state museum not only provides the know-how and expertise in technical matters but also the familiarity with the bureaucratic tradition and well-established relationship with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism's related departments and a network of professionals. Nazan Ölçer provides the know-how and network of professionals. She is a symbol of prestige for the institution with her expertise and qualifications. Furthermore, she symbolizes an institutional hierarchy and respect for her authority which is legitimized through her extensive knowledge and expertise in museology. My respondent addressed Nazan Ölçer as the "chance" and source of main difference among the three museums (Ms. Hüma Arslaner, pers.comm., 25 January).

Nazan Ölçer, is not only effective concerning her managerial responsibilities and executive roles but also for publicizing exhibitions. She appears in interviews, TV programs, in press meetings as an authority figure who informs the public and presents the features and importance of the exhibitions and the works of art that have been staged in a contextual framework. In this respect she is the "face" of the institution in public besides Güler Sabancı.

It is crucial to note that there are few numbers of professionals who move in and out of institutions in the field. İKSV, banks art and cultural centers serve as pools of professionals. Nevertheless, it is therefore very common to observe same few professionals in different institutions fulfilling advisory or curatorship responsibilities. For example, my respondent from Sabancı Museum is a graduate of archeology and art history from Bilkent University and studied marketing and advertising in United States. She formerly worked for Raffi Portakal and İstanbul Modern on a European Union supported project basis. She started working in the Sabancı Museum in 2005, initially in the education department and later transferred to the coordination of incoming exhibitions and also fulfilled the responsibility of chief for the painting collection. Sabancı Museum hired staff and divided them into separate departments. Interns from Sabancı University, Okan

University and Mimar Sinan University also work for the museum for guided tours and so on.

İstanbul Modern's administrative structure is based on differentiated advisory boards-Fine Arts Advisory Board, International Advisory Board and Photography Advisory Board- and departments are highly differentiated. Board of Directors is on the top level of management.

The current members of the Board of Directors consist of ten members and two vice chair: Oya Eczacıbaşı (Chairman of the Board), Ethem Sancak (Vice Chairman) and Okşan Atilla Sanön (Vice Chairman). The members of the Board of Directors are all from business world. Ethem Sancak is one of the founders of İstanbul Modern and he is also the Chairman of the Hedef Alliance Holding. Okşan Atilla Sanön is the Vice President and the President of Corporate Communications and Sustainable Development at Eczacıbaşı Holding.

Members of the Board consists of Minister Egemen Bağış, İstanbul Mayor Kadir Topbaş, İKSV Vice Chair and İKSV Executive Committee Member Münir Ekonomi, Founding Shareholder of Space Real Estate Development and Services Şeli Elvaşvili, Chief Corporate Affairs Officer of Turkcell Koray Öztürkler, Former executive of Yıldız Holding Cahit Paksoy, Chairman of Polimeks Construction Company Erol Tabanca, General Director of İKSV Görgün Taner, Eczacıbaşı Group Consumer Goods Group President Hakan Uyanık and Chairperson of Doğan Holding Arzuhan Yalçındağ (İstanbul Modern Administration, Official Webpage, 2014). As the list reveals, the Board is the strategic combination of professionals from businessworld, representative of a local administration and representative of the current government. Compared to Sabancı Museum, İstanbul Modern's Board is more focused on business. The arts professionals and scholars are excluded from the Board of Directors. Rather professional from the art world are included in the Advisory Boards.

Eczacıbaşı Holding and Family members not only appear as founders and major donors, but also closely involved with decisions. Oya Eczacıbaşı and Bülent

Eczacıbaşı are engaged in various Eczacıbaşı Holding related institutions. For example, Oya Eczacıbaşı besides being the Chairman of İstanbul Modern, is a Board Member of İKSV (İKSV Official Webpage, 2013). Formerly, she worked as the member of the Biennial Advisory Board of the İKSV in 1985 (Baliç and Ermiş, 2013). She is a graduate of Boğaziçi University, from the Department of Management and later she received a Master's Degree on Museum's Management from the University of Leicester. Her connection with the Eczacıbaşı Family is through her marriage in 1980 with Bülent Eczacıbaşı, the current Chairman of the Eczacıbaşı Holding and son of Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı (Milliyet Newspaper, 17.11.2012).

Bülent Eczacıbaşı is both the Chairman of Eczacıbaşı Holding and İKSV and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of İstanbul Modern Art Foundation. He is strongly associated with the as the founder and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees. By coincidence, during my interview (2013) with the then Chief Curator and current Director Mr. Levent Çalıkoğlu, our interview was interrupted because of a telephone informing him that Bülent Eczacıbaşı was there to visit him. His immediate response was “the boss is here”. Bülent Eczacıbaşı seems paying regular visits to the Museum. Furthermore, Levent Çalıkoğlu has been working as the art consultant of the Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation (Yapı Kredi Yayınları Kültür, 2011) which is directly associated with Bülent Eczacıbaşı as the Chairman of the company.

The effect of the business world is explicit in the İstanbul Modern. Former Chief Operating Officer Ms. Güniz Atis Azrak is currently the CEO of İstanbul Convention and Exhibition Center. Her former professional experience is based on the tourism sector. She worked as the General Manager of big hotels. When interviewed in 2003, Ms. Güniz Atis Azrak, stated that the administration of business and arts are differentiated as two main administrative units and she is responsible from the business while Levent Çalıkoğlu was coordinating the exhibitions, and issues related with arts. Ms. Azrak stated that about 65 personnel are working in the museum.

Recent shift in the management by Levent Çalıkoğlu's appointment as the Director demonstrates a shift in professionalization. An appropriate organizational form was sought to embrace business to expand rapidly, to centralize the decision making and to comprise family control over the museum. Current model of management enhance this centralization since the managerial control is compromised between the family members and a professional. By emphasizing contemporary arts, family members -trustees- empowered Levent Çalıkoğlu. Levent Çalıkoğlu's close affiliation with contemporary arts and corporate world served as an element of creating a profession which keeps him close to the upper classes. It also legitimized the salience of professionals in the organizations of private art and cultural institutions.

The administrative unit of İstanbul Modern is located in a closed space within the museum. Only the personnel is allowed to enter the office by identity cards. Unlike the intimate space allocation in Sabancı Museum's administrative offices, where a small space is shared among the manager and relatively very small size of the administrative personnel, İstanbul Modern staff works in an open office. Higher management sits on the mezzanine. Although the rooms are transparent with glass walls, the hierarchical position within the administration is observed. If one considers the internal design of the offices, limited and controlled access to the administrative unit, institutional hierarchies and departmentalization this organizational form is very similar with a corporate organizational structure. When interviewed in 2003 Mr. Levent Çalıkoğlu used the metaphor of "factory" to describe the museum's functioning. I suggest, this representation is in line with this similarity.

Pera Museum's administrative and departmental structure is not transparently presented. Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation is controlled by the trustees Suna, İnan and İpek Kıraç. The business effect is observable in the management of Pera Museum. The General Manager of the Museum is Özalp Birol for ten years. According to information gathered from business network service, Özalp Birol is a graduate of Boğaziçi University, Department of Management and specialized on sales and marketing. His previous working experiences include sales and

marketing management at multinational corporations such as Unilever and Nestle Group companies, Turcas Petroleum. Birol served for Vice presidency of “Advertising, Public Relations, Culture and Art Department” at Yapı Kredi Bank, worked as the General Manager and a Board Member of Yapı Kredi Culture, Art and Publishing. He was the “Director of Corporate Communications at Yapı Kredi Bank until 2001. His association with the Koç Holding began in 2001, when he took the positions of General Manager and Board Member of Koç Culture, Art and Communication Services. He also worked as Corporate Communications Director of Koç Financial Services. It is crucial to note that Yapı Kredi Bank is one of the largest and prominent banks in Turkey and in 2005-2006 the bank was added to Koç Holding’s portfolio. Özalp Biral became the General Manager of the Museum in 2004 during the course of its foundation. As this information reveals, having been experienced in the same corporate culture through working experience with the Group companies and experience in business serve as important factors in the recruitment of higher level of management in the Museum. The professional expertise in business is the main characteristics of the management.

Departments are differentiated among the specialized areas of activities such as project management and temporary exhibitions, film, video and communication programming, marketing programs and education programs.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p.152) in their work on institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields, suggest that “[o]rganizations tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field that they perceive to be more legitimate and successful.” I suggest that the organizational field of the private museum is structured with the dominance of corporate actors in the control of private museums through their trusteeship. This facilitates the modeling of major conglomerates affiliated with their formation. DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p.153) also suggest that “[t]he professionalization of management tends to proceed in tandem with the structuration of organizational fields. The exchange of information among professionals helps contribute to the commonly recognized hierarchy of status, of center and periphery that becomes a matrix for information flows and personnel movement across organizations”. This argument

is relevant for the cases of private museums discussed here. The exchange of information is made possible among professionals through administrative organs of private museums. Movement of professional staff from organizations of conglomerates is particularly relevant for Pera Museum. Sabancı Museum combined the professional staff transferred from the public sector and university trained art experts. Two hypotheses of DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p.154-155) outlined under the heading of “predictors of isomorphic change” are relevant for the private museum cases discussed here: (1) *“The greater the centralization of organization A’s resource supply, the greater the extent to which organization A will change isomorphically to resemble the organizations on which it depends for resources.”* (2) *“The greater the extent to which an organizational field is dependent upon a single (or several similar) source of support for vital resources, the higher the level of isomorphism.”* The major resource supply in these three museums are the conglomerates, thus they resemble the conglomerates that they are affiliated from the establishment. Moreover, the funding resources of the major activities of temporary exhibitions and education programs are provided through corporate sponsorship. This further facilitates an isomorphism in direction towards corporations. I will discuss the funding structure of the private museums in section 8.2.4.

8.2.4. Funding

The main funder of the museum is the Sabancı University since the museum runs under the institutional umbrella of the University. However, the funds for the University are allocated from the Sabancı Foundation. This indicates to a direct link between three distinct institutions in terms of funding.

The second important element with regard to the financing of the Sabancı Museum is the external funding. External funders are the sponsors of the incoming exhibitions which consist of various companies including Sabancı Holding companies. The sponsorship of the events are structured and differentiated in alliance with the qualities, size and costs of the incoming exhibitions. Despite the important major resource of Sabancı Holding, the incoming exhibitions are

dependent on external funding due to high transportation and insurance costs of the works of arts, providing technical facilities that are necessary for exhibiting works such as the special lighting or providing equipment. This makes the sponsors as well as the organization of the sponsorship programs an important element in the running of the museum. The third source of revenue is the ticket sales. However compared to initial funding sources it is a minor item due to low ticket prices and regular number of visitors. Fourth source is the supplementary commercial activities such as the sales of publications and design products in the museum shops, tickets of public events such as “Kahvaltıda Jazz”, “Müze’de Yoga” and so on.

The Eczacıbaşı Holding is the “founding sponsor” of the İstanbul Modern. The amount of support given by the Eczacıbaşı is kept confidential. It is stated that there is an annual amount that is negotiated between Eczacıbaşı and İstanbul Modern (Ms. Güniz Atis Azrak, pers.comm.,20 January).

İstanbul Modern, similar to the case of İKSV, pulls over resources by sponsorship programs. Sponsors constitute the other funding resource for the museum. Sponsorship is a well-defined and promoted feature of the İstanbul Modern. Sponsors are differentiated in categories such as main sponsors, project sponsors and corporate sponsors, contributors and media sponsors (İstanbul Modern Official Webpage, Sponsorship, 2014). Among main sponsors there are Turkcell as the communication and technology sponsor, education sponsor is Garanti Bank. The other categories under the main sponsors address individuals rather than corporate groups. In the category of founders and collection donors, Oya Eczacıbaşı, Bülent Eczacıbaşı and Ethem Sancak are addressed. “Founding Contributors” is the other category presented by the İstanbul Modern. These contributors are Egemen Bağış, R. Paul Mcmillen, Cahit Paksoy, Melkan Gürsel Tabanlığlu and Arzuhan Yalçındağ (ibid). It is important to note that the same individuals concurrently appear in the sponsors and the members of the Board of Directors.

Other categories include “Project Sponsors” and “Corporate Sponsors”. The technical equipment, facilities regarding lighting, visual and audio systems,

architectural design and necessities such as accommodation, communication design are met with the sponsors in these categories. Other categories are designed in accordance with the need of activities and special programs such as cinema sponsors. İstanbul Modern offers free entrance on Thursdays. “Your Thursday Sponsor” is Ülker (ibid). The Museum justifies the sponsorship with rhetoric on contributing the society and emphasizing sponsors role in “contributing to bringing art to wider audiences and to the promotion and development of art and culture in the country” (ibid). The representation of sponsorship reproduces the corporate culture in the museum setting as well as justifying it. Sponsorship programs are professionalized. It is suggested that the relationship between the “missions” of the sponsors and the museum’s projects and activities is the determining factor behind sponsorship agreements (Ms. Güniz Atis Azrak, pers.comm., 20 January).

As well as sponsorship program, The Museum seeks for support through donations and corporate membership. Silver and Gold membership, is represented with the advantages offered to “company, staff and clients” (ibid). Alongside the emphasis on the sponsorship, it is stated that the ticket prices are “very very low” to contribute to the budget of the museum (Ms. Güniz Atis Azrak, pers.comm., 20 January). Currently admission fees are, regular 17 TL⁴², group (more than 10 people) is 14TL⁴³, discounted 9TL⁴⁴ and the admission is only free for museum members, children under twelve, visitors with disabilities, and for ICOM and CIMAM Cardholders (İstanbul Modern Official Webpage, Visiting Hours and Admission, 2014). Compared to the other two museums subject to discussion here, İstanbul Modern has the most expensive admission fees. The state institutions support is limited. Another external funding item is the Ministry of Culture and Tourism which only has contributed few numbers of exhibitions. Other than that, municipalities support the Museum’s educational programs by providing

⁴² Approximately \$USD 7.50 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

⁴³ Approximately \$USD 6 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

⁴⁴ Approximately \$USD 4 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

transportation for students to access the Museum, İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality provides support for the promotion of the exhibitions on highways, overpasses and so on (Ms. Güniz Atis Azrak, pers.comm., 20 January).

Pera Museum's major funding resource is the trustees: Kıraç Family. During the course of its history, Pera Museum was affected by the economic crisis that hit the world in the second half of 2008. Below quotation demonstrates the dependency of the museum to this major resource. Özalp Birol emphasizes the role of major funder:

The crisis hit not only the museums, but also all institutions of the culture industry; it had a major impact on all the players. I find that the current view is not very promising. (...) Due to the problems encountered in the funds and other financial instruments that finance our foundation, we had to adjust our budget (...) Nonetheless, our founders are very sensitive toward the continuity of our institutions and have generously granted us support during this difficult time. We were greatly sustained by their generosity. As management and staff, we are learning to economize to the best of our ability to attain our goals and plan our events accordingly" (Demir and Gamm, *Hürriyet Daily News*, n.d.).

Compared to the other two museum focused here, Pera Museum do not specifically focus on sponsorship programs, yet works with sponsors for temporary exhibitions. However, Pera Museum designed a program called "Friends of Pera Museum" whereby different packages of Membership cards are offered with advantages varying from free admissions for the year, invitations to exhibition openings, audio and guided tours, discounts at the artshop and discounts on Pera Film and Pera Education activities. (Pera Museum Official Webpage, The Friends of Pera Museum Program, 2014). The categories of membership cards are differentiated with regard to the support given to the Museum as Pera Card +, Pera Card Young, Pera Card Bronze, Pera Card Silver and Pera Card Gold. For example, while the one year fee for the silver card is 1000 TL⁴⁵, the fee for the gold is 5000 TL⁴⁶, Pera Card Family is 300⁴⁷ TL per year. Bronze, silver and gold

⁴⁵ Approximately \$USD 440 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

⁴⁶ Approximately \$USD 2200 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey.

⁴⁷ Approximately \$USD 132 according to the exchange rates of Central Bank of Turkey

members are invited to the opening of the exhibitions (ibid). This fee-based membership program indicates to a differentiation among the public and justifies being a member of a distinct status group. A café, museum shop and an auditorium room also serve as sources of revenue in the museum. For example it is possible to rent the café and the auditorium room for special occasions and events (Pera Museum Official Webpage, About, 2014).

In conclusion, prior agencies Vehbi Koç Foundation, İKSV and banks offered the pivotal support for the structuration of private museums in Turkey as an organizational field. They are central for setting the legal infrastructure and consolidation of professionalization. The private museums are based on the philanthropic foundation model. Philanthropic foundations that control the museums are directly affiliated with the large conglomerates in Turkey. Private museums function as extensions of conglomerates and corporate philanthropists. Philanthropic foundations established by the conglomerates and corporate philanthropists constitute the main resource of private museums. Consecutively, these characteristics have proliferated isomorphism in the organizational structure of the private museums. Private museums organizational structure resembles the conglomerates and affiliated philanthropic foundations. The resemblance between conglomerates, philanthropic foundations and private museums is reflected in private museum's missions, administrative organization, funding structure. Furthermore, the founding corporate philanthropists' focus of orientation in collection building practices determines the major focus of the private museums. Sabancı Museum concentrated on Turkish and Islamic Art, İstanbul Modern focused on contemporary art and Pera Museum concentrated on orientalist art. This differentiated interest claimed to be the major justification of non-competitive character of the private museums. Rather, I suggest, despite their differences in concentration shared missions of exhibition, education and globalizing İstanbul yields a competition between the private museums. Particularly, focus on İstanbul is instrumental for private museums to gain international recognition and acclaim. This constitutes the ground for competition.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, I evaluated the emergence of private art museums in Turkey within the broader historical context and in relation to social conditions that facilitated their establishment. In this respect, I approached the private museums that flourished in the 2000's from a historical perspective while conceptualizing them as an organizational field (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). I focused on three private museums: Sabancı Museum; İstanbul Modern; and Pera Museum which emerged in İstanbul, Turkey in the 2000's. I traced the history of their emergence by focusing on some important moments of their structuration as an organizational field (DiMaggio 1991) and central agencies that supported their emergence by forming the required infrastructure, legal and institutional framework, funding mechanisms, and means of justification. I concentrated on large conglomerates, corporate philanthropists, and philanthropic foundations, which are affiliated with the organization field of private museums in various ways, as founders, resources of funding, managers, and trustees, in the context of private museums and central agencies organizing the field.

I argued that the founders of three large conglomerates, Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı, and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, who founded Koç Holding, Sabancı Holding, and Eczacıbaşı Holding, respectively, constitute the three key individual figures to consider if one studies the structuring of private museums as an organizational field.

First, I argued that Vehbi Koç was crucial because he was the first to establish the family holding company and corporate philanthropic foundation models. Furthermore, he was the person who was aware of the Islamic *waqf system*, was influenced by the philanthropic foundation model developed in the United States in the aftermath of the Second World War, and adopted the idea to set up a philanthropic foundation in American lines (Çizakça 2000). He was crucial alongside the law professionals in constituting the 1967 legislation on

philanthropic foundations, which can be regarded as an important turning point for the history of the *waqf system* in Turkey, which meant the “survival” and “restoration” of waqfs in Turkey (Çizakça 2000, p.90). Two crucial things introduced by this legislation, the possibility of the establishment of waqfs by conglomerates, and tax-exemption (Çizakça 2000, p.92), have paved the way for diffusion of the model among conglomerates. Vehbi Koç provided the pioneering example of the model by the establishment of Vehbi Koç Foundation (1969). The integration of the “holding company” and “philanthropic foundation” had paved the way for adaptation of the bifurcated organization model by the private sector. The organizational model, offered by Vehbi Koç, was adopted by Sakıp Sabancı in the following years, and both a holding company and philanthropic foundation was founded.

The guiding aim of philanthropic foundations was forming “permanency”. The major aim of “permanence”, presented by founders of the holding companies, particularly appeared strong in Vehbi Koç during the formation of the Vehbi Koç Foundation as a resurgent aim in the establishment of private museums.

The initial focus on education was set forward by the philanthropic foundations, established under the 1967 legislation Vehbi Koç Foundation, as the main area of philanthropic foundations’ operations, and the mission of enhancing the level of public education had constructed the field as a legitimate area of intervention by the private sector. The interest on education was realized in the form of a philanthropic foundation- Turkish Education Foundation (1967) which was founded by 205 people, including Sakıp Sabancı and Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, led by Vehbi Koç (Turkish Education Foundation Founders, n.d.). This facilitated the process of defining education as an organizational field by “increasing patterns of coalition” and “development of a mutual awareness participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise” as parts of structuration defined by DiMaggio and Powell (1983). Meanwhile, Koç and Sabancı established universities, Koç University (1993) and Sabancı University (1994), in İstanbul under the framework of Vehbi Koç Foundation and Sabancı Foundation, respectively. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı concentrated on the scholarship

programs in the field of culture and arts, awards in health, design, and photography through his initiative Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation. Despite the differences in concentrations of activities, the mission of educating the public is prominent in the philanthropic foundations to which these actors are affiliated. The aim of enhancing the education of the public articulated with the modernization project serve the ground for various investments such as building permanent institutions like schools, dormitories, recreational areas, funding provided to support the establishment of departments in schools and universities for research and development, and scholarships provided for students among the philanthropic foundations. It can be suggested that *production of university trained experts* (DiMaggio 1991) in areas supporting the business life in Turkey is one of the guiding aims of these businessmen. In addition to Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı who were prioritizing the field of education and establishing universities, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı was strongly committed to this mission. For example, in the 1950's he led the formation of the Institute of Business Economics in İstanbul University, in which professionalization of the workforce through this institution was intended, he was a member of the The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (Dündar, 2003, p.96). In 1960, he became a member of the Board of Trustees of newly- established Middle East Technical University, and remained on duty until his resignation in 1969. He initiated the Economic and Social Studies Conference Board (ESEKH), which then gained its current institutional structure in 1994 as TESEV (Eczacıbaşı, 1982, p.147-148). It is observed that education as a central focus of businessmen started to establish in the late 1960's and also had a role in the development of the missions of future organizational initiatives by businessmen, including the private museums.

Vehbi Koç also provided the first example of private foundation models, organized in accordance with the philanthropic foundations. He established Sadberk Hanım Museum in 1980, under the framework Vehbi Koç Foundation. This particular museum not only provided the organizational model adopted by the Koç Family members in the following years, but also constituted the ground for the

proliferation of private art museums, founded by philanthropic foundations in the post 1980's.

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı's contribution is more directly associated with the field of culture and arts. His primary contribution was leading the establishment of İKSV in 1973. Similar to Vehbi Koç, he was influenced by the organizations abroad. Salzburg Festival, during his graduate education in Germany, influenced him to establish an organization in İstanbul to serve by organizing art and cultural festivals. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı had been personally committed to spreading and diffusing the mechanisms of private sector intervention in the field of culture and arts, not only by facilitating the use of external support for İKSV's festival organization during the course of his life time, but also personally providing prescriptions and suggestions and even an article on corporate sponsorship, where İKSV demonstrated the best example.

I suggest that İKSV can be regarded as the central organization which offered pivotal support for the structuration of organizational field of private museums. It is argued by Yardımcı (2007) that İKSV has become a prominent institution and authority in the cultural field. The review of the history of the İKSV reveals that, through its cultural activities and funding structure, mostly based on corporate sponsorship, it provided the ground for the proliferation of cultural industries in İstanbul, production of professions and professionalization in the field, and proliferation and legitimization of corporate sponsorship as a form of practice among the private sector in Turkey. Pulling over various resources in the form of corporate sponsorship for the actualization of its festivals and cultural activities, İKSV played a crucial role in diffusing and spreading the funding model, by emphasizing sponsorship, among private initiatives. I argue that this model is adopted and internalized by three private museums on which I focused. It supported the consolidation of networks among professionals, since it worked just like a "school" to receive experience and get acquainted with different areas of expertise such as festival organization, coordinating sponsorship programs, and coordinating international projects and partnerships. It also provided the ground for integration with the international professional circles. It is crucial to note that

İKSV had long been associated with Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı as the major founder, and this caused it to be recognized as an extension of him and his family. On the one hand, it was instrumental since Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı used his social networks of businessmen and professionals in the use of İKSV in the form of financial resources and staff, respectively. On the other hand, it hindered the institution's easy access to external resources when Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı died, until a professional sponsorship department was established in the mid 1990's which presented sponsorship as a contribution to "İstanbul" and as a way of reaching target markets. Furthermore, İKSV's focus on İstanbul has been explicit since its establishment in 1973. It is also crucial to note that, in the post 1980's whereby İstanbul has been recognized with its cultural potential (Aksoy 2012) for the aims of globalization, it can be suggested that İKSV's leading position in the field, and activities such as international festivals and Istanbul Biennial have given way to the dissemination of the vision of İstanbul as a center for culture and arts. Furthermore, the idea of establishing a private modern art museum was originated in İKSV, following the 1st İstanbul Biennial (1987). In the aggregate, these characteristics of the İKSV, constitute it as the precursory institution of private museums.

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı suggested that the private sector should be responsible for social matters and should intervene in the fields of arts, culture and education for the "social good". His legitimization was based on the New Deal principle which was enacted in the United States of America by Roosevelt during the course of the 1930's. The New Deal encouraged spending and employment in the arts and spending in social matters (Zukin, 1989, p.103). This justification mechanism makes Bourdieu's (1984) concept of *symbolic capital* theoretically relevant.

Three large conglomerates associated with the three of my cases, have been prominent conglomerates in the business activity in Turkey (Buğra 1994). The competition between Koç and Sabancı conglomerates which was represented by personal encounters of Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı in the autobiographies of respective businessmen is an important element to consider in understanding the future initiatives in various different fields, including the private museums.

Particularly, the range of competition areas between the Sabancı and Koç conglomerates has been extended to various commercial areas including purchasing of art objects (Buğra 1994, p.84-85). I argue that this competitive character is represented at the level of the private museums field.

I suggest that the social backgrounds of these three key individuals are related to their differentiating paths in exposure to culture and arts. It is argued by Buğra (1994, p.77) that Vehbi Koç and Sakıp Sabancı were exceptions among the well-educated Turkish businessmen by being self-made men. As I discussed in Chapter 7 in detail, Vehbi Koç's relationship with arts was purchasing artworks and antiques from auctions in the later part of his economic life. His wife, Sadberk Koç, was more engaged with collecting practices which formed the collection of the Sadberk Hanım Museum. Sakıp Sabancı presented that he developed an interest in arts in the later part of his life in association with building social encounters with prominent art dealer, Portakal Family, who formerly worked with Sakıp Sabancı's father, Hacı Ömer Sabancı. To put in other words, Western forms and appreciation of high arts were absent in the Sabancı Family before they grew into one of the largest family holding companies in Turkey. Relatively, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı demonstrated a different case. Nejat Eczacıbaşı was born in İzmir in an urban-rooted family, and was cultivated in reputable educational institutions such as Robert College, Heidelberg University in Germany, and Chicago University in U.S., and had acquired the sophisticated knowledge and credentials to appreciate arts and conceive the consumption of culture and arts as valuable assets of his social identity. Reviewing these differences in exposure to arts, it can be suggested that Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı had a more direct relationship with the high-arts and appreciation for it. Bourdieu's (1984) theory of social distinction and culture offer the relevant conceptual tools to explain these differences. Bourdieu suggested that educational attainment is a form of capital; it is affected by the class habitus, alongside the cultural knowledge and style. It can be considered a transmitter of social class and status differences, and thus, social inequalities among individuals (Swartz 1997, p.198). It can be suggested that Nejat Eczacıbaşı's comparative

higher volume of cultural capital formed the basis of his *social distinction* among the other two self-made businessmen.

Sakıp Sabancı developed an interest in Islamic art and Turkish painting by the support of art dealers and began the practice of collecting in a later period of his professional career as a businessman, whereas Vehbi Koç got acquainted with the practice of collecting from his wife Sadberk Hanım's interest in building a collection of antiques and traditional forms of art such as traditional costumes, embroidery, and silver artifacts with Sultan's seals. Meanwhile, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı concentrated more on modern art forms, Western artists, international examples of festivals, and performing arts and music. I suggest that the traces of these different orientations in these key figures can be observed in the private museums that I focus on today, which are affiliated with the families of these crucial individuals.

I suggest that the organizational form of philanthropic foundation, owing to Vehbi Koç, enables the transfer of financial resources for initiatives in arts and culture. Today these philanthropic foundations, namely Vehbi Koç Foundation, Sabancı Foundation, and Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Foundation, are active participants in the field of culture. The review of the current initiatives and sponsorship of the respective foundations suggest that they both engage in domestic and international projects and this is in line with the conglomerate's interest in global integration, gaining international recognition, and maintaining their dominance in the field. Furthermore, this is supported by the group companies of Koç Holding (ex: Arçelik, Aygaz, Yapı Kredi Bank, Tüpraş), Sabancı Holding (ex: Akbank, Enerjisa, Çimsa, Teknosa) and Eczacıbaşı Holding (ex: Vitra), and their participation in arts sponsorship. When considered together with the institutions of private museums as concrete institutional manifestations, the presence of the conglomerates has been expanded in the cultural field.

I suggest that the state is an important participant in the organizational field of private museums. One of the indirect effects of the state on the field is its relationship with the business activity. Given the affiliation of private museums

with the large conglomerates, I suggest that the role of the state should not be overlooked. It is argued by Buğra (1994, p.69) that the state has a crucial role in the business activity in Turkey, “even if the state does not appear as a source of credit at the initial stage, the turning point in business life can often be traced to a project in which the state plays the crucial role as the contractor, principal buyer, or the provider of the capital necessary to take the step that would change the course of businessman’s career orientation”. Similarly, Pamuk (2014, p.8) suggested that since the early years of Republican Turkey, the internalization of state oriented development strategy, had brought by the techniques and institutions of creating private sector and the wealthy by state itself. Although the state adopted diversified scripts for strengthening the private sector, the role of the state in distributing privileges to the private sector and selecting the ‘wealthy’ had become prominent during the course of the 20th century and continued in the post 1980’s in changing fashions. Following the 1980’s economic liberalization policies, the private sector had gained strength. And as Öniş (2006, p.13) argued, during the phase of neoliberal restructuring under the AKP rule the larger domestic firms and conglomerates had “benefitted disproportionately from the improvement in the macroeconomic and regulatory environment” and the transnationalization of major Turkish conglomerates’ operations had accelerated (Öniş, 2006, p.13). These characteristics are suggested to be relevant factors in the strengthening and transnationalization of conglomerates, thus the expansion of interest in arts and art and cultural initiatives as a medium to gain international recognition. In such context, private museums, serve as recent “showcases” of the domestic conglomerates for attracting foreign capital and declaring that they are part of the international capital by fulfilling the requirements of having cultural institutions and conforming to the rules of the market-oriented rationality.

It is important to point out that the private art museums that I focused on should be understood in relation to the economic liberalization, as well as the promotion of İstanbul as a global city which has become prominent in the era of Justice and Development Party. During the last decade of AKP rule, the prevalence of neoliberal values in AKP and focus on globalization affected the way İstanbul has

been governed (Aksoy, 2012). As part of branding İstanbul and constructing a global image for the city as the center of culture, tourism and arts, “investing in art and culture has become increasingly fashionable for private investors” through “extensive range of tax breaks and facilitation of lucrative property deals” and corporate philanthropists emphasize that their investments are a “gift to city” (Aksoy 2009 and 2012, p.102).

The extensive focus on İstanbul has been incorporated in the exhibition mission of three museums. The exhibitions highlighting İstanbul have been prominent in the three cases. Thus, private museums serve as the organizational forms to actualize the aims of investing in the city as a means to integrate with international capital.

I suggest that the state also appears crucial for its regulatory role that structures the institutions of private museums. The first attempt to constitute the national infrastructure for the establishment of private museums was the enactment of “Regulation on Private Museums” in 1980 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 17129, 08.10.1980). The emergence of a national infrastructure is an important element for models of diffusion. The first amendments were made in 1984 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 18289, 22.01.1984). The recent amendments were made in 2006 in the AKP Era (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 26356, 24.11.2006). Under the current Regulation on Private Museums and Their Supervision ministries, public institutions, persons, judicial personalities, and philanthropic foundations can establish museums that contain all types of movable cultural and natural assets for the realization of their areas of service or aims. The control and supervision of the private museums are directly vested with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Although relatively autonomous compared to public museums, especially with regard to their funding, private museums are subject to state control and supervision maintained by mechanisms such as application procedures and routine inspections by the public officials of the public museums specifically allocated for each and every private museum.

The state is also crucial, as also mentioned by Aksoy (2012, p.102), for providing extensive range of tax breaks. I discussed this in Chapter 6 in detail. Recent amendments under the AKP rule on regulations on taxation and enactment of Law number: 5225, titled the “Law of Incentive for Culture Investments and Enterprises” in 2004 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey No: 25529, 21.07.2004) particularly serve as the legal framework that supports the private initiatives in arts and culture. In the aggregate, these enactments not only enable the private intervention in arts, but also enhance the lucrative character of the private investments and enterprises in arts. Consecutively, private museums have their share from these regulatory changes. The expansion of interest among conglomerates to establish private museums out of their personal art collections can be partly related to the diffusion and spreading of the model by the prominent large conglomerates and partly to this ethos of privatization of culture.

In this respect, private museums that are under investigation here have been competing institutions, and actors behind their formation and funding struggle for the social recognition, status, and prestige gained through the symbolic practice of “having” a museum. Perhaps, one of the most important consequences of these developments is the privatization of the field of cultural production (Yardımcı 2007).

The subsequent generations of Koç, Sabancı and Eczacıbaşı families, sustained the philanthropic foundations and utilized this organizational model initiated by former crucial members of the family for the establishment of private museums. Therefore, I suggest that although having emerged in the 2000’s, the pioneering steps of the structuring of private museums began in the late 1960’s. Three private museums have been established on the infrastructure developed by philanthropic foundations. Their emergence in the 2000’s was an outcome of the well-established system of philanthropic foundations, the maturing of the conditions enabled by the liberalization in Turkey in the post 1980, the rise of İstanbul as a business opportunity for both the governments and private sector, and the competitive interests of conglomerates in benefiting from this opportunity.

I offered an analysis of organizations of private museums in different analytical categories of missions, edifice, organizational structure, and funding. I argued that prior agencies, particularly Vehbi Koç Foundation, İKSV, and banks provided the crucial support for the structuration of private museums as an organizational field. Vehbi Koç was effective in setting the legal infrastructure, while Vehbi Koç Foundation was central for exemplifying the philanthropic foundation model established by a conglomerate. I argue that the administrative model in private museums centralizes around the philanthropic foundation model. I suggest that addressing the philanthropic foundation as the central framework of the organization of the private museum facilitates the use of economic resources for the private museums, provides the opportunity of tax exemption, and centralizes the control of the institutions among the respective families and family members.

A difference in concentration in terms of permanent collection is observed in these three museums. This is related to the patterns of collection that have been established by former generation of family members. Sabancı Museum concentrated on Turkish and Islamic Art, İstanbul Modern focused on contemporary art, and Pera Museum concentrated on orientalist art. These differences in concentrations, claimed to be the major justification of non-competitive character of the private museums. However, I suggest that despite the differences in concentration, the competition among the families has been reflected in the very existence of private museums. Furthermore, I suggest that the interest in possessing a “modern Turkish painting” and its role in transmitting the symbolic meaning of modernization of the country is the ground for prevalence of competitive values among these three private museums. Shared missions of exhibition, education, and globalizing İstanbul expand the competition between the private museums, in which İstanbul is the competed center to manifest possessions shared and to gain international recognition and acclaim.

The impact of professionals such as curators in professionalization is more glaring since they are also few and compete for scant professional positions in museums and art and cultural centers initiated by the private sector. It is also important to note that the professions and expertise that have been produced in different spheres

and economic sectors- such as tourism and business administration- have been incorporated into the institutional structure of private museums through professionals recruited for higher level management. I suggest that this process facilitates the isomorphic processes, and thus, similarities exist between different organizations.

Furthermore, in the Turkish case it is seen that professionals that had gained experience in state institutions have been strategically incorporated in the institutional structures through which the relations with the bureaucracy have been maintained. Sabancı Museum adopted the strategy of transferring managerial personnel from the public museum. This, I suggest on the one hand, constitutes the distinctive character of Sabancı Museum from the other two museums. On the other hand, it enables the organization to benefit from networks, know-how, and experience of the managerial personnel which had been formed in relation to the relevant state institutions and their functioning.

The state is the main source of uncertainty when considering its role in the economy (1994, p.70). Given this, I suggest that it has been the main source of uncertainty for the cultural field as well. Archival research on the history of İKSV, Sadberk Hanım revealed formerly, the main issues emphasized by the criticisms were inconsistency in allocation of venues for cultural events, frequent reshuffling of ministers, and consecutive changes in the visions of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. It is observed that the “venue” problem has been transferred to the problem of physical structure-building- in the case of private museums. Meanwhile, Sabancı Museum and Pera Museum own their buildings and this renders an advantageous position. İstanbul Modern operates in a building loaned by the local and central government. This jeopardizes the permanence of the institution and makes it vulnerable to the government’s stance.

Corporate philanthropists that are engaged both with respective large conglomerates and philanthropic foundations constitute the main resource for private museums. As DiMaggio and Powell (1983) outlined, among organizations in capitalist societies, resource dependency is an important element of isomorphic

change. I suggest that the organizational model of private museums resembles the organizational model of conglomerates and philanthropic foundations. This is reflected in the missions conveyed by private museums, their administrative organization and funding structure.

In conclusion, I argue that the organizational field of private museums is underwritten by market-driven rationality, conglomerates' interest of integration with the global capital, and competition over possessing the field. Large conglomerates, which have been crucial in the economic and business activity in Turkey, have transported the competitive character of the market to an extended field: private museums. In this respect, the organizational models of the museums inherited the reflections of these aspirations and interests. The large conglomerates have utilized the institutional structures of philanthropic foundations, and legal and professional infrastructure for realizing their interests in the organizational field of private museums.

All these characteristics arguably have differentiated private museums in Turkey from their counterparts established on the grounds of artistic connoisseurship and with the influence of élite's artistic tastes. The emergence of private museums in Turkey can be explained, in reference to the corporate interests guiding their emergence, in addition to the personal interests of the corporate founders to manifest their conspicuous consumption in arts within the organizational form of private museums, to be recognized as élites in society. This disseminates the expansion of interest in arts and culture to instrumentalize it as a business opportunity among the corporation and corporate identities in Turkey.

On these grounds, further research can be directed towards exploring the rising interest in "contemporary arts" in Turkey and strategies of diffusing and spreading this trend among corporations and alternative organizational models developed in Turkey, such as the artists' museums.

REFERENCES

- 22 işadımı daha özel müze kuruyor [online], 2005. *Milliyet*. Available from: <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/Ekonomi/HaberDetay.aspx?aType=HaberDetayArxiv&KategoriID=3&ArticleID=133177> [Accessed 15 May 2014].
- 2634 nolu Turizmi Teşvik Yasası, 1982.
- 3349 sayılı Gelir Vergisi Kanunu, 1960.
- 5225 kültür yatırımlarını ve girişimlerini teşvik kanunu, 2004. *Resmi Gazete*, 21 Jul.
- 5225 sayılı Kültür Yatırımlarını ve Girişimlerini Teşvik Kanunu, 2004.
- 5228 sayılı Bazı Kanunlarda ve 178 Sayılı Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamede Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun, n.d. *Resmi Gazete*, 31/7/2014.
- 5706 Nolu İstanbul 2010 Kültür Başkenti Kanunu, 2007.
- 5737 Sayılı Vakıflar Kanunu, 2008.
- Acar, F., 2002. Turgut Özal: pious agent of liberal transformation. In: M. Heper and S. Sayarı, eds. *Political leaders and democracy in Turkey*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 163–180.
- ACSA, 1996. Japan's corporate support of the arts: synopsis of the 1992 survey. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 189–194.
- Ada, S., 2011. *Turkish cultural policy report: a civil perspective*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press.
- Ada, S. and İnce, H.A., eds., 2009. *Introduction to cultural policy in Turkey*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press.
- Adorno, T. and Horkheimer, M., 1972. *Dialectic of enlightenment*. New York: Harper and Harper.
- Adorno, T. and Horkheimer, M., 2001. The culture industry: enlightenment as mass deception. In: *Media and cultural studies: keywords*. 41–72.
- Ahmad, F., 1993. *The making of modern Turkey*. London: Routledge.
- Ahşap yalıdan, müzeye [online], 1989. *Cumhuriyet*. Available from: <http://www.sadberkhanimmuzesi.org.tr/default.asp?page=basinodasi&b=shm&hl=en> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Akay, A., 1999. *Sanatın sosyolojik gözü*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.

Akbank about [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.akbank.com/hakkimizda/kurumsal-sosyal-sorumluluk/Sayfalar/dunyayi-turkiyeye-tasimak-icin.aspx> [Accessed 5 May 2014].

Akbank Sanat official web page [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.akbanksanat.com/en/> [Accessed 10 May 2014].

Akgün, M., 2013. Murat Ülker Bedri Baykam'ın boş çerçevesini satın aldı. *Radikal*, 2 Apr.

Akgüneş, G., 2012. İstanbul'u İstanbul yapan 100 aile. *Milliyet*, 24 Jan.

Aksoy, A., 2009. The Atatürk Cultural Centre and AKP's "mindshift" policy. In: S. Ada and H.A. İnce, eds. *Introduction to cultural policy in Turkey*. İstanbul: İstanbul University Press.

Aksoy, A., 2008. Istanbul's choice. *Third Text*, 22 (1), 71–83.

Aksoy, A., 2012. Riding the storm: "new Istanbul." *City*, 16 (1-2), 93–111.

Aksoy, A. and Robins, K., 1994. Istanbul between civilisation and discontent. *New perspectives on Turkey*, 1 (5-6), 57–74.

Aksoy, A. and Robins, K., 1997. Peripheral vision: cultural industries and cultural identities in Turkey. *Paragraph*, 20 (1), 75–99.

Aksoy, A. and Robins, K., 2011. *Changing urban cultural governance in Istanbul: the Beyoğlu plan*. İstanbul, No. 1.

Aksoy, A. and Şeyben, B.Y., 2014. Storm over the state cultural institutions: new cultural policy direction in Turkey. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, in press, 1–17.

Albayrak, A., 2011. Les musées des grandes familles turques: réflexion sur les pratiques culturelles des Koç, Sabancı et Eczacıbaşı. *Cahiers de la Méditerranée*, (82), 213–230.

Alexander, V.D., 1996a. From philanthropy to funding: the effects of corporate and public support on American art museums. *Poetics*, 24 (2), 87–129.

Alexander, V.D., 1996b. *Museums and money: the impact of funding on exhibitions, scholarship, and management*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Alexander, V.D., 1996c. Pictures at an exhibition: conflicting pressures in museums and the display of art. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (4), 797–839.
- Alexander, V.D., 1996d. Monet for money? Museums exhibitions and the role of corporate sponsorship. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 213–224.
- Alexander, V.D., 1999. A delicate balance: museums and the market-place. *Museum International*, 51 (2), 29–34.
- Alexander, V.D., 2003. *Sociology of the arts*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Alp, R., ed., 2002. *Bir kuruluşun öyküsü: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi*. İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi Yayınları.
- Altan, G., 2009. İş dünyası müze açmaya koşuyor. *Akşam*, 23 Mar.
- Altuğ, E., 2009. İstanbul’un yeni etkinlik oteli. *Sabah*, 14 Jun.
- Altunışık, M. and Tür, Ö., 2005. *Turkey: challenges of continuity and change*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Anderson, B., 1991. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Revised Ed. London: Verso.
- Arapoğlu, F., Elçık, G., and Kösemen, B., eds., 2014. “Çağdaş sanat ve sermaye” *İktisat Dergisi*. 526. İstanbul: İ.Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Mezunları Cemiyeti.
- Arat, Y., 1991. Politics and big business: janus faced link to the state. In: M. Heper, ed. *The state and economic interest groups: the post-1980 Turkish experience*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 135–147.
- Arter official web page [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.arter.org.tr/W3/> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Artists protest privatization of state theaters and operas, 2013. *Hurriyet Daily News*, 25 May.
- Artun, A., 2002. The museum that cannot be. In: *Exposer l’art contemporain du monde arabe et de Turquie, ici et là bas*. IISMM-École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris(Vol. 14).
- Artun, A., 2006. *Sanat müzeleri 1: Müze ve modernlik*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Artun, A., 2010. Halil Edhem'in Modern İstanbul Müzesi [online]. *Ali Artun*. Available from: <http://www.aliartun.com/content/detail/57> [Accessed 20 Dec 2013]
- Artun, A., 2011. *Çağdaş sanatın örgütlenmesi: Estetik modernizmin tasfiyesi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Artun, A. and Akman, R., eds., 2006. *Müze ve eleştirel düşünce: Tarih sahneleri: Sanat Müzeleri 2*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Artun, A. and Baransel, Z., 2011. Türkiye'de 2002-2012 arası müze girişimleri dökümü [online]. *e-skop*. Available from: <http://www.e-skop.com/skopbulten/cagdas-muzemani-turkiyede-2002-2012-arasi-muze-girisimleri-dokumu/455> [Accessed 20 Dec 2013].
- Artun, D., 2007. *Paris'ten modernlik tercümeleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Ashenfelter, O., 1989. How auctions work for wine and art. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 3 (3), 23–36.
- Atgün, M., 2013. Turkish boss buys frame for \$100.000. *Hurriyet Daily News*, 3 Apr.
- Ayata, A. and Tütüncü, F., 2008. Party politics of the AKP (2002–2007) and the predicaments of women at the intersection of the Westernist, Islamist and Feminist discourses in Turkey. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 35 (3), 363–384.
- Ayata, S., 1996. Patronage, party, and state: the politicization of Islam in Turkey. *Middle East Journal*, 50 (1), 40–56.
- Ayata, S., 2002. The new middle class and the joys of suburbia. In: D. Kandiyoti and A. Saktanber, eds. *Fragments of culture: the everyday of modern Turkey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 25–42.
- Aydemir, O., 1998. Mesenlikten sponsorluğa tarihi süreç. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8, 169–179.
- Balcıoğlu, E.M., 2002. Bir müzenin oluşum öyküsü. In: R. Alp, ed. *Bir kuruluşun öyküsü: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi*. İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi Yayınları, 117–133.
- Balfe, J.H., 1993a. Art patronage: perennial problems, current complications. In: *Paying the piper: causes and consequences of art patronage*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 306–323.

- Balfe, J.H., ed., 1993b. *Paying the piper: causes and consequences of art patronage*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Baliç, İ. and Ermiş, D., 2013. *İkaseve : 370 kişi İstanbul Kültür Sanat Vakfı'nın 40 yılını anlatıyor*. İstanbul: İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı.
- Barkey, H.J. and Fuller, G.E., 1998. *Turkey's Kurdish question*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bartu, A., 1999. Who owns the old quarters? Rewriting histories in a global era. In: Ç. Keyder, ed. *İstanbul : between the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 31–47.
- Bayraktar, N., 2011. İyimserliği yeniden düşünmek küratör Hou Hanru ile söyleşi. In: *İstanbul nereye?: Küresel kent, kültür, Avrupa*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 261–287.
- Bazin, G., 1967. *The museum age*. New York, NY: Universe Books.
- Becker, H.S., 1974. Art as collective action. *American Sociological Review*, 39 (6), 767–776.
- Bedri Baykam biography [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.bedribaykam.com/en/ozgecmis.html> [Accessed 24 Jul 2014].
- Bek, G., 2014. 1970-1980 yılları arasında Türkiye’de kültürel ve sanatsal ortam. *SALT Online*. PhD Thesis. Hacettepe University.
- Benedict, S.E., ed., 1991. *Public money and the muse: Essays on government funding for the arts*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Benjamin, W., 1999. The artist as producer. In: *Collected Writings II*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 301–311.
- Benjamin, W., 2008. *The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bennett, T., 1988. The exhibitionary complex. In: N.B. Birks, G. Eley, and G.B. Ortner, eds. *Culture / power / history: a reader in contemporary social theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 123–154.
- Bennett, T., 1990. The political rationality of the museum. *Continuum*, 3 (1), 35–55.
- Bennett, T., 1995. *The birth of the museum: history, theory, politics*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Berk, N. and Gezer, H., 1973. *50 yılın Türk resim ve heykeli*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Berkes, N., 1965. *The development of secularism in Turkey*. Montreal: McGill University Press.
- Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Korosu'nun konserleri büyük ilgi gördü [online], 1981. *Hürriyet*. Available from: <http://www.sadberkhanimmuzesi.org.tr/default.asp?page=basinodasi&b=shm&hl=en> [Accessed 14 Feb 2014].
- Bora, T., 1999. İstanbul of the conqueror: the “alternative global city” dreams of political Islam. In: Ç. Keyder, ed. *İstanbul : between the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 47–58.
- Boratav, K., 1990. Inter-Class and intra-class relations of distribution under “structural adjustment” : Turkey during the 1980s. In: T. Aricanli and D. Rodrik, eds. *The political economy of Turkey: debt, adjustment and sustainability*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 199–229.
- Boratav, K., 1993. Book review: state and class in Turkey. A study in capitalist development. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 25 (1), 129–141.
- Boratav, K., 2004. *Türkiye iktisat tarihi, 1908-2003*. Ankara: İmge kitabevi.
- Boratav, K., 2005. *1980“ li yıllarda Türkiye “ de sosyal sınıflar ve bölüşüm*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Bourdieu, P., 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1985. The market of symbolic goods. *Poetics*, 14 (1), 13–44.
- Bourdieu, P., 1990. *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 2006. The forms of capital. In: *Cultural theory: an anthology*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 81–93.
- Bourdieu, P., Boltanski, L., Castel, R., Chamboredon, J.C., and Schnapper, D., 1990. *Photography: a middle-brow art*. London: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A., 1990. *The love of art: European art museums and their public*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J., 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bozdoğan, S., 2002. *Modernizm ve ulusun inşası: Erken cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde mimari ve kültür*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Bozdoğan, S. and Kasaba, R., eds., 1997a. *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Bozdoğan, S. and Kasaba, R., eds., 1997b. *Rethinking modernity and national identity*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Brubaker, R., 1992. *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bu koleksiyonlardan nasıl ayrılacağız diye soruyorum Suna'ya. Yatağı müzeye taşıyor o da, 2004. *Hürriyet Pazar*, 19 Dec.
- Bu tür projeler kenti birinci lige çıkarıyor, 2009. *Sabah*, 14 Jun.
- Buchanan, I., 2010. *A dictionary of critical theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buğra, A., 1994a. *State and business in modern Turkey*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Buğra, A., 1994b. Political and institutional context of business activity. In: *Developmentalism and beyond : society and politics in Egypt and Turkey*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 233–255.
- Buğra, A., 1995. *Devlet ve işadamları*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Calhoun, C.J., ed., 1992. *Habermas and the public sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Castells, M., 1997. *The power of identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Central directory of revolving funds sponsorship activities [online], 2013. Available from: <http://dosim.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,51936/sponsorluk-faaliyetlerine-konu-olacak-uygulamalar.html> [Accessed 27 Nov 2013].
- Central directory of revolving funds tax advantages in sponsorship [online], 2013. Available from: <http://dosim.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,51935/sponsorlukta-vergi-avantajlari.html> [Accessed 27 Nov 2013].
- CerModern about [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.cermodern.org/en/> [Accessed 5 May 2014].

- Chobot, M.C. and Chobot, R.B., 1990. Museums as educational institutions. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 47, 55–62.
- Civaoğlu, G., 2012. Bülent ile ocak ayında tanıştık aralıkta evlendik. *Milliyet*, 17 Nov.
- Cizre, Ü., 2004. Problems of democratic governance of civil-military relations in Turkey and the European enlargement zone. *European Journal of Political Research*, 43 (1), 107–125.
- Cizre, Ü. and Yeldan, E., 2005. The Turkish encounter with neo-liberalism: economics and politics in the 2000/2001 crises. *Review of International Political Economy*, 12 (3), 387–408.
- Controversial draft law comes to table, 2014. *Hurriyet Daily News*, 4 Mar.
- Coşar, S. and Özman, A., 2004. Centre-right politics in Turkey after the november 2002 general election: neo-liberalism with a Muslim face. *Contemporary Politics*, 10 (1), 57–74.
- Coşar, S. and Yeğenoğlu, M., 2011. New grounds for patriarchy in Turkey: gender policy in the age of AKP. *South European Politics and Society*, 16 (4), 555–573.
- Crane, S.A., ed., 2000. *Museums and memory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Çalikoğlu, L., ed., 2007. *Çağdaş sanat konuşmaları 2: Çağdaş sanatta sivil oluşumlar ve inisiyatifler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Çalikoğlu, L., ed., 2008. *Çağdaş sanat konuşmaları 3: 90'lı yıllarda Türkiye'de çağdaş sanat*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Çalikoğlu, L., ed., 2009. *Çağdaş sanat konuşmaları 4: Koleksiyon, koleksiyonerlik ve müzecilik*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Çitak, Z. and Tür, Ö., 2008. Women between tradition and change: the Justice and Development Party experience in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 44 (3), 455–469.
- Çizakça, M., 2000. *A history of philanthropic foundations: The Islamic world from the seventh century to the present*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Davison, A., 1998. *Secularism and revivalism in Turkey: a hermeneutic reconsideration*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Demir, G. and Gamm, N., 2014. M. Özalp Birol: Solidifying a museum's future [online]. *Hurriyet Daily News*. Available from: <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/english/domestic/11755728.asp> [Accessed 25 Jul 2014].
- DiMaggio, P.J., 1982. Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston, part II: the classification and framing of American art. *Media, Culture & Society*, 4 (4), 303–322.
- DiMaggio, P.J., 1991a. Constructing an organizational field as a professional project: US art museums, 1920-1940. In: P.J. Di Maggio and W.W. Powell, eds. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 267–292.
- Di Maggio, P.J., 1991b. Social structure, institutions, and cultural goods: the case of the United States. In: P. Bourdieu and J.S. Coleman, eds. *Social theory for a changing society*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- DiMaggio, P.J., 1991c. Decentralization of arts funding from the federal government to the states. In: S. Benedict, ed. *Public, money and the muse: essays on governmental funding for the arts*. New York, NY: Norton, 216–256.
- DiMaggio, P.J., 1991d. Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: the creation of an organisational base for high culture in America. In: C. Mukerji and M. Schudson, eds. *Rethinking popular culture: contemporary perspectives in cultural studies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Di Maggio, P.J., 2006. Nonprofit organizations and the intersectoral division of labor in the arts. In: W.W. Powell and R. Steinberg, eds. *The nonprofit sector: a research handbook*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 432–461.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and Mohr, J., 1985. Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90 (6), 1231–1261.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W., 1983. The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48 (2), 147–160.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W., eds., 1991. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and Useem, M., 1978. Social class and arts consumption. *Theory and Society*, 5 (2), 141–161.

- Dirks, N.B., Eley, G., and Ortner, S.B., eds., 1994a. *Culture/power/history: a reader in contemporary social theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dirks, N.B., Eley, G., and Ortner, S.B., 1994b. Introduction. *In: Culture/power/history: a reader in contemporary social theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 3–45.
- Doğan, E., 2005. The historical and discursive roots of the Justice and Development Party's EU stance. *Turkish Studies*, 6 (3), 421–437.
- Duncan, C., 1994. Art museums and the ritual of citizenship. *In: S. Pearce, ed. Interpreting objects and collections*. Routledge, 279–286.
- Duncan, C., 1995. *Civilizing rituals: inside public art museums*. Routledge.
- Duncan, C. and Wallach, A., 1980. The universal survey museum. *Art History*, 3 (4), 448–469.
- Durand, J.C., 1996. Business support to the arts and culture in Brazil. *In: R. Martorella, ed. Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 65–82.
- Durham, M.G. and Kellner, D.G., eds., 2001. *Media and cultural studies: keywords*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Durham, M.G. and Kellner, D.M., eds., 2009. *Media and cultural studies: Keywords (Vol. 2)*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Dündar, C., 2003. *Bir yaşam iksiri / Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı*. İstanbul: İş Kültür Yayınları.
- Dünden bugüne Feshane [online], 2008. *Mimarizm*. Available from: <http://www.mimarizm.com/kentintozu/makale.aspx?id=588&sid=609> [Accessed 7 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group arts & culture İstanbul Foundation for Arts and Culture [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/social-responsibility/social-responsibility-arts-culture/istanbul-foundation-for-culture-and-arts> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group arts & culture İstanbul Museum of Modern Art [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/social-responsibility/social-responsibility-arts-culture/Istanbul-museum-of-modern-art> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

- Eczacıbaşı Group arts & culture Vitra Ceramic Arts Studio [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/social-responsibility/social-responsibility-arts-culture/vitra-ceramic-arts-studio> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group arts& culture Izmir Foundation for Culture, Arts and Education [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/social-responsibility/social-responsibility-arts-culture/izmir-foundation-for-culture-arts-and-education> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group founder [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/eczacibasi-gruop/the-founder> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group milestones [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/eczacibasi-gruop/group-milestones> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group official web page [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/home> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group profile [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/eczacibasi-gruop/topluluk-profil-en> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Group social responsibility [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/social-responsibility> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı Holding [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/en/home> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı, N., 1982. *Kuşaktan kuşağa*. İstanbul: Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Vakfı Yayınları.
- Eczacıbaşı, N., 1994. *İzlenimler, umutlar*. İstanbul: Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Vakfı Yayınları.
- Eczacıbaşı, O., 2014. İstanbul Modern about [online]. Available from: http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/museum/about_760.html [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı social responsibility [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.eczacibasi.com.tr/tr/sosyal-sorumluluk/kultur-ve-sanat/iksv> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Eczacıbaşı, Ş., 2010. *Çağrışımlar tanıklıklar dostluklar*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

- Egrik, E.B., ed., 2006. *Türkiye’de kültür politikaları*. İstanbul: İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı.
- Elgiz Museum [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.elgizmuseum.org/> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- En üst düzey devlet nişanı alan Güler Sabancı’ya Avusturya basınından büyük övgü [online], 2010. *Wirtschaftswoche*. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com.tr/basin/dunya-basininda-sabanci/en-ust-duzey-devlet-nisani-alan-guler-sabanci-ya-avusturya-basinindan-buyuk-ovgu/i-1593> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Erciyes, C., 2010. İKSV artık politika yapacak. *Radikal*, 22 Oct.
- Erdal, S., 2014. Osman Hamdi Bey’in “Kaplumbağa Terbiyecisi” adlı tablosu [online]. *Restora Türk*. Available from: <http://www.restoraturk.com/restorasyon-sanat/resim-ve-heykel-restorasyonu/735-osman-hamdi-bey-kaplum-baga-terbiyecisi.html> [Accessed 25 Jul 2014].
- Erdoğan, N., 2007. *Yoksulluk halleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Erdoğan’ın Trump Towers açılış töreni konuşması [online], 2014. *En son haber*. Available from: <http://www.ensonhaber.com/erdoganin-trump-towers-acilis-toreni-konusmasi-2012-04-19.html> [Accessed 7 May 2014].
- Ergil, D., 2000. The Kurdish question in Turkey. *Journal of Democracy*, 11 (3), 122–135.
- Ergu, E., 2012. Sanata yatırımda Koç Sabancı ve Eczacıbaşı’ndan sonra dördüncü aile Ülker. *Vatan*, 12 Aug.
- Ergüder, Ü., 1991. The Motherland Party, 1983-89. In: M. Heper and J.M. Landau, eds. *Political Parties and Democracy in Turkey*. London: IB Tauris, 152–169.
- Ergün, B. and Özlüer, A., 2004. Koç rekor. *Sabah*, 13 Dec.
- Ertuğrul, A. and Selçuk, F., 2001. A brief account of the Turkish economy, 1980-2000. *Russian and East European finance and trade*, 37 (6), 6–30.
- Erzen, J., 2010. İstanbul’da sanat: Çağdaş gösteriler ve tarihe bir bakış. In: *İstanbul nereye?: Küresel kent, kültür, Avrupa*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 283–303.
- Falk, J.H. and Dierking, L.D., 2000. *Learning from museums: visitor experiences and the making of meaning*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

- Faroghi, S., 2005. *Subjects of the sultan: culture and daily life in the Ottoman empire*. New York, NY: IB Tauris.
- Feagin, S.L. and Maynard, P., 1997. *Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feldstein, M., ed., 2009. *The economics of art museums*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foster, A.W. and Blau, J.R., eds., 1989. *Art and society readings in the sociology of the arts*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Fowler, B., 2006. Autonomy, reciprocity and science in the thought of Pierre Bourdieu. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 23 (6), 99–117.
- Galligan, A.M., 1993. The politicization of peer-review panels at the NEA. In: J. Huggings, ed. *Paying the piper: causes and consequences of art patronage*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 254–272.
- Gans, H.J., 1974. *Popular culture and high culture*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Garanti Bank main contract [online], 2014. Available from: http://assets.garanti.com.tr/assets/pdf/tr/diger/garanti_bankasi_ana_sozlesmesi.pdf [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Garanti caz yeşili [online], 2014. *Garanti Bankası*. Available from: http://www.garanti.com.tr/tr/garanti_hakkinda/surdurulebilirlik/kurumsal_sorumluluk/kultur_sanata_destek/garanti_caz_yesili.page [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- Gelir İdaresi Başkanlığı, 2013. Vergi muafiyeti tanınan vakıfların listesi [online]. Available from: <http://www.gib.gov.tr/index.php?id=406> [Accessed 27 Nov 2013].
- Genelge ve formlar [online], 2013. Available from: <http://dosim.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,51939/genelge-ve-formlar.html> [Accessed 28 Nov 2013].
- Germaner, S. and İnankur, Z., 2002. *Oryantalistlerin İstanbul'u*. İstanbul: İş Kültür Yayınları.
- Giddens, A., 1990. *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A., 1991. *Modernity and self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Glasmacher, V. and Strachwitz, C.R., 1996. The role of foundations in support of the arts in Germany. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 109–118.

- Gonçabate, R.S. and Hajduk, M.E., 1996. Business support to the arts and culture in Argentina. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 47–64.
- Göktürk, D., Soysal, L., and Türeli, I., eds., 2010. *Orienting Istanbul: cultural capital of Europe?* Routledge.
- Göle, N., 1997. Secularism and Islamism in Turkey: the making of elites and counter-elites. *Middle East Journal*, 51 (1), 46–58.
- Gönül, S., 2001a. Beni üzen eski fotoğraflar. *Hürriyet*, 16 Dec.
- Gönül, S., 2001b. Benim kürk paraları abimin müzesinde. *Hürriyet*, 15 Jul.
- Gönül, S., 2002. Kimler geldi, kimler geçti? *Hürriyet*, 25 Aug.
- Guerrieri, M., 2002. Müze: hatıra ve gerçeğin sahnesi. In: R. Alp, ed. *Bir kuruluşun öyküsü: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi*. İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi Yayınları, 53–115.
- Güler Sabancı dünyanın en güçlü 10 iş kadını arasında [online], 2007. *Fortune*. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/tr/basin-odasi/dunya-basininda-sabanci/fortune-guler-sabanci-dunyanin-en-guclu-10-is-kadini-arasinda/i-1581>.
- Güler Sabancı: Çağdaş Türkiye'nin bir numarası [online], 2007. *Algemeen Dagblad*. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/tr/basin-odasi/dunya-basininda-sabanci/algemeen-dagblad-guler-sabanci-hollanda-basininda/i-1575> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Güler Sabancı: Çağdaşlığın ustası [online], 2008. *Financial Times Deutschland*. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/tr/basin-odasi/dunya-basininda-sabanci/financial-times-deutschland-guler-sabanci-cagdasligin-ustadi/i-1589> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Güler Sabancı: Türk imparatorluğunun başındaki kadın [online], 2007. *Les Echos*. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/tr/basin/dunya-basininda-sabanci/les-echos-guler-sabanci-turk-imparatorlugunun-basindaki-kadin/i-1578> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- “Güler Sabancı: Türkiye'nin önder kadını” [online], 2010. *Succeed*. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/tr/basin-odasi/dunya-basininda-sabanci/succeed-dergisi-guler-sabanci-roportajini-kapak-haberi-yapti/i-1594> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

- Güneş-Ayata, A., 1994. Roots and trends of clientelism in Turkey. In: L. Roniger and A. Güneş-Ayata, eds. *Democracy, clientelism, and civil society*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 49–63.
- Güneysu, S., 2014. TÜSAK’a hayır diyen gider. *Cumhuriyet*, 26 Aug.
- Habermas, J., 1989. *The theory of communicative action (Vol. 2)*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Hacı Ömer Sabancı Holding A.Ş.’nin yeni yönetim kurulu başkanı Güler Sabancı [online], 2004. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com.tr/basin-odasi/basin-bultenleri-arsiv/haci-omer-sabanci-holding-a-s-nin-yeni-yonetim-kurulu-baskani-guler-sabanci/i-1146> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Hale, W., 1994. *Turkish politics and military*. London: Routledge.
- Hansen, S., 2012. The Istanbul art-boom bubble. *The New York Times Magazine*.
- Harvey, D., 2007. Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610 (1), 21–44.
- Harvey, D., 2009. The art of rent: globalisation, monopoly and the commodification of culture. *Socialist Register*, 38 (38).
- Haunted mansion [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.borusancontemporary.com/haunted-villa.aspx> [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- Hauser, A., 1999. *Social history of art, volume 2: renaissance, mannerism, baroque*. Routledge.
- Heidegger, M., 1992. The origin of the work of art. In: J. Young and K. Haynes, eds. *Off the beaten track*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heper, M., 1989. Motherland Party governments and bureaucracy in Turkey, 1983–1988. *Governance*, 2 (4), 460–471.
- Heper, M., 1990. The state, political party and society in post-1983 Turkey. *Government and Opposition*, 25 (3), 321–333.
- Heper, M., 2005. The Justice and Development Party government and the military in Turkey: Toward a liberal model. *Turkish Studies*, 6 (2), 215–231.
- Heper, M., 2011. Civil-military relations in Turkey: toward a liberal model. *Turkish Studies*, 12 (2), 242–252.

- Heper, M. and Keyman, F., 1998. Double faced state: political patronage and the consolidation of democracy in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34 (4), 259–277.
- Hızlan, D., 1998. Modern sanat müzesiz müzeler haftası. *Hürriyet*, 19 May.
- Hızlan, D., 2000. Bir özel müzenin yirmi yılı. *Hürriyet*, 28 Feb.
- Hızlan, D., 2007. Müzeler Haftası’nda müzelere genel bakış. *Hürriyet*, 17 May.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E., 1992. *Museums and the shaping of knowledge*. Routledge.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E., ed., 1999. *The educational role of the museum*. Routledge.
- İçduygu, A., Romano, D., and Sirkeci, İ., 1999. The ethnic question in an environment of insecurity: the Kurds in Turkey. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22 (6), 991–1010.
- İkon Events Company official web page [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.ikonevents.com/> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İKSV about [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.iksv.org/en/aboutus/iksv> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İKSV archive [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.iksv.org/en/archive/p/1/840> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İKSV Biennial archive [online], 2014. Available from: [tp://bienal.iksv.org/tr/arsiv/bienalar/sivi/217](http://bienal.iksv.org/tr/arsiv/bienalar/sivi/217) [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İKSV cultural policy [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.iksv.org/en/aboutus/cultural_policy [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İKSV history [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.iksv.org/en/aboutus/history> [Accessed 10 Jun 2014].
- İKSV Lalekart [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.lalekart.org/lalekart> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İKSV sponsorluk programı [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.iksv.org/en/sponsorship> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İKSV sponsorship [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.iksv.org/en/sponsorship/sponsors> [Accessed 4 May 2014].

- İKSV sponsorship presentation [online], 2014. Available from: <http://cdn.iksv.org/media/content/files/sponsorluksunum.pdf> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İnsel, A., 2003. The AKP and normalizing democracy in Turkey. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102 (2), 293–308.
- İspanya Sabancı hat koleksiyonu sergisi'ni konuşuyor [online], 2012. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/tr/basin-odasi/dunya-basininda-sabanci/ispanyol-basini-ispanya-sabanci-hat-koleksiyonu-sergisi-ni-konusuyor-i-1582>.
- İstanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.iksv.org/en> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı, 1973. *Resmi Gazete*, 29 Jul.
- İstanbul Modern [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.istanbulmodern.org/> [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- İstanbul Modern açıldı, 2004a. *Radikal*, 12 Dec.
- İstanbul Modern açıldı, 2004b. *Radikal*, 12 Dec.
- İstanbul Modern exhibitions about [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/exhibitions/about_57.html [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- İstanbul Modern kapatılıyor mu? [online], 2012. *F5 Haber*. Available from: <http://www.f5haber.com/sicak-gundem/istanbul-modern-kapatiliyor-mu-haberi-2895853/?ref=out> [Accessed 7 May 2014].
- İstanbul Modern Kültür Sanat Vakfı'yla yollarını ayırdı, 2005. *Zaman*, 9 Dec.
- İstanbul Modern Official Webpage, education [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/education/education-at-istanbul-modern_431.html [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- İstanbul Modern past exhibitions [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/exhibitions/past-exhibitions> [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- İstanbul Modern past exhibitions abroad [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/exhibitions/past-exhibitions-abroad> [Accessed 5 May 2014].

İstanbul Modern press releases [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/press/press-releases> [Accessed 5 May 2014].

İstanbul Modern Sanat Vakfı, 2006. *Resmi Gazete*.

İstanbul Modern Sanat Vakfı kuruldu, 2006. *Zaman*, 3 Jul.

İstanbul Modern sponsorluk [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.iksv.org/en/sponsorship/sponsors> [Accessed 5 May 2014].

İstanbul Modern sponsorship [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/support/sponsorship_338.html [Accessed 5 May 2014].

İstanbul Modern, administration [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/museum/administration_43.html [Accessed 5 May 2014].

İstanbul Modern, visiting hours and admission [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en/visit/visiting-hours-and-admission_52.html [Accessed 5 May 2014].

İş Sanat about [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.issanat.com.tr/en/about/> [Accessed 10 May 2014].

Jameson, F., 1990. *Late Marxism: Adorno, or, the persistence of the dialectic*. London: Verso.

Jenkins, G., 2005. *Context and circumstance: the Turkish military and politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, G., 2007. Continuity and change: prospects for civil—military relations in Turkey. *International Affairs*, 83 (2), 339–355.

Jenkins, R., 2013. *Pierre Bourdieu*. Routledge.

Kahraman, H.B., 2005. *Sanatsal gerçeklikler, olgular ve öteleri*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.

Kahraman, H.B., 2007. From culture of politics to politics of culture: reflections on Turkish modernity. In: F. Keyman, ed. *Remaking Turkey: globalisation, alternative modernities and democracy*. Lexington Books, 47–74.

Kalaycıoğlu, E., 1991. Commercial groups: love-hate relationship with the state. In: M. Heper, ed. *The state and economic interest groups: the post-1980 Turkish experience*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 79–87.

- Kalaycıoğlu, E., 2002. The Motherland party: the challenge of institutionalization in a charismatic leader party. *Turkish Studies*, 3 (1), 41–61.
- Kalaycıoğlu, E., 2009. Democracy, Islam and secularism in Turkey. In: N.J. Brown and E. Shahin, eds. *The struggle over democracy in the Middle East: regional politics and external policies*. Routledge, 153–186.
- Kalaycıoğlu, E., 2010. Justice and Development Party at the helm: resurgence of Islam or restitution of the Right of center predominant party? *Turkish Studies*, 11 (1), 29–44.
- Kandiyoti, D., 2002. Introduction: reading the fragments. In: D. Kandiyoti and A. Saktanber, eds. *Fragments of culture: the everyday of modern Turkey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1–24.
- Kandiyoti, D. and Saktanber, A., eds., 2002. *Fragments of culture: the everyday of modern Turkey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kant, I., 2007. *Critique of judgement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaplan, S., 2002. Sadberk Hanım’da deprem önlemleri üç ayda alındı. *Hürriyet*, 23 Feb.
- Karaca, B., 2010. Kentsel sanat etkinlikleri politikaları: İstanbul’la Berlin’i karşılaştırmak. In: *İstanbul nereye?: Küresel kent, kültür, Avrupa*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 304–328.
- Karakayalı, N., 2004. Reading Bourdieu with Adorno the limits of critical theory and reflexive sociology. *Sociology*, 38 (2), 351–368.
- Karpat, K.H., 1990. Book review: State and class in Turkey. A study in capitalist development. *Review of The American Historical Review*, 95 (5), 1594–1595.
- Kasaba, R., 1997. Kemalist certainties and modern ambiguities. In: S. Bozdoğan and R. Kasaba, eds. *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 15–36.
- Kasaba, R. and Bozdoğan, S., 1997. Introduction. In: S. Bozdoğan and R. Kasaba, eds. *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 3–14.
- Kasalı, B.K., 2010. Çok partili dönemde kültür politikaları ve sanata yansımaları. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Ege University.
- Kawasaki, K., 1996. Art and cultural policy in Japan. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 195–202.

- Kaykılar, D., 2006. Sabancı Müzesi'nde drtl ittifak. *Akşam*, 23 Mar.
- Kazgan, G., 2004. *Tanzimattan 21.yzyıla Trkiye ekonomisi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press.
- Kenyon, G.S., 1996. Corporate involvement in the arts and the reproduction of power in Canada. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 33–46.
- Keyder, Ç., 1992. İstanbul'u nasıl satmalı? *İstanbul*, 3, 80–86.
- Keyder, Ç., 1993a. *Ulusal kalkınmacılığın iflası*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Keyder, Ç., 1993b. *Trkiye'de devlet ve sınıflar*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Keyder, Ç., 1997. Whither the project of modernity? Turkey in the 1990s. In: S. Bozdoğan and Kasaba, eds. *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 37–51.
- Keyder, Ç., 1999a. The setting. In: Ç. Keyder, ed. *İstanbul : between the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 3–28.
- Keyder, Ç., ed., 1999b. *İstanbul: between the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Keyder, Ç., 2006. Moving in from the margins? Turkey in Europe. *Diogenes*, 53 (2), 72–81.
- Keyder, Ç. and Önc, A., 1993. *Istanbul and the concept of world cities*. İstanbul: Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
- Keyman, F., 2007a. Introduction: modernity and democracy in Turkey. In: *Remaking Turkey: globalisation, alternative modernities and democracy*. Lexington Books, xv–xxviii.
- Keyman, F., 2007b. Modernity, secularism and Islam: the case of Turkey. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 24 (2), 215–234.
- Keyman, F., ed., 2007c. *Remaking Turkey: globalisation, alternative modernities and democracy*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Keyman, F. and İduygu, A., 2005. Articulating citizenship and identity: the “Kurdish Question” in Turkey. In: *Citizenship in a global world: European questions and Turkish experiences*. Taylor&Francis, 267–288.
- Kılı, A., 2009. Mavi Senfoni'nin yeni sahibi Murat lker. *Zaman*, 18 Nov.

- Kıraç, C., 1995. *Anılarımla patronum Vehbi Koç*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları.
- Kıraç Vakfı'ndan kültür sanata 100 milyon dolar, 2004. *Hürriyet*, 15 Dec.
- Kirchberg, V., 1996. Emerging corporate arts support: Potsdam, Eastern Germany. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 119–130.
- Kirchberg, V., 2003. Corporate arts sponsorship. In: R. Towse, ed. *A handbook of cultural economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 143–151.
- Kirişçi, K. and Winrow, G.M., 1997. *The Kurdish question and Turkey: an example of a trans-state ethnic conflict*. London: Routledge.
- Koç Holding [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.koc.com.tr/en-us> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Koç Holding about [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.koc.com.tr/en-us/about> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Koç Holding activity fields [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.koc.com.tr/en-us/activity-fields> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Koç Holding corporate social responsibility [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.koc.com.tr/en-us/corporate-social-responsibility> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Koç Holding fields of activity [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.koc.com.tr/tr-tr/faaliyet-alanlari/sirket-listesi> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Koç, V., 1974. *Hayat hikayem*. İstanbul: APA Ofset Basımevi.
- Koç, V., 1987. *Hatıralarım görüşlerim öğütlerim*. İstanbul: Vehbi Koç Vakfı.
- Korad Birkiye, S., 2009. Changes in the cultural policies of Turkey and the AKP's impact on social engineering and theatre. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15 (3), 261–274.
- Kosova, E. and Aslan, T., eds., 1998. “*Sanat ve kuram*” *Toplum ve Bilim*. 79. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kozanoğlu, C., 1995. *Pop çağı ateşi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kössner, B., 1996. Art sponsorship by the Austrian business sector. In: R. Martorella, ed. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 101–108.

- Kubicek, P., 2005. The European Union and grassroots democratization in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, 6 (3), 361–377.
- Kuru, A.T., 2006. Reinterpretation of secularism in Turkey: The case of the Justice and Development Party. In: M.H. Yavuz, ed. *The emergence of new Turkey : democracy and the AK Party*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 136–159.
- Kuru, A.T., 2007. Changing perspectives on islamism and secularism in Turkey: The Gülen Movement and the AK Party. In: İ. Yılmaz, ed. *Muslim world in transition: contributions of the Gülen Movement*. London: Leeds Metropolitan University Press, 140–151.
- Kültür varlıkları ve müzeler genel nüdürlüğü [online], 2013. Available from: <http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/TR,43980/ozel-muzeler.html> [Accessed 27 Nov 2013].
- Kültürel alandaki destek (sponsor) faaliyetlerinin teşvik edilmesi hakkında genelge*, 2005.
- Lowenthal, L., 1961. *Literature, popular culture and society*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lui, C., 2005. Art escapes criticism, or Adorno’s museum. *Cultural Critique*, 60 (1), 217–244.
- Macdonald, S., ed., 1998. *The politics of display: museums, science, culture*. Routledge.
- Macdonald, S. and Fyfe, G., eds., 1996. *Theorising museums*. Blackwell.
- Macdonald, S.J., 2003. Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities. *Museum and Society*, 1 (1), 1–16.
- Macdonald, S.J., 2012. Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities. In: B.M. Carbonell, ed. *Museum studies: an anthology of contexts*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mardin, Ş., 1981. Religion and secularism in Turkey. In: E. Özbudun and A. Kazancıgil, eds. *Atatürk: founder of a modern state*. London: C. Hirst & Co., 191–219.
- Mardin, Ş., 1994. *Türk modernleşmesi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Martorella, R., 1990. *Corporate art*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Martorella, R., 1996a. Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship. *In: Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 3–14.
- Martorella, R., ed., 1996b. *Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Marx, K., 1974. *Marx & Engels on literature & art: a selection of writings*. Internatio. Telos Press.
- Marx, K., 1976. *Preface and introduction to a contribution to the critique of political economy*. Peking: Foreign Languages Press.
- Marx, K., 1996. *Grundrisse*. Penguin Books.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F., 1965. *The German ideology*. London: Lawrance & Wishart.
- McClellan, A., 1994. *Inventing the Louvre: art, politics, and the origins of the modern museum in eighteenth-century Paris*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- McDonald, D., 1957. A theory of mass culture. *In: B. Rosenberg and F.M. White, eds. Mass culture: the popular arts in America*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Mei, J. and Moses, M., 2002. Art as an investment and the underperformance of masterpieces. *American Economic Review*, 92 (5), 1656–1668.
- Mevlana, Sadberk Hanım Müzesi'nde anıldı [online], 1980. *Tercüman*. Available from: <http://www.sadberkhanimmuzesi.org.tr/default.asp?page=basinodasi&b=shm&hl=en> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Meyer, J.W. and Scott, W.R., eds., 1992. *Organizational environments ritual and rationality*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Modern ve güçlü Türk kadını [online], 2009. *Kurier*. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com.tr/basin-odasi/dunya-basininda-sabanci/kurier-modern-ve-guclu-turk-kadini/i-1590> [Accessed 15 Aug 2014].
- Morawski, S., 1970. The aesthetic views of Marx and Engels. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 28 (3), 301–314.
- Muhteşem unutkanlık, 2013. *Hürriyet*, 13 Dec.

- Museum [online], 2013. *Theasaurus Dictionary*. Available from: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/museum> [Accessed 12 Dec 2013].
- Müftüler-Baç, M., 2002. Turkey in the EU's enlargement process: obstacles and challenges. *Mediterranean Politics*, 7 (2), 79–95.
- Nalbantoğlu, H. Ü., 2000. *Çizgi Ötesinden: Modern Üniversite, Sanat ve Mimarlık*. Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Nalbantoğlu, H. Ü. (2007). "Âlem kitsch olmuş, biz n'apalım." Adorno, kültür, sanat. *Toplum ve bilim*, (110), 83.
- Narlı, N., 2000. Civil-military relations in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, 1 (1), 107–127.
- Narlı, N., 2011. Concordance and discordance in Turkish civil-military relations, 1980-2002. *Turkish Studies*, 12 (2), 215–225.
- Navaro-Yashin, Y., 2002. *Faces of the state: secularism and public life in Turkey*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nejat Eczacıbaşı [online], n.d. *Biyografi.net*.
- Nejat Eczacıbaşı Foundation [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.nejateczacibasivakfi.org/tr/dr-nejat-f-eczacibasi-vakfi> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Neoliberalism [online], 2014. *Oxford Reference*. Available from: <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100228313> [Accessed 14 Feb 2014].
- Netzer, D., 1978. *The subsidized muse: public support for the arts in the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuman, W.L., 2006. *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Pearson.
- O'Hagan, J. and Harvey, D., 2000. Why do companies sponsor arts events? Some evidence and a proposed classification. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 24 (3), 205–224.
- Odendahl, T., 1990. *Charity begins at home: generosity and self interest among the philanthropic elite*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

- Oral, Z., 2014. Yazılar [online]. Available from: http://www.zeyneporal.com/yazilar/2006/13062006_5.htm [Accessed 6 May 2014].
- Organizma Company [online], 2014. Available from: <http://organizma.com/> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Osman Hamdi bey [online], 2014. *İstanbul Arcaeological Museums*. Available from: http://www.istanbularkeoloji.gov.tr/osman_hamdi_bey_eng [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Öncü, A., 1999. İstanbulites and others: the cultural cosmology of being middle class in the era of globalism. In: Ç. Keyder, ed. *İstanbul : between the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 95–119.
- Öncü, A., 2002. Global consumerism, sexuality as public spectacle, and the cultural remapping of Istanbul in the 1990s. In: D. Kandiyoti and A. Saktanber, eds. *Fragments of culture: the everyday of modern Turkey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 171–190.
- Önder, K., 1981. “Ressamları gözü ile Atatürk” sergisi Sadberk Hanım Müzesi’nde açıldı. *Tercüman*, 15 Apr.
- Öner, O., 2010. İstanbul 2010 Avrupa kültür başkenti: Katılımcı bir kültüre doğru mu? In: *İstanbul nereye? Küresel kent, kültür, Avrupa*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 245–259.
- Öniş, Z., 2004. Turgut Özal and his economic legacy: Turkish neo-liberalism in critical perspective. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 40 (4), 113–124.
- Öniş, Z., 2006a. Globalization and party transformation: Turkey’s Justice and Development Party in perspective. In: P. Burnell, ed. *Globalizing democracy: party politics in emerging democracies*. Routledge, 1–27.
- Öniş, Z., 2006b. The political economy of Turkey’s Justice and Development Party. In: H. Yavuz, ed. *The transformation of Turkish politics: the Justice and Development Party of Turkey*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Öniş, Z., 2009a. Conservative globalism at the crossroads: the Justice and Development Party and the thorny path to democratic consolidation in Turkey. *Mediterranean Politics*, 14 (1), 21–40.
- Öniş, Z., 2009b. Beyond the 2001 financial crisis: the political economy of the new phase of neo-liberal restructuring in Turkey. *Review of international political economy*, 16 (3), 409–432.

- Öniş, Z., 2011. Power, interests and coalitions: the political economy of mass privatisation in Turkey. *Third world quarterly*, 32 (4), 707–724.
- Öniş, Z., 2012. The triumph of conservative globalism: the political economy of the AKP era. *Turkish Studies*, 13 (2), 135–152.
- Öniş, Z. and Yılmaz, Ş., 2009. Between Europeanization and Euro-Asianism: foreign policy activism in Turkey during the AKP era. *Turkish Studies*, 10 (1), 7–24.
- Önsal, B., 2006. Emergence of art galleries in Ankara: a case study of three pioneering galleries in the 1950s. Unpublished MSc Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Özaltay, F., 2000. The 1994 currency crisis in Turkey. *The journal of policy reform*, 3 (4), 327–352.
- Özbek, M., 1997. Arabesk culture: a case of modernization and popular identity. In: S. Bozdoğan and R. Kasaba, eds. *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 211–232.
- Özbudun, E., 1991. The post-1980 legal framework for interest group associations. In: M. Heper, ed. *The state and economic interest groups: the post-1980 Turkish experience*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 41–53.
- Özbudun, E., 2000. *Contemporary Turkish Politics*. Contemporary Turkish politics. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Özbudun, E., 2007. Democratization reforms in Turkey, 1993-2004. *Turkish Studies*, 8 (2), 179–196.
- Özel müze yönetmeliği, 1980. *Resmi Gazete*, 8 Oct.
- Özel müzeler ve denetimleri hakkında yönetmelik, 1984. *Resmi Gazete*, 22 Jan.
- Özel Müzeler ve Denetimleri Hakkında Yönetmelik, 1984.
- Özel müzeler ve denetimleri hakkında yönetmelikte değişiklik yapılmasına dair yönetmelik, 2006. *Resmi Gazete*, 24 Nov.
- Özel sektörden sorumluluk projeleri, 2002. *Hürriyet*, 2 Jan.
- Özsezgin, K., 1998. *Cumhuriyetin 75 yılında Türk resmi*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.

- Özyürek, E., 2006. *Nostalgia for the modern: state secularism and everyday politics in Turkey*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pamuk, Ş., 2007. *Economic change in twentieth century Turkey: is the glass more than half full?* No. 41.
- Pamuk, Ş., 2014. *Türkiye'nin 200 Yıllık iktisadi tarihi*. İstanbul: İş Kültür Yayınları.
- Patton, M.J., 2006. The economic policies of Turkey's AKP government: rabbits from a hat? *Middle East Journal*, 60 (3), 513–536.
- Pera Museum [online], 2014. Available from: <http://en.peramuzesi.org.tr/> [Accessed 6 May 2014].
- Pera Museum collection exhibitions [online], 2014. Available from: <http://en.peramuzesi.org.tr/> [Accessed 6 May 2014].
- Pera Museum exhibitions [online], 2014. Available from: <http://en.peramuzesi.org.tr/Exhibition> [Accessed 6 May 2014].
- Pera Museum official webpage, collections [online], 2014. Available from: <http://en.peramuzesi.org.tr/> [Accessed 6 May 2014].
- Pera Museum past exhibitions [online], 2014. Available from: <http://en.peramuzesi.org.tr/Past-Exhibition> [Accessed 6 May 2014].
- Pesando, J.E., 1993. Art as an investment: the market for modern prints. *American Economic Review*, 83 (5), 1075–1089.
- Pfeffer, J.S. and Salancik, G., 2003. *The external control of organizations: a resource dependence perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Prior, N., 2002. *Museums and modernity: art galleries and the making of modern culture*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rahmi Koç Museum History [online], 2014. *Rahmi Koç Museum*. Available from: http://www.rmkmuseum.org.tr/en/rmk_history.htm [Accessed 10 August 2014].
- Rectanus, M.W., 2002. *Culture incorporated: museums, artists, and corporate sponsorships*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Remzi Gür Başkent Gaz'a talip [online], 2012. *Gazeteport*. Available from: <http://www.gazeteport.com.tr/haber/74407/remzi-gur-baskent-gaza-talip> [Accessed 14 Feb 2014].

- Revenue Administration, 2013a. Tax incentives for cultural investments and enterprises [online]. Available from: <http://www.gib.gov.tr/index.php?id=821> [Accessed 27 Nov 2013].
- Revenue Administration [online], 2013b. Available from: <http://www.gib.gov.tr/index.php?id=821> [Accessed 27 Oct 2013].
- Rice, D., 2003. Museums: theory, practice, and illusion. In: A. McClellan, ed. *Art and its publics: museum studies at the millennium*. Wiley-Blackwell, 77–95.
- Robbins, B., 1993. Introduction: the public as phantom. In: B. Robbins, ed. *The phantom public sphere*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rodrik, D., 1991. Premature liberalization, incomplete stabilization: the Özal decade in Turkey. In: M. Bruno, ed. *Lessons of economic stabilization and its aftermath*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 323–358.
- Rodrik, D. and Arıcanlı, T., 1990. Introduction and overview. In: T. Arıcanlı and D. Rodrik, eds. *The political economy of Turkey: debt, adjustment and sustainability*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–7.
- Sabancı Foundation charter & bylaws [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.sabancivakfi.org/page/charter-bylaws> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sabancı Foundation culture and arts [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.sabancivakfi.org/page/culture-arts> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Sabancı Foundation official web site [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.sabancivakfi.org/homepage/> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sabancı Group in brief [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en/sabanci-group/sabanci-group-in-brief/the-sabanci-group-in-brief/i-128> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sabancı Holding [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sabancı Holding foundation-university-museum [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en/social-responsibility/foundation-university-museum/k-159> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sabancı Holding Official web site milestones [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en/sabanci-group/milestones/k-57> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sabancı Holding official web site, history [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/tr/sabanci-toplulugu/tarihce/k-10> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sabancı Holding our social responsibility activities [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en/social-responsibility/our-social-responsibility-activities/k-161> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sabancı Holding our social responsibility principles [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en/social-responsibility/our-social-responsibility-principles/our-social-responsibility-principles/i-3351> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sabancı Holding social responsibility and sustainability in our companies [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en/social-responsibility/social-responsibility-and-sustainability-in-our-companies/social-responsibility-and-sustainability-in-our-companies/i-3361> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sabancı Holding's consolidated revenues reach 13.48 billion TL in the first half of 2014, up 25 percent year-on-year [online], 2014. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com/en/press/press-releases/sabanci-holding-s-consolidated-revenues-reach-13-48-billion-tl-in-the-first-half-of-2014-up-25-percent-year-on-year/i-3408> [Accessed 15 Aug 2014].

Sabancı, S., 1985. *İşte hayatım*. İstanbul: Aksoy Matbaacılık.

Sabancı Vakfı 35. yılında [online], 2014. Available from: <http://alumni.sabanciuniv.edu/tr/zoom/sabanci-vakfi-35-yilinda-0> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sadberk Hanım Koleksiyonu Japonya'da, 2002. *Hürriyet*, 9 Feb.

Sadberk Hanım Museum official web page [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.sadberkhanimmuzesi.org.tr/default.asp?hl=en> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sadberk Hanım Museum press clippings [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.sadberkhanimmuzesi.org.tr/default.asp?page=basinodasi&b=shm&hl=en> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

Sadberk Hanım Müzesi açıldı, 1980. *Milliyet*, 15 Oct.

Sadberk Hanım Müzesi bugün hizmete giriyor [online], 1980. *Cumhuriyet*. Available from: <http://www.sadberkhanimmuzesi.org.tr/default.asp?page=basinodasi&b=shm&hl=en> [Accessed 9 May 2014].

- Sakarya, S. and Büyükarıslan, D., 2013. International trade of contemporary artworks: an empirical study on the role of artist history in demand. *In: International Conference on Marketing Studies*. Hong Kong.
- Sakıp Sabancı Museum [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.sakipsabancimuzesi.org/en> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sakıp Sabancı Museum is opening its doors with two superb exhibitions [online], 2002. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com.tr/en/press/press-release-archives/sabanci-university-sakip-sabanci-museum-is-opening-its-doors-with-two-superb-exhibitions/i-910> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi açıldı [online], 2002. Available from: <https://www.sabanci.com.tr/basin/basin-bultenleri-arsiv/sabanci-universitesi-sakip-sabanci-muzesi-acildi/i-1192> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu üyeleri Mardin’de [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.sabancimuzesimardin.gov.tr/sabanci/haberdetay.asp?id=175&kategori=Haberler> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- Sakıp Sabancı official web site [online], 2014. Available from: <http://sakipsabanci.com.tr/en/main> [Accessed 9 May 2014].
- SALT İstanbul, 2011. Becoming Istanbul [online]. Available from: <http://saltonline.org/media/files/1227.pdf> [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- SALT official web page [online], 2014. Available from: <http://saltonline.org/en/home> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Sarıgil, Z., 2007. Europeanization as institutional change: the case of the Turkish military. *Mediterranean Politics*, 12 (1), 39–57.
- Sarıgil, Z., 2012. Ethnic groups at critical junctures: the Lazs vs Kurds. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 48 (2), 269–286.
- Saruhan, E., 2012. Artık sanat para ediyor. *Yeni Şafak*, 29 Dec.
- Sassen, S., 1991. *The global city*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen, S., 2001. *The global city*. New York, London, Tokyo: Princeton University Press.
- Sayarı, S., 1996. Political parties, party systems, and economic reforms: the Turkish case. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 31 (4), 29–45.

- Schuster, J.M.D., 1985. *Supporting the arts: an international comparative study*. Washington, D.C.
- Sel, Z., 2013. Özel müze sayısı artıyor [online]. *Anadolu Ajansı*. Available from: <http://www.aa.com.tr/tr/tag/186100--ozel-muze-sayisi-artiyor> [Accessed 15 May 2014].
- Semper, R.J., 2008. Science museums as environments for learning. *Physics Today*, 43 (11), 50–56.
- Sevgi Gönül'ün hat koleksiyonu sergileniyor, 2004. *Hürriyet*, 26 May.
- Sezer, T., 1999. *Çağdaş Türk sanatı*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Shaw, W.M.K., 2003. *Possessors and possessed: museums, archeology, and the visualisation of history in the late Ottoman Empire*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sherman, D.J., 1989. *Worthy monuments: art museums and the politics of culture in nineteenth-century France*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sherman, D.J. and Rogoff, I., 1994. Introduction: frameworks for critical analysis. In: D.J. Sherman and I. Rogoff, eds. *Museum culture: histories, discourses, spectacles*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sherman, D.J. and Rogoff, I., eds., n.d. *Museum culture: histories, discourses, spectacles*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sponsorluk faaliyetlerine konu olacak uygulamalar hakkında genelge [online], 2013. Available from: <http://dosim.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,51936/sponsorluk-faaliyetlerine-konu-olacak-uygulamalar.html> [Accessed 27 Nov 2013].
- Sponsorlukta vergi avantajları [online], 2013a. Available from: <http://dosim.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,51935/sponsorlukta-vergi-avantajlari.html> [Accessed 28 Nov 2013].
- Sponsorlukta vergi avantajları [online], 2013b. Available from: <http://dosim.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,51935/sponsorlukta-vergi-avantajlari.html> [Accessed 28 Nov 2013].
- Stanworth, P. and Giddens, A., eds., 1974. *Elites and power in British society*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stokes, M., 1992. *The Arabesk debate: music and musicians in modern Turkey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Stokes, M., 1999. Sounding out: the culture industries and the globalization of İstanbul. In: Ç. Keyder, ed. *İstanbul : between the global and the local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 121–139.
- Stokes, M., 2000. Kültür endüstrileri ve İstanbul'un küreselleşmesi. In: Ç. Keyder, ed., S. Savran, tran. *İstanbul küresel ile yerel arasında*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Stokes, M., 2002. Afterword: recognising the everyday. In: D. Kandiyoti and A. Saktanber, eds. *Fragments of culture: the everyday of modern Turkey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 322.
- Suna ve İnan Kırâç Vakfı, 2003. *Resmi Gazete*, 14 Nov.
- Suna-İnan Kırâç Research Institute of Mediterranean Civilisations [online], 2014. Available from: <http://akmed.kaleicimuzesi.com/en/> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Swartz, D., 1997. *Culture and power: the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Swartz, D. and Zolberg, V.L., eds., 2004. *After Bourdieu: influence, critique, elaboration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Şen, M., 2010. Transformation of Turkish Islamism and the Rise of the Justice and Development Party. *Turkish Studies*, 11 (1), 59–84.
- Şeni, N., 2009. Le mécène, un acteur méconnu de la ville. İstanbul à l'heure des musées privés. Transcontinentales. *Sociétés, idéologies, système mondial*, (7), 105–128.
- Şeni, N., 2014. Özel müzeler döneminde İstanbul [online]. Available from: <http://www.karalahana.com/makaleler/tarih/ozel-muzeler-doneminde-istanbul.htm> [Accessed 10 Aug 2014].
- Şeni, N., Akay, A., İnal, İ., Kösemen, B., and Arapoğlu, F., 2014. Yuvarlak masa: hamilikten sanat sponsorluğuna: sanata desteğin değişen karakteri. *İktisat Dergisi*, 526.
- Şenses, F., 1988. An overview of recent Turkish experience with economic stabilization and liberalization. In: T.F. Nas and M. Odekon, eds. *Liberalization and the Turkish economy*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- T. C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2014a. Genelge ve formlar [online]. Available from: <http://dosim.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,51939/genelge-ve-formlar.html> [Accessed 27 Nov 2014].

- T. C. K lt r ve Turizm Bakanlıđı, 2014b. K lt rel alanda sponsorluk [online]. Available from: <http://cdn.iksv.org/media/content/files/sponsorluksunum.pdf> [Accessed 27 Nov 2014].
- Tafolar, M., 2008. The neoliberal populism and the ‘‘ zal Decade’’: its implications for the democratic process. Unpublished MA Thesis. Bođazi i University.
- Tank, P., 2005. Political Islam in Turkey: a state of controlled secularity. *Turkish Studies*, 6 (1), 3–19.
- Tanner, J., ed., 2003. *The sociology of art: a reader*. Routledge.
- Tanyeri-Erdemir, T., 2011. A tale of two cities: freaks of kars and Berlin [online]. *Turquie Europeenne*. Available from: <http://turquieeuropeenne.eu/a-tale-of-two-cities-freaks-of-kars-and-berlin.html> [Accessed 12 Dec 2013].
- Tař-İstanbul Azaryan Yalısı [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.tas-istanbul.com/index.php/semtileri/sariyer/item/2204-azaryan-yalisi> [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- Temizkan, E., 2014. İstanbul Modern’e ne olacak? *Birg n*, 16 Dec.
- Tez, M., 2013. İKSV Deniz Palas’ı neden satıyor? *Milliyet Cumartesi*, 26 Oct.
- The National Gallery The Sultan Mehmet II [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/attributed-to-gentile-bellini-the-sultan-mehmet-ii> [Accessed 25 Jul 2014].
- Thornton, S., 2008. *Seven days in the art world*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Throsby, D., 1994. The production and consumption of the arts: a view of cultural economics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32 (1), 1–29.
- Timur, T., 1993. *T rk devrimi ve sonrası*. Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Tocci, N., 2005. Europeanization in Turkey: trigger or anchor for reform? *South European Politics and Society*, 10 (1), 73–83.
- Turan, İ., 1991. Religion and political culture in Turkey. In: R. Tapper, ed. *Islam in modern Turkey*. London: IB Tauris, 31–55.
- Turgut  zal belgeseli*, 1994. Documentary film. Directed by Dođan Kutlay.
- Turkey: protests against proposed arts council [online], 2014. *Arts Freedom*. Available from: <http://artsfreedom.org/?p=7616> [Accessed 25 May 2014].

- Turkish Prime Minister's bid to privatize theaters stirs uproar, 2012. *Hurriyet Daily News*, 30 Apr.
- Türk Eğitim Vakfı, kurucularımız [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.tev.org.tr/tev/detay.aspx?SectionID=PMO1LxuU1hr6IoJQtL511g==&ContentId=86PwdGbg73cup46nmynBxQ==> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Hükümeti ile İspanya Krallığı Hükümeti arasında eğitsel ve kültürel alanlarda işbirliği programı'nın onaylanması hakkında karar, 2007. *Resmi Gazete*, 8 Dec.
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Hükümeti ile İtalya Cumhuriyeti Hükümeti arasında 2006-2009 yıllarına ait kültürel işbirliği uygulama programının onaylanması hakkında karar, 2008. *Resmi Gazete*, 6 Jan.
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ile Çin Halk Cumhuriyeti arasında 2006-2009 yıllarına ilişkin kültürel değişim programının onaylanması hakkında karar, 2007. *Resmi Gazete*.
- "Türkiye'de güncel sanat" *Toplum ve Bilim*. 125. 2012. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Türkiye'de kültür politikaları*, 2003. İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık.
- Türkiye'nin ilk ofis müzesi Borusan Contemporary hafta sonları Perili Köşk'te sanatseverlerle buluşuyor [online], 2011. Available from: <http://www.borusancontemporary.com/basin-bultenleri/6/turkiyenin-ilk-ofis-muzesi-borusan-contemporary-hafta-sonlari-perili-koskte-sanatseverlerle-bulusuyor.aspx> [Accessed 5 May 2014].
- Türkmen, F., 2008. The European Union and democratization in Turkey: the role of the elites. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 30 (1), 146–163.
- Ulutaş, U., 2010. Religion and secularism in Turkey: the dilemma of the Directorate of Religious Affairs. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 46 (3), 389–399.
- Useem, M., 1980. Corporations and corporate elite. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25 (6), 41–77.
- Useem, M., 1984. *The inner circle: large corporations and the rise of business political activity in the US and UK*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Useem, M., 1987. Corporate philanthropy. In: W.W. Powell, ed. *The nonprofit sector: a research handbook*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 340–359.

- Useem, M., 1989. Corporate support for culture and arts. *In: M.J. Wyzomirski and P. Chubb, eds. The cost of culture: patterns and prospects of private arts patronage.* New York, NY: Americans for the Arts, 45–62.
- Useem, M. and Kutner, S.I., 1986. Corporate contributions to culture and the arts: the organization of giving and the influence of the chief executive officer and of other firms on company contributions in Massachusetts. *In: P.J. Di Maggio, ed. Nonprofit enterprise in the arts: studies in mission and constraint.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 93–112.
- Ünlü-Bilgiç, T., 2009. The military and europeanization reforms in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 45 (5), 803–824.
- Üstünipek, M., 1998. Cumhuriyet’ten günümüze Türkiye’de sanat yapıtı piyasası. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi.
- Vanhaerbeke, A., 1996. Business support for the arts and CEREC. *In: R. Martorella, ed. Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 83–88.
- Vehbi Koç Foundation [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.vkv.org.tr/default.aspx?hl=en> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Vehbi Koç Foundation culture [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.vkv.org.tr/kategori_detay.aspx?id=6&hl=en [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Vehbi Koç Foundation project support/culture [online], 2014. Available from: http://www.vkv.org.tr/icerik_detay.aspx?id=35&hl=en [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Vehbi Koç Vakfı Avrupa’nın en büyük 7 vakfı arasında, 1999. *Hürriyet*, 28 Aug.
- Velthuis, O., 2005. Talking prices: contemporary art, commercial galleries, and the construction of value. Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Watson, S., 2007. *Museums and their communities.* Routledge.
- Weil, S., 2007. The museum and the public. *In: S. Watson, ed. Museums and their Communities.* Taylor & Francis, 32–46.
- Wittlin, A.S., 1949. *The museum: its history and its tasks in education.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wolff, J., 1993. *The social production of art.* London: Macmillan.

- Wu, C.T., 1996. Corporate collectors of art in Britain. *In: R. Martorella, ed. Art and business: an international approach on sponsorship*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 89–100.
- Wu, C.T., 1998. Embracing the enterprise culture: art institutions since the 1980s. *New Left Review*, (230), 28–57.
- Wu, C.T. and Soğancılar, E., 2005. *Kültürün özelleştirilmesi: 1980’ler sonrasında şirketlerin sanata müdahalesi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Wyszomirski, M.J. and Chubb, P., eds., 1988. *The cost of culture: patterns and prospects of private arts patronage*. Americans for the Arts.
- Yalman, G., 2002. The Turkish state and bourgeoisie in historical perspective: a relativist paradigm or a panolpy of hegemonic strategies? *In: N. Balkan and S. Savran, eds. The politics of permanent crisis : class, ideology and state in Turkey*. New York, NY: Nova Publishers, 21–54.
- Yaman, M.H., ed., 2006. *The emergence of new Turkey : democracy and the AK Party*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Yaman, Z.Y., 1996. Yurt gezileri ve sergileri ya da mektepten memlekete dönüş. *Toplum ve Bilim*, (4), 35–52.
- Yaman, Z.Y., 1998a. 1950’lerin sanatsal ortamı ve temsil sorunu. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 79, 94–137.
- Yaman, Z.Y., 1998b. Cumhuriyet dönemi Türk resmi (1923-1938) üzerine düşünceler. *Arredamento Mimarlık*, 100 (7), 68–74.
- Yapı Kredi Yayınları kültür [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.ykykultur.com.tr/> [Accessed 8 May 2014].
- Yardımcı, S., 2004. Meeting in İstanbul: cultural globalization and art festivals. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Lancaster University.
- Yardımcı, S., 2005. *Küreselleşen İstanbul’da Bienal*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Yardımcı, S., 2007. *Festivalizing difference: privatization of culture and symbolic exclusion in Istanbul*. Florence, No. 35.
- Yavuz, M.H., 2006. The role of the new bourgeoisie in the transformation of the Turkish Islamic movement. *In: M.H. Yavuz, ed. The emergence of new Turkey : democracy and the AK Party*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1–19.

- Yavuz, M.H. and Özcan, N.A., 2006. The Kurdish question and Turkey's justice and development party. *Middle East Journal*, 13 (1), 102–119.
- Yeğen, M., 2007. Turkish nationalism and the Kurdish question. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30 (1), 119–151.
- Yılmaz, E.M., 2005. Oya Eczacıbaşı anlattı: İstanbul Modern'in ilginç hikayesi [online]. *Arkitera*. Available from: <http://www.arkitera.com/haber/7760/oya-eczacibasi-anlatti--istanbul-modernin-ilginc-hikayesi-> [Accessed 6 May 2014].
- Yılmaz, M.H., 2001. Five stages of the construction of Kurdish nationalism in Turkey. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 7 (3), 1–24.
- Yılmaz, M.H., 2009. *Secularism and Muslim democracy in Turkey*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zeitlin, M., 1989. *The large corporation and contemporary classes*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Ziraat Bank Museum [online], 2014. Available from: <http://www.ziraatbank.com.tr/en/OurBank/CultureAndArt/Pages/ZiraatBankMuseum.aspx> [Accessed 10 May 2014].
- Zolberg, V.L., 1974. The art institute of Chicago: the sociology of a cultural organization. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Chicago.
- Zolberg, V.L., 1981. Conflicting visions in American art museums. *Theory and Society*, 10 (1), 103–125.
- Zolberg, V.L., 1983. Changing patterns of patronage in the arts. In: J.B. Kamerman and R. Martorella, eds. *Performers and performances in the arts: The social organization of artistic work*. New York, NY: Praeger, 251–268.
- Zolberg, V.L., 1984. American art museums: sanctuary or free-for-all? *Social Forces*, 63 (2), 377–392.
- Zolberg, V.L., 1990. *Constructing a sociology of the arts*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zolberg, V.L., 1992. Book review: worthy monuments: art museums and the politics of culture in nineteenth-century France by Daniel J. Sherman. *Theory and Society*, 21 (1), 140–145.
- Zolberg, V.L., 1994. An elite experience for everyone: art museums, the public, and cultural literacy. In: D.J. Sherman and I. Rogoff, eds. *Museum culture:*

histories, discourses, spectacles. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 49–65.

Zucconi, M., 2009. The impact of the EU connection on Turkey's domestic and foreign policy. *Turkish Studies*, 19 (1), 25–36.

Zukin, S., 1989. *Loft living: culture and capital in urban change*. New York, NY: Rutgers University Press.

Zukin, S., 1995. *The cultures of cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Zürcher, E., 1993. *Turkey: a modern history*. London: IB Tauris.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS-SABANCI MUSEUM

Sabancı Museum Temporary Exhibitions						
#	Year	Exhibition Title	Duration	Affiliated Institutions/ Supporters	Sponsor	Curators
1	2002	Apuntti Allo Stadio Soccer Sketches	6.09.2002-15.10.2002	NA	Aria	NA
2	2003	From the Medicis to the Savoias Ottoman Splendour.	21.12.2003 - 18.04.2004	organized jointly by the Italian Cultural Centre and Sabancı University's Sakıp Sabancı Museum	Akbank and the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	NA
3	2003	Partnership of Power: Man and Horse	27 June 2003-5 May 2004	organized in conjunction with Ministry of Culture and Tourism Cultural Assets Istanbul Museums of Archaeology	NA	NA
4	2003	Paris - St.Petersburg Three Centuries of European	12.5.2004 -	Organized jointly by Beymen	NA	NA

	04	Fashion..	24.10.2004	Alexandre Vassiliev Collection		
5	2005	European Porcelain at the Ottoman Palace	24.5.2005 - 28.08.2005	Topkapı Palace Museum (selection from)	NA	NA
6	2005	The Image of Turks in Europe in the 17th Century	13.7.2005-9.10.2005	different museums in Central Europe (especially Slovenia) and private collections from England and Turkey	Credit Suisse	NA
7	2005	Picasso in Istanbul	24.11.2005 - 26.03.2006	Picasso Museums in Paris and Barcelona, the Lille Modern Art Museum, Fundación Almine y Bernard Ruiz-Picasso para el Arte (FABA), and the family collections	Sabancı Holding FABA French Cultural Center İstanbul	NA
8	2006	The Art of the Book from East to West and Memories	14.4.2006 - 28.05.2006	Calouste Gulbenkian Museum in Lisbon	Bank Europa Turgut Pharmaceutical Company	NA
9	2006	Master Sculptor Rodin in İstanbul	13.6.2006 - 03.09.2006	Paris Rodin Museum	Akbank	NA

10	206	Genghis Khan and His Heirs, The Great Mongol Empire	07.12.2006 - 08.4.2007	jointly organized by the Kunst und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland-Bonn, the Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde-Munich, the Kunsthistorisches Museum-Vienna, the federal state of lower Austria, the BMBWK	Garanti Bank	NA
11	207	In Praise of God - Anatolian Rugs in Transylvanian Churches.	19.4.2007 - 19.8.2007	in collaboration with Romanian Institute of Culture, the National Brukenthal Museum in Sibiu, the Evangelical Church A.C. of Romania, the Romanian Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, the Bucharest Museum of Art Collections, the Hungarian National Museum, the Museum of Applied Arts in Budapest, the Berlin Museum of Islamic Art	Yünsa	NA
1	20	Blind Date - İstanbul	08.9.2007 -	Deutsche Bank Art (concurrently with	Deutsche Bank	NA

2	0		01.11.2007	the 10th İstanbul Biennial)		
1	2					
3	0		24.11.2007			
	7	The World of Abidin Dino	- 27.1.2008	NA	Philips	NA
1	2					
4	0	Istanbul, Isfahan, Delhi	19.2.2008 -	Louvre Museum		
	8	Three Capitals of Islamic Art..	01.06.2008	Islamic Arts Collection	Türk Telekom	NA
1	2					
5	0	Salvador Dalí: A Surrealist in Istanbul	20.9.2008 -	Gala-Salvador Dalí Foundation	Akbank	Montse Aguer Teixidor
	8		01.02.2009			
1	2					
6	0	LISBON Memories from Another City	14.5.2009 -	Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in Portugal	Faber-Castell Father's Day event sponsor	NA
	9		02.8.2009			
1	2					
7	0	TRAVEL TO THE WEST - 70 Years of Turkish Painting (1860 - 1930)	16.4.2009 -	works of art selected from the collections of the Presidential Atatürk Museum Pavilion, the Ankara Museum of Painting and Sculpture, the TBMM National Palaces Dolmabahçe Palace Museum, MSGSÜ İstanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture, the SSM	Yüksel İnşaat A.Ş	Ferit Edgü
	9		02.08.2009			

				collections and private collections		
18	2009	Flow	10.8.2009-20.8.2009	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Sabanci University	NA	NA
19	2009	Joseph Beuys and His Students - Works	09.9.2009 - 01.11.2009	Deutsche Bank	Deutsche Bank	Friedhelm Hütte Ahu Antmen
20	2009	Venice and Istanbul during the Ottoman Period; Love, by any other name	19.11.2009 - 20.3.2010	Museums of Venice Topkapı Palace Museum, Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art, Pera Museum and Yapı Kredi Vedat Nedim Tör Museum	Sabancı Holding	NA
21	2010	Transcending Borders With Brush And Pen	15.4.2010 - 27.06.2010	Mitsubishi Corporation and Japan Tobacco	Mitsubishi Corporation and Japan Tobacco	Nazan Ölçer, SSM Consultant Dr. Filiz Çağman, President of the MG School of Latin Calligraphy Ms

						Muriel Gaggini, and the Director of the Kampo Museum Ms Yuri Harada.
2202	2010	Legendary Istanbul - From Byzantion to Istanbul	05.6.2010 - 26.9.2010	selected works from leading institutions in England, Germany, France, Italy, the Vatican, Hungary, Greece, Austria, Belgium, Holland, Ireland, Qatar, Portugal, and Russia. The exhibition also includes works selected from state museums, private museums and collections in Turkey and brings together, for the first time, a range of different pieces chosen from a total of 58 museums, 39 of which are located abroad and 19 in Turkey	Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture Agency Sabancı Holding	Nazan Ölçer
231	2010	The Jameel Prize 2009	11.11.2010 - 09.01.2011	Victoria & Albert Museum in London	Abdul Latif Jameel Co	Tim Stanley

	0		1			
2 4	2 0 1 0	Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum	05.11.2010 - 13.3.2011	Istanbul 2010 - European Capital of Culture Aga Khan Trust for Culture Aga Khan Museum	NA	Benoit Junod
2 5	2 0 1 1	Across	23.5.2011 - 30.10.2011	various Turkish museums National Archaeological Museum of Athens N. P. Goulandris Foundation Museum of Cycladic Art	ÇİMSA(head sponsor) Akbank (sponsor for education) Bergen Fine Arts (Logistics) Turkish Airlines for (transportation) and Turgut Pharmacy and Monte İda for the catalogue.	Assoc. Prof. Vasıf Şahoğlu (one of the curators)
2 6	2 0 1 1	SSM hosts Sophie Calle with "For the Last and First Time"	17.9.2011 - 31.12.2011	ran concurrently with the Istanbul Biennial Altı Nokta Foundation for the Blind Altı Nokta Association for the Blind Istanbul 2010 European Cultural Capital Mimar Sinan University of Fine Arts	Sony and Teknosa	NA

2 7	2 0 1 2	Where Darkness Meets Light ...Rembrandt and His Contemporaries	22.2.2012 - 17.6.2012	Rijksmuseum	<p>The Turkish and Dutch governments are the diplomatic co-sponsors number of major Dutch companies operating in Turkey main sponsors are Sabancı Holding and ING Bank Philips is also among the sponsors.</p> <p>Contributions from: Unilever and Shell Service sponsors: Grand Hyatt Hotel, the Park Hyatt Istanbul-Maçka Palas Hotel and KLM Royal Dutch Airlines.</p>	Pieter Roelofs
	2 0 1 8	Cobra-1000 days of free art	29.06.2012 - 16.09.2012	Cobra Museum of Modern Art and the private collection of ABN, AMRO Bank	<p>ABN AMRO Bank, De Meeuw Group / ABC Prefabrik, Gözde Private Equity, Investment Company, İpragaz, Merck Serono, TMF Group and the Kingdom of the Netherlands</p>	Katja Weitering , the Artistic Director of Cobra Museum of Modern Art.

2 9	2 0 1 2	Monet's Garden	09.12.2012 - 06.01.2013	Marmottan Monet Museum	Sabancı Holding is the exhibition's main sponsor, with Le Méridien Istanbul Etiler as sponsor for accommodation, and support from Vista Tourism	Marianne Mathieu
3 0	2 0 1 3	The 1001 Faces of Orientalism	25.4.2013 - 11.8.2013	sponsorship of Çiftçi Towers, technology support of Teknosa and accommodation support of The Grand Tarabya.	NA	NA
3 1	2 0 1 3	Fan From Past to Present	30.05.2013 - 25.08.2013	private collection of Nurcan Artam, Artam Antik INC. CEO		
3 2	2 0 1 3	Anish Kapoor in İstanbul	10.09.2013 - 02.02.2014		Akbank-main sponsor	Sir Norman Rosenthal

APPENDIX B

LIST OF TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS-İSTANBUL MODERN

İSTANBUL MODERN Temporary Exhibitions						
#	Year	Exhibition Title	Duration	Affiliated Institutions/Supporters*	Funding/Sponsor	Curators
1	2004	Observation, Interpretation, Multiplicity	11 December 2004 - 4 December 2005	Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Vakfı Koleksiyonu İstanbul Modern Koleksiyonu Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi İstanbul Resim ve Heykel Müzesi Koleksiyonu Oya - Bülent Eczacıbaşı Koleksiyonu Türkiye İş Bankası Koleksiyonu	NA	Ali Akay - Levent Çalıkoglu - Haşim Nur Gürel
2	2004	Appearances As We See Them	11 December 2004 - 27 March 2005	NA	FUJI FILM	Engin Özendes
3	2004	The Making of İstanbul Modern	12 December 2004 - 10 January	NA	NA	Fulya Erdemci

			2005			
4	2005	New Acquisitions	15 January 2005 - 29 March 2005	NA	NA	Haşim Nur Gürel – Ali Akay – Levent Çalıkoglu
5	2005	Rendez-Vous	6 April 2005 - 19 June 2005	NA	FUJI FILM	Engin Özendes
6	2005	Video Programme	15 April 2005 - 25 August 2005	NA	<u>Calyon-Credit Agricole Group</u>	Rosa Martínez
7	2005	Fikret Mualla Retrospective	15 April 2005 - 25 August 2005	NA	Eti, Selpak, Lafarge Turkey, MNG Bank, Doğu Çocuk and Garanti Mini Bank	Haşim Nur Gürel - Ali Akay - Levent Çalıkoglu
8	2005	Cityrama	28 June 2005 - 28 August 2005	UIA2005 Istanbul XXII World Architecture Congress	NA	Engin Özendes
9	2005	The Sculpture Garden	30 July 2005 - 5 September 2005	NA	NA	Levent Çalıkoglu

10	2005	Centre of Gravity	18 September 2005 - 15 January 2006	NA	Türk Ekonomi Bankası Petrol Ofisi, the British Council, the Frame - Finnish Fund for Art Exchange and Bautek İnşaat.	Rosa Martínez
11	2005	Intersecting Times	11 December 2005-15 January 2007	NA	NA	Haşim Nur Gürel - Ali Akay - Levent Çalıkoğlu
12	2006	In the Light of Republic- The Photographs of Othmar Pferschy	1 February 2006 - 21 May 2006	NA	FORTIS	Engin ÖZENDES
13	2006	Nothing Lasts Forever	1 February 2006 - 12 May 2006	NA	Calyon-Credit Agricole Group	Rosa Martínez
14	2006	Modern Sculpture- Memory and Scale	10 February 2006 - 30 April 2006	NA	NA	Haşim Nur Gürel, Ali Akay, Levent Çalıkoğlu
15	2006	Painting As a Way of Living	18 May 2006 - 1 October 2006	NA	Calyon-Credit Agricole Group	Rosa Martínez

1 6	2006	Two Generations of the Rainbow	18 May 2006 - 1 October 2006	NA	ETİ	Haldun Dostoglu
1 7	2006	True Stories	30 May 2006 - 27 August 2006	NA	FORTIS	Engin Özendes (ESFIAP)
1 8	2006	Right Place Right Time	7 Septemb er 2006 - 12 Novembe r 2006	NA	FORTIS	Engin Özendes
1 9	2006	Venice-İstanbul	18 October 2006 - 2 February 2007	International Supporters: British Council Consulate General of Sweden in Istanbul Consulate General of the Kingdom of the Netherlands Goethe Institut İstanbul Italian Cultural Institute in Istanbul Mondriaan Foundation Amsterdam	Türk Telekom Municipality of İstanbul Technology Sponsor Sony Lighting Design Tepta Aydınlatma	Rosa Martinez
2 0	2006	Double of Life	22 Kasım 2006 - 4 Şubat 2007	NA	FORTIS	Engin Özendes

2 1	2007	Turkey by Magnum	17 February 2007 - 20 May 2007	Exhibition Supporter Municipality of İstanbul Exhibition Lighting Desing Supporter Tepta Aydınlatma Exhibition Accomodation Supporter Point Hotel International Supporters Digiturk French Cultural Center American Consulate General Italian Cultural Center	Abdi Ibrahim Pharmaceuticals , Bilim Pharmaceuticals , Fortis , Samsung	Engin Özendes, Diane Dufour
2 2	2007	60 Years of Magnum	17 February 2007 - 20 May 2007	Exhibition Supporter Municipality of İstanbul Exhibition Lighting Desing Supporter Tepta Aydınlatma Exhibition Accomodation Supporter Point Hotel International Supporters Digiturk French Cultural Center American Consulate General Italian Cultural Center	Abdi Ibrahim Pharmaceuticals , Bilim Pharmaceuticals , Fortis , Samsung	Diane Dufour, Julien Chapsal
2 3	2007	Is This Fiction	17 February 2007 - 20 May	NA	Calyon-Credit Agricole Group	Rosa Martinez

			2007			
2 4	2007	The Light From Ankara	19 April 2007-20 May 2007	NA	NA	Engin Özendes
2 5	2007	Who are you? Ahmet Polat	30 May 2007 - 26 August 2007	Mondriaan Foundation Amsterdam Consulate General of the Kingdom of the Netherlands	FORTIS	Engin Özendes
2 6	2007	Andreas Gursky	30 May 2007 - 26 August 2007	Exhibition is organized by Haus der Kunst, Munich with the collaboration of İstanbul Modern	Merrill Lynch, WestLB, Turkish German Bussinesmen Cultural Foundation, Goethe Institut Istanbul Consulate general of the Federal Republic of Germany and Tepta Lighting	Thomas Weski
2 7	2007	... and Dreams are Dreams	30 May 2007 - 26 August 2007	NA	Calyon-Credit Agricole Group	Rosa Martínez

28	2007	Time Present Time Past	6 September - 2 December 2007	<p>EXHIBITION</p> <p>SUPPORTERS: UBS AG, Ernst&Young, Austrian Cultural Institute</p> <p>British Council, Embassy of Finland, French Cultural Center, Goethe Institut İstanbul, Consulate General of Sweden, Italian Cultural Center</p> <p>CONTRIBUTORS: A4 Ofset, Asya Nakliyat / Fine Art Logistics Borsa Lokantaları A.Ş., Global Tanıtım Halkla İlişkiler, Lafarge Dalsan, İETT İşletmeleri Genel Müdürlüğü, İntema İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, Kayra Şarapları, Lafarge Dalsan Vitra, Yapı Merkezi</p>	<p>Exhibition</p> <p>Sponsor: Morgan Stanley, BP, P&G Video Area</p> <p>Sponsor: Calyon-Credit Agricole Group</p>	<p>İstanbul Modern Director</p> <p>David Elliott and İstanbul Modern Chief Curator Rosa Martínez</p>
29	2007	BRID6E-Photographers in İstanbul	6 September 2007- 3 February 2008	NA	FORTIS	Engin Özendes

30	2007	Cihat Burak Retrospective	13 December 2007 - 06 April 2008	Exhibition Supporters: İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality Tepta Aydınlatma Global Tanıtım Halkla İlişkiler Sevilen Şarapları Graphis Matbaa Lafarge Dalsan Acarlar Makine	Türk Telekom	Levent Çalıkoğlu
31	2007	Love and Politics in a Minor Key	13 December 2007 - 06 April 2008	NA	Calyon-Credit Agricole Group	Paolo Colombo
32	2008	Quiet Resistance	13 February 2008 – 25 May 2008	Moscow House of Photography Museum	NA	Olga Sviblova
33	2008	Occupying Territory	23 April 2008 - 10 August 2008	NA	NA	Paolo Colombo

3 4	2008	Design Cities	23 April 2008 - 10 August 2008	exhibition is organized by the Design Museum, London İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality (for support)	Vitra and Intercity and other sponsors include: TEPTA AYDINLATMA CNN TÜRK MAS MATBAA ACARLAR MAKİNE BLUECHIP CREATIVE EVENTS BORSA LOKANTALARI ICON TASARIM YAYIN GRUBU XXI 2'DEBİR Contributors: BRITISH COUNCIL GOETHE- INSTITUT ISTANBUL EMBASSY OF FINLAND, ANKARA and MARSHALL for exhibition hall painting	Deyan Sudjic
3 5	2008	Pinhole Photographs	17 June 2008-31 August 2008	EXHIBITION SUPPORTERS VISA RENKLİ UFUKLAR MAS MATBAA MARSHALL	Mustafa Nevzat Pharmaceuticals	Engin Özendes

	2008	Held Together With Water	10 September 2008 – 11 January 2009	Verbund Collection	EnerjiSA other sponsors/supporter s: TEPTA AYDINLATMA MAS MATBAA ACARLAR MAKİNE BORSA LOKANTALARI exhibition areas have been colored by MARSHALL.	Gabriele Schor and Levent Çalikoğlu (in this exhibition for the first time he was titled as "İstanbul Modern Chief Curator)
3 6	2008	The City Rises	10 September 2008 – 11 January 2009	NA	NA	Paolo Colombo
3 7	2008	Human Conditions Sıtkı Kösemen/ Ergün Turan/ Süreyya Yılmaz Dernek	10 September 2008 – 25 January 2009	NA	Mas Matbaa and Marshall	: Engin Özendes
3 8	2008	Modern Experiences	13 December 2008-26 May 2009	NA	Permanent Exhibition Sponsor: Türk Telekom and other sponsors: Marshall Tepta Aydınlatma Apa Uniprint Global Tanıtım Halkla İlişkiler	David Elliott and Ali Akay, Levent Çalikoğlu, Haşim Nur Gürel

					Sevilen Şarapları	
3 9	2009	In Praise of Shadows	22 January 2009 - 6 May 2009	With the Support of the Culture Programme of the European Union	UBS, Tepta Aydınlatma, Point Hotel Mas Matbaa, Borsa Restaurants Sevilen, Flos, George Dragonas, Frame Moderna Museet, Embassy Of Finland Goethe Institute, Embassy Of Republic Of Poland, Embassy Of Ireland, Embassy Of Greece, Marshall and support of İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality	Paolo Colombo, Advisor of İstanbul Modern
4 0	2009	Pureblood Reflections	4 February 2009 – 26 April 2009	NA	NA	Engin Özendes

4 1	2009	The Room Project	5 May 2009 – 30 August 2009	NA	NA	Engin Özendes
4 2	2009	Significant and Insignificant Events	26 May 2009 – 16 August 2009	NA	NA	Paolo Colombo
4 3	2009	When Angels Fall-11th Video Program	11 Septemb er 2009 - 7 February 2010	NA	NA	Paolo Colombo
4 4	2009	Sarkis: Site Exhibition	11 Septemb er 2009 - 17 January 2010	TEPTA AYDINLATMA ANTALIS DOLUCA MAS MATBAA BORUSAN MANNESMANN SABUNCAKİS LIVE SANAT WINSOR&NEWTON NOVATECH INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ISTANBUL GOETHE-INSTITUT ISTANBUL İSTANBUL METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY (SPONSORS)	Exhibition main sponsor: Garanti Bank	Levent Çalıkoglu

4 5	2010	Ryan Trecartin- Video Program	19 January- 6 March 2011	NA	NA	NA
4 6	2010	Time Within Us	27 January 2010 – 16 May 2010	Moscow House of Photography Thessaloniki Museum of Photography (exhibition photographs were selected by the representatives of these museums)	NA	Engin Özendes and Olga Sviblova and Vangelis Ioakimidis
4 7	2010	Return to Reason-12th Video Program	17 February 2010 – 20 June 2010	NA	NA	Paolo Colombo
4 8	2010	From Traditional to Contemporary:C ultural Memory in Modern Turkish Art	17 February 2010 – 20 June 2010	İstanbul 2010 Avrupa Kültür Başkenti Ajansı	Garanti Bank (education program sponsor)	Levent Çalıkoglu
4 9	2010	Rusty End- Thomas Radbruch	26 May 2010 – 19 Septemb er 2010	NA	NA	Engin Özendes
5 0	2010	Way	26 May 2010 – 19 Septemb	NA	NA	NA

			er 2010			
5 1	2010	Adrian Paci: Precarious Life	15 July 2010-19 September 2010	NA	NA	Paolo Colombo
5 2	2010	Hussein Chalayan: 1994- 2010	15 July 2010 - 24 October 2010	NA	İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality, Ddf, Tepta Aydınlatma, Point Otel, Acarlar Makine, Kavaklıdere ve Solmaz Şirketler Grubu	Donna Loveday
5 3	2010	İstanbul Contrast	26 August 2010 - 19 September 2010	İstanbul 2010 Capital of Culture Agency İTKİB-İstanbul Fashion Week, İstanbul Fashion Academy	NA	NA
5 4	2010	Ani Çelik Arevyan- Nothing is as it seems	29 September 2010 – 9 January 2011	NA	NA	Engin Özendes
5 5	2010	Discover Manga!	5 october 2010-17 October 2010	Japan Year 2010 in Turkey	Shueisha Inc. And Consulate-General of Japan in İstanbul	NA
5 6	2010	Kutluğ Ataman- The Enemy Inside Me	10 November 2010 - 6 March	NA	Garanti Bank	Levent Çalikoğlu

			2011			
57	2010	Armenian Architects of İstanbul	9 December 2010 - 9 January 2011	İstanbul European Capital of Culture Agency, International Hrant Dink Foundation and HAYCAR Solidarity Association of Architects and Engineers		Hasan Kuruyazıcı
58	2011	Yao Lu's New Landscapes	19 January 2011 - 22 May 2011	NA	NA	Engin Özendes
59	2011	Paradise Lost	25 March 2011-24 July 2011	NA	Technology Sponsor LG Supporting Sponsor Credit Suisse Contributors U.S. CONSULATE GENERAL ITALIAN CULTURAL INSTITUTE, İSTANBUL CONSULATE GENERAL OF SWITZERLAND GOETHE-INSTITUT İSTANBUL	Paolo Colombo – Levent Çalıkoglu
6	2011	Innocent	1 June –	NA	NA	NA

0		Surrogates	4 September 2011			
61	2011	The Last Roll of Kodachrome	3 August 2011 - 4 September 2011	NA	Zaman Daily	Engin Özendes
62	2011	Dream and Reality	16 September 2011-22 January 2012	NA	Exhibition sponsor: Eczacıbaşı, Technology sponsor: LG and "İstanbul Modern is grateful to Mrs. TAMARA MANSIMOV for her generous support of all exhibition-related events."	Fatmagül Berktaş, Levent Çalikoğlu, Zeynep İnankur, and Burcu Pelvanoğlu
63	2011	Uncanny Encounters	16 September 2011 – 22 January 2012	NA	NA	Çelenk Bafra, Levent Çalikoğlu
64	2011	New Works New Horizons (collection exhibition)	-	NA	NA	Levent Çalikoğlu

6 5	2012	La La La Human Steps	16 February 2012– 6 May 2012	A Selection From The Collection Of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen	Supporting Sponsor: Fibabanka, Contributors: 4 Holland Türkiye, Hollanda Kraliyeti, Visual and Audio Systems Sponsor: LG	Sjarel Ex
6 6	2012	After Yesterday (photography collection exhibition)	16 February 2012 – 23 September 2012	NA	NA	Engin Özendes
6 7	2012	Fifty Years Of Urban Walls: A Burhan Doğançay Retrospective	23 May 2012- 23 September 2012	NA	Exhibition sponsor: Yıldız Holding and contributions of Promotion Fund of Turkish Prime Ministry	Levent Çalıkoğlu
6 8	2012	İstanbul Design Biennial- Musibet	13 October 2012– 12 December 2012	İKSV	number of sponsors however exhibition co sponsors: eren, koray, vestel, vitra	Emre Arolat
6 9	2012	Gaze-Changing Face of Portrait Photography	3 October 2012 – 20 January 2013	From Bank of America Collection	Bank of America Merrill Lynch's Art Loaning Programme: Art in Our Communities	Sena Çakırkaya

7 0	2012	Transformation: A View on Chinese Contemporary Art	21 Septemb er 2012- 25 Novembe r 2012	2012 Chinese Cultural Year in Turkey	Ministry of Culture of China, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Turkey, and the Embassy of China in Turkey and in collaboration with China International Exhibition Agency of China Arts,the Entertainment Group	Sun Feng
7 1	2013	Modernity? Perspectives from France and Turkey	16 January 2013 - 16 May 2013	NA	Comité Colbert	Çelenk Bafra, Levent Çalıkoğlu
7 2	2013	YAP Istanbul Modern: Young Architects Program	25 June 2013- 15 Novembe r 2013	in collaboration with The Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) and MoMA PS1	MOMA PS1, Garanti Bank, Polimeks, Vitra	Çelenk Bafra, Pelin Derviş
7 3	2013	Prix Pictet: Power	30 January 2012– 28 April 2013	NA	In partenrship with Prix Pictet	NA
7 4	2013	km.441- Firsts	19 Decembe r 2012 – 20 January	Feyzi Akkaya, founders of the STFA Group phptpgraphy related with the history of the	STFA Group	

			2013	company		
7 5	2013	Vitra Contemporary Architecture Series Presents: PLEASE DO NOT DISTURB	7 February 2013 - 7 April 2013	VitrA and the Turkish Association of Architects in Private Practice	Vitra and Türk SMD	Ertuğ Uçar
7 6	2013	Fantastic Machinery	18 April 2013 – 16 June 2013	Renault's Art Collection	Renault	Ann Hindry
7 7	2013	Close Quarters	9 May 2013-17 November 2013	NA	STFA Group	Head of Photograph y Departmen t: Sena Çakırkaya Photograph y Advisory Board: Merih Akoğul, Orhan Cem Çetin, Murat Germen, Sıtkı Kösemen
7 8	2013	Erol Akyavaş - Retrospective	29 May 2013 – 1 December 2013	NA	Finansbank	Levent Çalıkoglu

APPENDIX C

LIST OF TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS-PERA MUSEUM

Pera Museum Temporary Exhibitions					
Number	Year	Exhibition Title	Duration	Affiliated Institutions/ Supporters	Funding/Sponsor
1	2005	Young Expansion	8 June-30 September 2005	International Art Association	NA
2	2005	Jean Dubuffet	26 October 2005 - 8 January 2006	NA	NA
3	2005	Around the World Under Glass	26 October 2005-8 January 2006	Neveser Aksoy	Bortçaina Genim Suna and İnan Kırac Foundation
4	2006	Henri Cartier Bresson Biography	31 January-9 April 2006	NA	NA
5	2006	Women, Paintings, Stories	31 January-9 April 2006	Public institutions and private collections	NA

6	2006	Profiles	10 May-25 June 2006	Philippe Piguet-as organiser	NA
7	2006	Mehmed the Hunter	1 June-1 October 2006	Nordiska Museet- paintings commisioned by Swedish Ambassador Claes Rålamb	NA
8	2006	El/Le-Marmara University Faculty of Fine Arts Exhibition of Graduation Projects	17 July-1 October 2006	Marmara University Faculty of Fine Arts	NA
9	2006	Rembrandt and His Circle Drawings	20 October 2006-7 January 2007	From the collection of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen in Rotterdam	NA
10	2006	From Konstantiniyye to Istanbul Photographs of the Rumeli Shore of the Bosphorus from the mid XIXth century to XX century	20 October 2006-7 January 2007	Suna and İnan Kırar Old İstanbul Photography Collection	NA
11	2007	JP Morgan Collected Visions Modern and Contemporary Works from the JPMorgan Chase Art Collection	27 October - 06 January 2007	The JPMorgan Chase Art Collection	NA
12	2007	Chermayeff & Geismar Chermayeff & Geismar:Symbols, logotypes and graphic design from the last five	24 January- 25 March 2007	Koç Holding (artists made Koç Holding logo designs)	

		decades			
13	2007	Ivan Chermayeff: Collages and Small Sculptures	24 January - 25 March 2007	NA	NA
14	2007	Ali Emiri Efendi and His World : Fermans, Berats, Calligraphies, Books A Selection from the Millet Manuscript Library	24 January - 01 July 2007	Istanbul Research Institute (also exhibited there)	NA
15	2007	Wall, Arch, Dome Byzantine Istanbul in the Eyes of Ottoman Photographers	13 April - 01 July 2007	Suna and İnan Kırac Old İstanbul Photography Collection	NA
16	2007	Kariye From Theodore Metochites to Thomas Whittemore One Monument, Two Monumental Personalities	13 April - 01 July 2007	NA	NA
17	2007	Pirosmani A Legend in ""Naïve"" Art	2 August-7 October 2007	NA	NA
18	2007	Working Space Yıldız Technical University Faculty of Art and Design?2006 - 2007 Student Projects Exhibition	02 August - 07 October 2007	Yıldız Technical University Faculty of Art and Design	NA

19	2007	Prints, Drawings, Watercolours A Selection, by the Masters of the 20th Century, from the St Stephan's Cathedral and Diocese Museum Otto Mauer Collection	02 August - 07 October 2007	St Stephan's Cathedral and Diocese Museum Otto Mauer Collection	NA
20	2008	Josef Koudelka	16 January - 13 April 2008	NA	NA
21	2008	Collage Décollage Doğançay- Villegié	03 May - 13 July 2008	NA	NA
22	2008	Miro Prints, Paintings and Sculptures from the Maeght Collection	03 May - 31 August 2008	Maeght Collection	NA
23	2008	Owl's Frames	25 July - 31 August 2008	Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University's Department of Photography	NA
24	2008	The Lure of the East: British Orientalist Painting	26 September 2008 - 11 January 2009	NA	NA
25	2009	Akira Kurosawa: Drawings	10 February - 26 April 2009	NA	NA

26	2009	From Mekteb-I Sultani To Galatasaray Lycee Painters	10 February - 26 April 2009	NA	NA
27	2009	Masterpieces of World Ceramics from the Victoria and Albert Museum	15 May - 19 July 2009	Victoria and Albert Museum	NA
28	2009	The Logbook of the Ottoman Navy: Ships, Legends, Sailors	15 May - 04 October 2009	NA	NA
29	2009	Octet: Selected Works from the School of Visual Arts, New York	13 Ağustos - 04 Ekim 2009	School of Visual Arts, New York	NA
30	2009	Marc Chagall Life and Love: Prints, Drawings and Paintings	23 October 2009 - 24 January 2010	The Israel Museum, Jerusalem	NA
31	2010	Hippodrom And Atmeydanı: A Stage For Istanbul's History	16 February - 18 April 2010	NA	NA
32	2010	Picasso-Suite Vollard Engravings	16 February - 18 April 2010	Fundación MAPFRE and Instituto Cervantes.	NA
33	2010	Botero-Fernando Botero	04 May - 18 July 2010	Honorary Consulate of Colombia, The Spanish Embassy and Instituto Cervantes, Istanbul	NA

34	2010	Csontvary ""An Extraordinary Master of Hungarian Painting""	21 October - 12 December 2010	NA	NA
35	2010	Ikuo Hirayama: Turkey, A Crossroad of Culture between West and East	06 August - 03 October 2010	NA	NA
36	2010	Japan Media Arts Festival in İstanbul	06 August - 03 October 2010	NA	NA
37	2010	Scenes From Tsarist Russia : 19th Century Russian Classics From The State Russian Museum Collection	04 November 2010 - 20 March 2011	State Russian Museum in St. Petersburg	NA
38	2010	Frida Kahlo And Diego Rivera From The Gelman Collection	23 December 2010 - 27 March 2011	Gelman Collection	NA
39	2011	Fundamentally Human	07 April - 03 July 2011	School of Visual Arts in New York	NA
40	2011	İhsan Cemal Karaburçak	07 April - 03 July 2011	NA	NA
41	2011	Present Times Anadolu University Faculty of Fine Arts 2010-2011 Student	20 July - 02 October 2011	Anadolu University Faculty of Fine Arts	NA

		Projects Exhibition			
42	2011	Beyond the Apparent A Selection from the Art Collection of The Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey	01 November - 31 December 2011	Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey	NA
43	2011	Osman Hamdi Bey and the Americans Archaeology, Diplomacy, Art	15 October 2011 - 08 January 2012	University of Pennsylvania, Fine Arts Museum Boston, İstanbul Archaeological Museums, İstanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture, as well as private collections.	NA
44	2012	Flash Back Yannick Vu & Ben Jakober Yapıtlar: 1982-2012	13 Ekim - 06 Ocak 2012	NA	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor
45	2012	Sultans, Merchants, Painters The Early Years of Turkish - Dutch Relations	21 January - 01 April 2012	Amsterdam Museum	NA
46	2012	From Konstantiniyye to Istanbul Photographs of the Anatolian Shore of the Bosphorus from the mid XIXth Century to XX Century	21 January - 01 April 2012	Suna and İnan Kıraç Foundation Photograph Collection and private collections	NA

47	2012	Goya Witness of His Time Engravings And Paintings	20 April - 29 July 2012	Italian and Spanish Museums and private collections	NA
48	2012	Beyond Experience Dokuz Eylül University Faculty Of Fine Arts St PROJECTS	10 August - 30 September 2012	Dokuz Eylül University Faculty Of Fine Arts	PSC Türkiye-gallery wall painting and packaging sponsor
49	2012	Golden Children 16th - 19th Century European Portraits	13 October 2012 - 06 January 2013	works from:Yannick and Ben Jakober Foundation's Children Portraits Collection Jakober Foundation's Collection Suna and İnan Kırac Foundation	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor
50	2013	Between Desert and Sea A Selection from the Jordan National Gallery of Fine Art	25 January - 21 April 2013	Jordan National Gallery of Fine Art	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor
51	2013	Nickolas Muray Portrait of a Photographer	25 January - 21 April 2013	Garnered from George Eastman House Nickolas Muray Archive, which is under the direction of the Muray family, and various private collections	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor
52	2013	Manolo Valdés Paintings And Sculptures	08 May - 21 July 2013	Marlborough Gallery New York	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor

53	2013	Connecting the Dots: Workshops Marmara University Faculty of Fine Arts 6th International Student Triennial	06 August - 22 September 2013	Marmara University Faculty of Fine Arts	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor
54	2013	Dreams, Realities, Images The Image of the Republic in Modern Turkish Painting	09 October - 17 November 2013	NA	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor
55	2013	Sophia Vari Sculptures and Paintings	09 October 2013 - 19 January 2014	NA	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor
56	2013	Yıldız Moran Timeless Photographs	27 November 2013 - 19 January 2014	NA	Jotun-gallery wall painting sponsor

APPENDIX D

CURRICULUM VITAE

GÖZDE ÇERÇİOĞLU YÜCEL

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

Birth of Date, Place: 25.04.1983, İstanbul

Mobile: +90 532 740 29 40

E-mail: gozdece@gmail.com

Address: Ümit Mahallesi Meksika Caddesi Defne Sitesi-Defne 6 D:17 Ümitköy / ANKARA

EDUCATION:

2007 – 2014 Middle East Technical University

Graduate School of Social Sciences

PhD / Department of Sociology

Dissertation Title: Institutional Transformation of Arts in Turkey: The Emergence of Private Art Museums

2005-2007 Galatasaray University

Graduate School of Social Sciences

Sociology

MS., Sociological Studies on Turkey

2002-2005 Middle East Technical University

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

B.S., Sociology

2003-2005 Middle East Technical University

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Minor in History of Philosophy

1994-2001 Eyüboğlu High School (IB Diploma Programme)

WORK EXPERIENCE:

2012-2013 Education Year Bilkent University,

Department of Political Science

Part Time Instructor, Fall and Spring semesters

2009 December – 2012 September Middle East Technical University,

Graduate School of Social Sciences, Research Assistant

Responsibilities: Student Affairs Coordinator of the German-Turkish Masters Program in Social Sciences
(Humboldt-METU Dual Degree), Faculty Teaching Program

2009 July- December Middle East Technical University,
German-Turkish Masters Program in Social Sciences (GeT MA) Student Advisor

2009 July-September Virtua Research
Researcher

2009 April –July Dünya Gazetesi
(National Political and Economic Newspaper), Ankara Legation, Ankara
Project Specialist: Managing special supplements of the newspaper including commercials, articles and interviews
Projects involved:
“UK in Details” Supplement, organized by the cooperation of British Embassy in Turkey
“Those Who Build World” (Turkish Constructors' Catalog)

2008 July- December Cast@Graphic- Tokdemir Agency, Ankara
Editor
Projects Involved:
“Moda Ankara”, Ankara Clothing Manufacturers' Association Monthly Magazine
“Asomedyä” Ankara Chambre of Industry Monthly Review
“Trafik”, Ankara Traffic Foundation Monthly Magazine

2006 June- November Asya Film, Istanbul
Executive Assistant of Film Director Ali Özgentürk
Promotion and sponsorship activities for international film projects, script writing, research, international correspondence.

AWARDS:
2001 ECIS International Understanding Student Award
Eyüboğlu High School Fine Arts Award
Eyüboğlu High School Literature Award
Eyüboğlu High School Folk Dance Award
International Baccalaureate Creativity, Activity and Service (CAS) Award

LANGUAGES:
Turkish: Native
English Advanced
German Elementary

ACADEMIC WORKS:

2014 A chapter co- authored with Dr. Tuğba Tanyeri Erdemir titled as “Migration Museum and Exhibitions in Germany” submitted for Ashgate Edited collection *Museums, Migration and Identity* in Europe

2013 Project Assistant: “İstanbul Seismic Mitigation and Emergency Preparedness (İSMEP) Project” evaluation Project July-September 2013

2013 Project Assistant: “Global Dialogue Turkey Strategic Fund Evaluation Project” July 2013

2012 “Turkish Migration in Europe: Projecting the Next 50 Years”

7-9 December 2012 Regent’s College London, UK

Oral Paper Presentation: Migrant Memories on Display: Making of Migration Museum in Germany by Dr. Tuğba Tanyeri Erdemir and Gözde Çerçioğlu Yücel

2011 “10th Conference of the European Sociological Association”

Geneva, Oral Paper Presentation: “Artistic and Cultural Sponsorship in Turkey 1990s and Onwards”

2010 Project Assistant : “Migration Museums: Comparative Analysis of Museums and their strategies” coordinated by Dr. Tuğba Tanyeri Erdemir

ACTIVITIES:

2013 Organizer, “German-Turkish Masters Program Alumni Conference” 3-5 October 2013, METU, Ankara-TURKEY

2012 Organizer, “2nd Angora Forum: Cliché and Clichés” 29-30 November 2012, METU, Ankara-TURKEY

2011 Performer, “Tino Sehgal: This Situation” 24-26 October 2011, Goethe Institut, Ankara-TURKEY

2011 Vocal, The Company Musical Society” s 10th Year Anniversary Concert

2010 Vocal, Les Misérables Concert Version, Turkish-American Association

2006 Participant, AEGEE (European Students Forum) Catania and AEGEE Palermo,

Sicily Summer University

2005 Vocal in Amateur Music Band

2004 Organizer, Turkish-Greek Civic Dialogue Project, Final Conference

Organizer, TR-GR Civic Dialogue Project (M)ask Yourself Workshop

2004 Vocal, The Company, Middle East Technical University Musical Community

2004 Participant, AEGEE Zaragoza, Spain, Voluntary Summer University

Voluntary Organization for organizing fests, dance and theater

2003 Participant, Dancer, TR-GR Civic Dialogue Project

Kayaköy, Fethiye Youth and Culture Festival

2001 Milliyet Newspaper Nationwide Folk Dance Contest

1st Prize in Turkey

APPENDIX E

TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu çalışmada İstanbul’da 2000’li yıllarda kurulan üç özel müzenin nasıl ortaya çıktığına odaklanılmıştır. Türkiye’de özel müzecilik alanında öncü örneklerden olan Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi, İstanbul Modern Sanat Müzesi ve Pera Müzesi’ne odaklanılan bu çalışmada, Türkiye’de özel sanat müzelerinin bir örgütsel alan olarak (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) inşasında hangi aktörlerin ve kurumların etkin olduğu ve bu alanın yapılanmasında nasıl bir destek sağladığı irdelenmiştir. Bu üç müzeyi çalışmamın sebebi, ekonomik alanda güçlü büyük holding şirketlerinin, yani özel sermayenin “özel müze” alanında nasıl örgütlendiklerini ortaya koymaktır. Özel müzelerin ortaya çıkışı, özel sermayenin Türkiye’de kültürel alandaki hâkimiyetinin kurumsal bir manifestosudur. Bu çalışmadaki temel bulgudur: Bu üç müze, Türkiye’de ekonomik alanda etkin olan üç büyük aile holding şirketinin, bu şirketlere bağlı hayırseverlerin menfaatlerinin ve ilgilerinin yönlendirmesi ve bu ailelere ve şirketlere bağlı olarak kurulan vakıfların bu alanı yapılandırması sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu müzelerin kurulmasına önyak olan üç sermayedar aile arasında ekonomik alandaki rekabet “özel müze” kurma pratiği üzerinden kültür-sanat alanına taşınmıştır. Özel müze kurumsallaşması, bu ailelerin “modern Türk sanatı”nı tasarruflarında tutmak konusunda giriştikleri rekabetin bir sonucu olarak kurulurken, örgütsel yapıları itibariyle şirket kurumsallaşmasıyla benzerlikler göstermektedir. Bunun da önemi, Türkiye’de özel müze kurumunun sanattan ziyade, girişimcilik ve işletme kültürünü yansıtan örgütsel bir alan olarak kurulmuş olmasıdır.

Söz konusu üç özel sanat müzesi kurumsal yapısı itibariyle, devlet tarafından kurulan sanat müzelerinden ayrı bir yerde durmaktadır. Türkiye’de özel müzeler, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı kontrolünde faaliyet göstermektedirler. İlgili yönetmelik kapsamında, bakanlıklar, kamu kurum ve kuruluşları, gerçek ve tüze kişiler ve vakıflar Türkiye’de amaçlarını gerçekleştirmek kapsamında koleksiyon

oluşturabilir ve özel müze kurabilirler. Benim bu çalışmada odaklandığım üç özel müzenin ortak noktası vakıf müzeleri olması ve Türkiye'nin ekonomik hayatında önemli rol oynayan üç sermayedar aile tarafından kurulmuş olmalarıdır.

Özellikle büyük aile holding şirketleri ve söz konusu ailelerin hayırsever bireyleri tarafından kurulan vakıf örgütsel formu, bu müzelerin ortaya çıkışının tarihini tartışmayı kritik kılmaktadır. Bu kapsamda, çalışmanın amacı özel müze örgütsel formu ile sermayedar hayırsever bireylerin ve onların kurdukları vakıflar arasındaki ilişkileri, bu ilişkinin yeni bir örgütsel alan olarak yapılanan “özel müze”yi oluşturmaktaki rollerini ortaya koymaktır. Bu bağlamda, özel müzeler Türkiye'nin 1980 sonrası dönemde yaşadığı toplumsal dönüşümün örgütsel görünümüdür.

1990'ların ortalarından sonra İstanbul İstiklal Caddesi'nde yürüyen bir kişi, kalabalık, dükkanlar, vitrinleri süsleyen renklerin yanı sıra bankaların isimlerini taşıyan sanat galerileri ve sanat platformlarıyla karşılaşabilirdi. Garanti Platform, Akbank Sanat, Yapı Kredi Kazım Taşkent Galerisi, Ziraat Bankası Sanat Galerileri'lerini görebilir, İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı'nın festivallerinin afişleri altında yürüyebilirdi. İstanbul son yirmi yıl içinde gözle görünür bir biçimde kültür ve sanat merkezi olma yolunda ilerledi; çağdaş sanata odaklanan kültür ve sanat merkezleri kentin odağında yer almaya başladı. Şehir bir yandan uluslararası kültür ve sanat etkinliklerin, uluslararası bienalin, müzayede evlerinin, festivallerin, uluslararası sanat fuarlarının merkezi olurken, bir yandan gittikçe artan bir biçimde küresel sermayeyle eklemlenme ve küreselleşme söyleminin önemli bir merkezi olmuş; bu yönde şehri yeniden yapılandırmaya yönelik, şehri bir ticari olanak olarak gören politikaların odağı haline gelmiştir (Keyder 1993; Aksoy & Robins 1997; Aksoy 2008 and 2012; Yardımcı 2007). Şehri kültür ve sanat odağı haline getiren ve kendisi bir “otorite” haline gelen en önemli kurumlardan biri, İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı'dır (Yardımcı 2007). 1990'lardan itibaren kültür ve sanat yatırımları, var olan sanat ve kültür platformları çağdaş sanata yönelmiş, çağdaş sanata odaklanan yeni merkezler kurulmuştur. Sanata olan ilgi yerel şirketler arasında artmıştır. Özellikle de imalat, distribütörlük, banka ve diğer hizmet

firmalarına sahip büyük aile holding şirketleri (Pamuk 2007, s.15) bu artan ilginin taşıyıcı aktörleri olmuşlardır. Bu şirketler gerek sponsorluk programları gerekse vakıfları aracılığıyla sanat ve kültürel alanda inisiyatifleriyle görünürlük kazanmışlardır. Böyle bir zeminde, 2000’li yıllarda özel müzeler ortaya çıkmış, tanınmış aileler ve vakıfları aracılığıyla kurulmuşlardır. Pek çok sermayedar da müze kurmaya heveslenen yeni aktörler olarak bu sahnede yerlerini almaya başlamıştır (Artun & Baransel 2011). Özel sanat müzesi açma sevdası, Sabancı Müzesi (2002), İstanbul Modern (2004) ve Pera Müzesi’nin (2005) kurulması, İstanbul’un kültür ve sanat hayatına yeni kurumlar olarak katılması ve sermayenin özlemlerini gerçekleştiren kurumlar olmaları sebebiyle sermayedarlar arasında güçlenmiştir. Öte yandan söz konusu müzeler, şehri bir reklam alanına dönüştüren tanıtım kampanyaları, sergi açılışları, açılış ve gala resepsiyonları, kurucularının televizyon ve gazete röportajları ile gündeme gelmiştir. Özel müzeler, sanat sayfalarının yanı sıra gazetelerin ekonomi sayfalarının, iş ve ticaret dünyasına odaklanan yayın organlarının bir parçası olarak anılırken, Türkiye’de bankalar “filantropi danışmanlığı” hizmeti vermeye başlamışlardır. Özel müzeler, işadamlarının şirket portföylerinin arasına kattıkları yeni “vitrinler” olmaya başlamışlardır.

Bir yandan, kültür ve sanat, İstanbul’a odaklanarak küresel sermayeye eklenmenin en önemli araçları haline dönüştürülmekte, bir yandan da Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP) hükümetleri döneminde tartışmaların ve karşıt görüşlerin odağında yer almıştır. Son beş yıllık dönemde, AKP’nin özelleştirmeyi öne çıkaran ve özellikle devlet sanat ve kültür kurumlarına karşı kapatmaya yönelik tutum ve politika geliştirme süreçleri (Aksoy & Şeyben 2014) toplumdaki kutuplaşmanın kültür ve sanat alanındaki ana akılarından biri olmuştur. Tartışmaları alevlendiren birkaç belli başlı olay ve konu arasında, 1960’lardan bu yana İstanbul’un önemli kültürel merkezlerinden ve simgelerinden biri olan Atatürk Kültür Merkezi’nin 2008 yılında kapatılması (Aksoy 2009), Başbakan Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’ın Kars’ta bulunan İnsanlık Anıtı’na “ucube” demesi (Tanyeri-Erdemir 2011), yine İstanbul’un önemli sanat mekanlarından biri olan ve İKSV’nin sinema festivalinin en önemli gösterim mekanı olan Emek Sineması’nın

bir alışveriş merkezi projesi yapımı nedeniyle, tüm tartışmalara ve itirazlara rağmen 2013 yılında yıkılması, şehir ve devlet tiyatrolarının özelleştirilmesi tartışmasıyla ortaya çıkan Türkiye Sanat Kurulu'nun kurulması yasa tasarısı yer almaktadır. Aksoy ve Şeyben'e göre (2014, s.5) her ne kadar Türkiye'de sanatsal ve kültürel hayat, özel aktörler tarafından desteklense ve bu aktörler kamuoyuna çağdaş sanat formlarının tanıtılmasında önemli bir rol oynasalar da, İstanbul artan bir uluslararası ilginin odağı olsa da ve bu İstanbul'un küresel imajına katkı sağlasa da, görünen o ki bu gelişmeler muhafazakârların kültürel kimlik ve yaşam tarzı beklentilerini karşılamamaktadır. Bu nedenle AKP'nin devlet kültür ve sanat kurumlarına karşı tutumu yalnızca özelleştirme amaçlarıyla açıklanamaz ve bir değerlendirme yapacak olursak muhafazakâr istekler de göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır (Aksoy & Şeyben 2014). Başbakan Erdoğan'ın "devlet eliyle tiyatro olmaz" söylemini bu açıdan ele almakta, ve bu tutumun altında seküler elitizme ve kültürel aşağılanmaya duyulan öfkenin yattığını söylemekte, bu söylemin devlet sübvansiyonu ve koruması altında gelişen belli bir Türk kültürel kimliğinden ve devletin kültürel projesinin temelinde yer alan Kemalizm prensibinden kurtulma arzusunu taşıdığını belirtmektedir.

Bu türden örneklerin de gösterdiği gibi, Türkiye'de görsel sanatlar alanında sosyolojik bir çalışma yapmak, sanat kurumları üzerine odaklanmak, Türkiye'nin Batı'nın sanat formlarıyla tanışma sürecini irdelemeyi, sanatın ideolojilerle ve modernleşmeyle olan girift ilişkisini ortaya koymayı gerekli kılmaktadır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma, yalnızca tarihin bir noktasına, tezin kapsamını oluşturan üç özel müzenin ortaya çıktığı 2000'li yıllara değil, modern Türkiye'nin geçirdiği sosyal dönüşümlerin, dönüm noktalarının, devamlılıkların ve kopuşların altını çizmektedir. Böylelikle bu çalışma, görece çok yeni oluşumlar olan özel müzelerin tarihine, sosyal dinamikleri, siyasi, ekonomik ve kültürel değişimleri ve bu değişimlerin oluşturduğu ve şekillendirdiği aktörlerin rollerine eleştirel bir yaklaşım geliştirmeyi önermektedir.

Tüm bu gelişmeler çerçevesinde "özel müze" alanının bir örgütsel yapı olarak değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum. Bu bağlamda, bu araştırmanın kuramsal çerçevesini oluşturan en önemli çalışmalardan biri DiMaggio ve

Powell'ın 1983 yılında yayınladıkları “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields” (Demir Kafes'i tekrar gözden geçirmek: Örgütsel Alanlarda Kurumsal İzomorfizm ve Kollektif Rasyonalite) oldu. DiMaggio ve Powell (1983, s.148) “örgütsel alan” kavramını, tedarikçileri, kaynakları ve ürünlerini tüketen tüketicileri, düzenleyici kurumları ve benzer hizmet ve ürün üreten organizasyonlarla, kurumsal yaşam alanları oluşturan ve genel kabul gören, organizasyonların tümü olarak tanımlıyorlar. Bu kapsamda ben Türkiye'deki özel sanat müzelerini bir örgütsel alan olarak değerlendirmek mümkün mü diye soruyorum. DiMaggio ve Powell'ın (ibid) dikkat çektiği bir diğer husus şudur: Bir örgütsel alanın yapısı, a priori olarak belirlenmemeli, ampirik bir çalışma sonucunda ortaya konmalıdır. Bu kapsamda DiMaggio'ya ve Powell'a göre, bir kurumu tanımlama süreci, ya da onların terminolojisiyle *structuration*- yapılanma süreci dört aşamadan oluşur: alandaki organizasyonlar arasındaki etkileşimde artış; organizasyonlar arasında, keskin bir biçimde tanımlanmış hakimiyete sahip yapılar ve koalisyon örüntüleri; alandaki organizasyonların rekabet etmek durumunda oldukları bilgi yükünde artış; ve pek çok farklı organizasyondaki katılımcılar arasında ortak bir girişime dahil olduklarına dair farkındalığın gelişmesi. Bu kapsamda DiMaggio 1991 yılında “Constructing an Organizational Field as a Professional Project: U.S. Art Museums, 1920-1940” başlıklı bir çalışma yayınlamış; Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde sanat müzelerin profesyonel bir proje olarak, yapılanma süreçlerine vakıfların öncülük ettiği bir biçimde bir örgütsel alan olarak inşa edildiğini ortaya koymuştur. DiMaggio'nun bu makalesi, örgütsel alanların kurumsallaşma ve yapılanmasına vurgu yapması, örgütsel alanların yalnızca kavramsal araçlar olmamakla beraber alanın katılımcıları açısından anlamlı olduğunu belirtmesi ve örgütsel alanların içinde uzmanlaşmış, alanı sınırlayan, düzenleyen, organize eden ve alan içinde de kendini temsil eden organizasyonların yer aldığının altını çizmesiyle benim çalışmamda yol gösterici olmuştur. Öte yandan, DiMaggio'nun (1991) vurgu yaptığı kurumsallaşmanın üç vechesi, yayılma modelleri, kurumsallaşma sürecindeki gerilimler, profesyoneller ve profesyonelleşme, Türkiye'de özel müzelerin kurumsallaşma süreçlerinde rol alan örgütlenmeleri, profesyonelleri, bu örgütlenme ve profesyonelleşme biçimlerinin özel müze

alanında nasıl temsil edildiğini düşündürmüştür. Ve önemli bir diğer unsur, Türkiye’de özel müzelerin ortaya çıkışında ve bir örgütsel alan olarak oluşturulmasında hangi kurumların öncü rol oynadığı ortaya konmalıdır.

Araştırmanın temel hipotezlerinden biri, Türkiye’deki özel müze alanını kuran, sınırlayan, düzenleyen ve alanda temsil edilen en önemli uzmanlaşmış organizasyonların vakıflar olabileceğiydi. Bu kapsamda, çalışmanın bir diğer önemli kaynağı, Çizakça’nın 2000 yılında yayınladığı, İslam dünyasında vakıfların tarihine odaklandığı kitabı olmuştur. Kitabın, özellikle, cumhuriyet Türkiye’sine odaklanan ve vakıfların yeniden doğuşuna işaret eden, 1967 yılında yapılan vakıflar kanununa odaklanan bölümünden yararlanılmıştır.

Türkiye’de sosyal bilimlerde sanat, müze, ve şirket sanat sponsorluğu konularına görece daha az ilgi gösterilmiştir. Bu durum aslında sanatın, müzenin ve sponsorluk gibi konuların, gazetelerde, dergilerde ve televizyon programı gibi alanlarda tartışılmaya bırakılmasına neden olmuş; sanat, son dönemde ekonomi ve haber ağırlıklı yayın yapan televizyon kanallarının kültür-sanat gündemine odaklanan programlarında ele alınmaya çalışılmıştır. Dolayısıyla tartışmalar daha ziyade tutarlı bir kültür politikasının eksikliği, hükümetin kültür politikalarının yanlışları, sanat ve kültürel mekanların açılması veya kapanması, çok yüksek fiyatlara alıcı bulan resimler gibi konular karşısındaki tutumlar ve sunulan genel açıklamalar düzeyinde kalmıştır. Ancak, özellikle İstanbul üzerine odaklanan çalışmaların, kültür ve sanat üzerine çalışma yapmak isteyen sosyal bilimciler açısından önemli bir kaynak niteliği taşıdığı söylenebilir. Buna bağlı olarak, İstanbul’da ortaya çıkan özel müzeleri konu edinen bu araştırma için, kültür endüstrilerinin yaygınlaşması ve genişlemesi, özel sektörde sanata olan ilginin artmasıyla ilişkilendirilebilecek İstanbul’un küreselleşmesine odaklanan çalışmalar (Aksoy 2008 ve 2012, Bartu 1999; Bora 1999; Göktürk, Soysal & Türeli 2010; Karaca 2010; Keyder 1993 ve 1999; Stokes 1999, Yardımcı 2005) yararlı olmuştur. “Sanat ve kuram” temalı, Kosova ve Aslan’ın editörlüğünü üstlendiği Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi’nin 1998 yılında çıkardığı sayısı ve yine aynı derginin 2012 yılında Türkiye’de güncel sanata odaklanan sayısı dışında 2014 yılında İktisat Dergisi (eds Arapoğlu, Elçik & Kösemen 2014) çağdaş sanat ve sermaye

konusunda odaklanmıştır. Her ne kadar sanat ve sosyal teori ele alınan konular arasında olsa da (Akay 1999; Nalbantoglu 2000 and 2007), modernleşme ve ulus devlet inşası süreci sanat ile olan ilişkisi üzerinden ele alınsa da (Bozdoğan 2002, Stokes 1992, Karaca 2010), şirketlerin sanat sponsorsluğu ve sermaye ve sanat arasındaki ilişki, son zamanlarda artan bir ilgi görmüştür.

Müze konusu ise, sanat tarihçilerinin egemen olduğu bir araştırma alanıdır. Özellikle Ali Artun'un bu alandaki çalışmaları önemli kaynaklar olmayı sürdürmektedir (2006a, 2006b and 2008). Özel müzeler konusu ise, çok yakın zamanda, hatta bu araştırma sırasında akademik ilgi görmüş; İstanbul'daki özel müzeler ve elitlerin (Albayrak 2011), özel müzeler döneminde İstanbul (Şeni 2010), özel müzelerin İstanbul'un şehir imajına katkısı (Altınbaşak & Yalçın 2010), özel müzeler ve şehrin yeniden canlandırılması projesi arasındaki ilişki (Polo 2013), İstanbul Modern Sanat Müzesi ve kurumsal kimlik (Aydınalp & Gökçe 2012) konuları araştırılmıştır. Bu çalışmalarda, benim araştırmama da konu olan özel müzelerin öne çıktığı görülür. Ancak, yalnızca İstanbul'da değil, Türkiye'de de önemli örnekler olmaları bakımından bu özel müzelerin özellikle araştırmalara konu olması şaşırtıcı değildir. Ben, bu çalışmanın, bu belli başlı müzelere odaklanmakla beraber, bu kurumların ortaya çıkışının arkasında yatan sebepler, kurumlar ve örgütsel formlara ve bunların tarihine odaklandığım için bu çalışmanın literatüre amprik bir inceleme sunarak katkı sağlayacağına inanıyorum. Başka bir deyişle, bu özel müzelerin kurumsal tanımlarını “doğal” birer olguymuşçasına Kabul etmek yerine, onları ayrı bir alan olarak kuran ve “özel müze” olarak tanımlayan süreçlere bakmanın yerinde bir katkı olduğuna inanıyorum.

Bu araştırma, üç özel müze, holding şirketleri, sermayedar hayırseverler, vakıflar üzerine yapılan belge ve arşiv çalışması sonucu toplanan verinin ve müze çalışanlarıyla yapılan uzman mülakatlarının yorumlamacı analizine dayanıyor. İncelediğim belgelerin arasında gazeteler, kurum ve kuruluşların resmi web siteleri, ilişkili işadamlarının (şirketleri, vakıfları ve müzeleri kuran kişiler) otobiyografileri, biyografileri ve özgeçmişlerine ilişkin bilgi ve belgeler, müzelerin

basın bültenleri, yayınları, sergileri ve aktiviteleri konusunda web sitelerinde sundukları bilgi ve yazılı ve görsel dökümanlar, müzelerin kuruluşunu ve sanat eseri alımlarını içeren haberler, müzelerin yayın ve katalogları, müze uzmanlarının ve kurucularının çeşitli yayın organlarına vermiş oldukları röportajlar, ilişkili yönetmelik ve kanunlar yer alıyor. 2012-2014 yılları arasında uzmanlarıyla mülakat gerçekleştirdiğim kurumlar arasında ise Sabancı Müzesi, Sadberk Hanım Müzesi, İstanbul Modern Sanat Müzesi, Sabancı Vakfı, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü ve ayrıca Cermodern Sanatlar Merkezi ve Elgiz Çağdaş Sanat Müzesi bulunuyor.

İlk olarak, ileri kapitalist toplumlarda sanat ürünlerinin metalaşması konusunda odaklanıyor; konuyu Harvey'nin (2002) ve Bourdieu (1985) kültür ürünlerinin meta olarak anılmasının önemini tartıştıkları çalışmalar üzerinden değerlendiriyorum. Bourdieu (1985) sanat eserini, diğer kültürel ürünlerle beraber, sembolik bir ürün olarak ortaya koymaktadır. Sanatın aristokrasi, kilise gibi meşruiyet sağlayıcı dış etmenlerden kurtularak özerkleştiğini belirten Bourdieu (1985) bu özerkleşme sürecinin ironik bir biçimde sanatçıyı piyasa koşullarının boyunduruğu altına girmeye zorladığını belirtmektedir. Öte yandan piyasa koşullarının belirleyici, sepekülatif bir sanat piyasasının hızla hüküm sürdüğü bir sanat dünyasında, sanat eserlerine biçilen değerlerin nasıl oluştuğuna bakan Velthuis (2005), bu fiyatların yalnızca birer sayıdan ibaret olmadıklarını, hem fiyatları belirleyen sanat tacirleri açısından sembolik değerleri olduğunu hem de koleksiyonerler açısından sosyal statülerini göstermeye yönelik simgesel anlamları olduğunu vurgulamıştır. Buradan hareketle, Türkiye'deki özel müzelerle doğrudan ilişkili olduğunu düşündüğüm şirketlerin sanat sponsorluğu konusuna odaklanıyor, bu alanda oluşan literatüre değerlendiriyorum. Sanat sponsorluğu, her ne kadar geçmişi çok eskiye dayanan bir olgu olsa da, 1980'lerin ekonomik ve politik atmosferiyle, 1980'lerden sonra özellikle şirketlerin çağdaş sanata olan yaklaşımları ve sponsorluk faaliyetleriyle daha görünür ve kritik bir hal alan bir olgu olarak ortaya konmaktadır (Wu 2005). Bu alanda özellikle Amerika ve Britanya'da gelişen literatür, sanat sponsorluğunun şirketlerin kamuda bir farkındalık yaratmak, prestij ve itibar sağlamak ve hedef kitlelerine ulaşmak için

sanata çeşitli biçimlerde maddi destek sağlamak ve bunun tanıtımını yapmak suretiyle kullandıkları bir araç olarak tanımlanmıştır (Kössner 1996; Martorella 1996). Öte yandan Martorella (1996) şirketlerin koleksiyon oluşturma, sanat eserlerini kamuya ulaştırma gibi pratiklerinin şirketlere saygınlık ve tanınma gibi faydaların yanı sıra, toplumlarda piyasanın belirlemiş olduğu sanat stillerinin ve beğenilerin yaygınlaşmasına neden olduğunun altını çizmiştir. Konunun Amerika’da ve Britanya’da çalışılma biçimine bakacak olursak Bourdieu’nun (1984) *Distinction*’da belirgin bir biçimde ortaya koyduğu kültürü bir iktidar alanı olarak ortaya koyan kuramı, kültürel sermaye, ekonomik sermaye, ve temayüz kavramları egemen kuramsal çerçeveyi teşkil etmektedir. Bir örnek vermek gerekirse, Wu (1998) girişimcilik kültürünün sanatı kucaklamasına odaklandığı, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri ve Britanya örneği üzerine kurulu çalışmasında, iş dünyasının elitlerinin, şirketlerdeki konumlarını kullanarak, ekonomik sermayelerini, şahsi menfaatleri doğrultusunda kültürel sermayeye tahvil ettiklerini; böylelikle hem şirket hem de şahsi düzeyde hareket ederek sosyal statülerini yükseltmeye yönelik amaçlarını gerçekleştirdiklerini iddia etmektedir. Karşılaştırmalı bir bakış açısına sahip olmak amacıyla baktığım Kanada, Arjantin, Almanya, Japonya gibi diğer ülkelerde de görüldüğü üzere, sanat ve sermaye ilişkisi, şirketlerin sanat sponsorluğu üzerinden, dünyada sanatın üretim, dağıtım ve tüketim süreçlerini önemli ölçüde etkileyen önemli bir etmendir ve kültürün neoliberal bir düzenin yaygınlaşmasıyla özelleştığının altı çizilmektedir.

Çalışmamın sanat dışındaki ikinci kavramını “müze” kurumu teşkil ediyor. Türkiye’de “Özel müze” olarak anılan örgütlenme biçimin odaklanmadan evvel müze kavramının tartışılması gerektiğini düşünüyorum. Eğer, şirketlere sanat yatırımlarının, bu çalışmada örneklenen “müze kurma”nın itibar sağladığından bahsedecek bu itibarı oluşturan öğelerden biri de müze kurumunun gerçekleştirdiği düşünülen toplumsal işlevler. Sanat müzesi kurumu 19. yüzyılda, sanat tarihini kurgulaması, sergileme biçimlerini belirlemesi, belirli bir bilgiyi kurması ve temsil etmesiyle modernliğin inşasıyla yakından ilişkilidir (Prior 2002; Sherman & Rogoff; Macdonal & Fyfe 1996). Öte yandan müze, Sherman & Rogoff (1994, s.ix) belirttiği gibi, tarihsel yapıların ve anlatıların, sergileme pratiklerinin ve

stratejilerinin, hükmeden ideolojilerin ve bu ideolojilerin getirdiği zorunluluklarının bir alaşımıdır. Bu kapsamda, müze kurumunun içinde barındırdığı bu karmaşık ilişkileri çözmek ve deşifre etmek sosyal bilimcilerin amaçlarından biri olmuştur. Fransız Devrimi'nden sonra, Avrupa'da müze, daha evvel prenslere ve soylulara ait koleksiyonların halka açılması ve halka mal edilmesi iddiası ve halkın eğitilmesi gibi unsurlarla, ulus devlet kurma söyleminin de önemli taşıyıcılarından biri olmuştur. Osmanlı'da 19. Yüzyılda kuvvetlenen modernleşme hareketiyle, Avrupa'daki kültür sanat kurumlarıyla etkileşim artmış, Osmanlı'da müze kurumunun oluşmasına yol açmıştır. Shaw'a göre (2003, s.18) Osmanlı'da müze, Osmanlı Devleti'nin 19. yüzyılda egemen olan milliyetçilik akımından hareketle kendisini yeniden kurma isteğinin ve Osmanlı milliyetçiliğini ortaya koymaya yarayan şablon kurumlar niteliğini taşımaktadır. Batı sanatının Osmanlı'da ve Türkiye'de modernleşmeyi temsil etme meselesi üzerinde düşünürken, Osmanlı'nın batılı sanat formlarıyla olan ilişkisi de unutulmamalıdır. Osmanlı'da, dekoratif sanatlar, minyatür, süsleme, seramik ve çini, hat gibi sanat türleri olmasına rağmen, insanların temsilini yasaklayan egemen dini görüş sebebiyle tuval resminin olmayışı, bu yasağın ancak padişahlar nezdinde Avrupalı ressamın saraya gelip padişah portreleri yapmalarıyla istisnai delindiği bilinmektedir (Faroqhi 2005). 19. yüzyılda özellikle Osmanlı Devleti'nin Fransa ile kurduğu ilişkilerin, Fransa'ya resim sanatının tekniklerinin öğrenilmesi ve uygulanması için Fransız resim akademilerine öğrenci gönderilmesi gibi uygulamaların hem Osmanlı Devleti'nde hem de cumhuriyet dönemi Türkiye'sinde Türk resim sanatı olgusunun oluşması ve tarihinin kurgulanması açısından önemli sonuçları olmuştur (Artun 2007). Artun'a (2007, s.280) göre, yurtdışından dönen ressamlar yalnızca batıda gördükleri modern sanatı değil, sanat eğitimi kurumlarını, sanatçı derneklerini de Türkiye'de "tercüme" etmişlerdir. Osmanlı döneminde, ilk sanat kurumları, akademi ve müze, kurulmuş, bu süreçte Osman Hamdi Bey gerek müzenin gelişiminde, gerekse arkeolojik kazılarla yürüterek ve arkeolojik eserlerin müzede sergilenmesini sağlayarak müzecilik çalışmalarına katkı sağlayan en önemli aktörlerden biri olmuştur (Shaw 2003).

Günümüz müzeleri, Harvey' nin (2002) de altını çizdiği gibi şehirlerin sembolik sermayesinden yararlanan kurumlar olmasının yanında, uluslararası ilgi çekmeye yönelik, bünyesinde sanat eseri sergilemenin dışında pek çok popüler eğlence aktiviteleri de barındıran kurumlardır. Öte yandan, devlet desteklerinin azalmasıyla, finansal kaynakları açısından daha fazla dışa bağımlı kurumlar haline gelmektedir. Bu açıdan yaklaşıldığında son dönemde müzelerin finansmanına yönelik yapılan çalışmalar, bu koşulların müzeler açısından yarattığı zorluklara ve dış finansmanın müzelerin aktiviteleri üzerindeki etkilerine odaklanmaktadır (Alexander 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d) ve müzelerin finansmanını sağlayan aktörler, bağışçı bireyler ve hayırseverler, hükümetler, şirketler ve vakıflar sayılabilir.

Bu noktadan hareketle, öncelikle Türkiye'de sanatın kurumsal dönüşümünde ve finansmanında rol oynayan aktörleri belirlemekte yarar var. Osmanlı döneminde, Osmanlı hanedanı, sanatın tek patronu niteliğindedir. Avrupa'ya öğrenci göndermesinin dışında, saraya gelen Avrupalı ressamı himaye etmesi, sanat kurumlarının oluşmasında tek idari otorite olması gibi rolleriyle Osmanlı Hanedanı ve saray çevresi dışında sanatın himayesi gibi bir konudan ve hamilerden söz etmek zordur. Ancak yine de İstanbul'da yaşayan gayrimüslim ailelerin batı sanatı için bir alan açma gayretlerinden de bahsedilebilir. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, Osmanlı'dan ve tarihinden radikal bir kopuşla kurulması ve cumhuriyetin ilanıyla birlikte, batılılaşma, modernleşme, laikleşme ve milliyetçilik gibi alanlara odaklanmış (Ahmad 1993; Berkes 1965; Kasaba & Bozdoğan 1997; Mardin 1994; Timur 1993; Zürcher 1993) görülmekte, sanat ve kültür alanlarını ise yeni devletin, modernleşme ve batılılaşma misyonu çerçevesinde ele almıştır. Bu kapsamda, özellikle erken cumhuriyet döneminde devlet, Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası'nın kontrolünde, sanatın hamisi konumundadır. Sanatçıların eserlerinin satın alınması, devlet sergileri düzenlenmesi, halkevlerinin kurulması ve sanat eğitiminin bu kurumlar aracılığıyla gerçekleştirilmesi, ressamın Anadolu kültürüyle tanışmasını sağlamak amacıyla Yurt Gezileri'nin düzenlenmesi, devlet bankalarının sanatçıların eserlerini satın almaları, Devlet Resim ve Heykel Müzesi'nin kurulması, yönetici sınıfın ve devlet kurumlarının sanat eseri satın alması gibi faaliyetlerde de görülebileceği üzere, devlet batı sanatının ülkede

gelişmesi ve yaygınlaşması ve böylelikle toplumun gelişmesi için yatırım yapan yegâne aktör durumundadır (Kasalı 2010; Önsal 2006; Üstünipek 1998). Öte yandan, devletin kültür ve sanat yatırımlarının merkezi de yeni devletin başkenti olan Ankara'dır (ibid). 1950'lerde çok partili döneme geçişle birlikte devletin kültür ve sanat alanındaki hamilik rolü azalmış, daha önce eksik olan özel galeri, sanat taciri gibi aracı aktörler ve kurumlar özel sermayeyle oluşmaya başlamıştır (Önsal 2006). Yine de Türkiye'de bir sanat piyasasının oluşması ancak 70'li yılların sonuna tekabül eder (Üstünipek 1998).

1980 askeri darbesinin ardından, Turgut Özal'ın kararlı ve istikrarlı bir biçimde neoliberal politikaları uygulamıştır. Türkiye, 1980'li yıllardan itibaren neoliberal ekonomik politikalarla yönetilmiş, devletin sermayeyi destekleme biçimleri değişmiş ve çeşitlenmiştir. Özel sermaye güçlenmiş ve faaliyetleri uluslararasılaşmıştır. Aynı zamanda Türkiye uluslararası piyasaya eklemlenmenin sancılı sonuçları olan ekonomik krizleri yaşamıştır (Acar 2002; Boratav 2004; Cizre & Yeldan 2005; Ertuğrul & Selçuk 2001; Heper & Keyman 1998; Kalaycıoğlu 2002; Kazgan 2004; Öniş 2004, 2007 ve 2009; Özatay 2000; Sayarı 1996; Pamuk 2014; Patton 2006). Öte yandan tüm bu süreçlerin toplumsal alanda önemli yansımaları olmuştur. 1980 sonrasında artan parçalanma, kutuplaşma ve bunun toplumsal kimliklerin oluşmasındaki etkileri (Kandiyoti 2002) göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, kültürel tercihler, estetik beğeniler, tüketim pratikleri ve tüm bunlara atfedilen anlamlar, Türkiye'de sosyal sınıfları ve kültürü çalışmak açısından önem kazanmıştır. Bu süreçte bir yandan, sermayedarların toplumdaki görünürlükleri kültürel ve sosyal pratikleri üzerinden artarken, 1980 sonrasında neoliberal atmosferinde sermayedarların toplumsal konumları yükselmiştir. Sanat ve kültür de bu bağlamda, şirketler ve sermaye sahipleri açısından önemli bir yatırım aracına dönüşmüştür. Bu süreçte, sanat ve kültür alanında önemli bir role sahip bankalar, makro ekonomik gelişmelerden en fazla etkilenen sektörlerden biridir ve bir yandan ticari bankalar arasında 1990'larda artan rekabet, bankaların sanat alanındaki yatırımlarında ve girişimlerinde de görülebilmektedir. Öte yandan 1990'ların sonlarından itibaren yolsuzluklar sonucunda Tasarruf Mevduatı Sigorta Fonu tarafından el konan bankaların sahiplerinin resim koleksiyonlarının

müzayelerde satılması (Artun 2011, s.177) gibi gelişmeler hem sanatın müzayedeleşmesi konusunu ortaya çıkarmış, hem de bir yandan sanatı, sermaye gruplarından ve sermaye sahiplerinden oluşan koleksiyonerin rekabet ettiği bir alana dönüştürmüştür.

Öte yandan, küreselleşmenin önemli bir analitik kategori olarak Türkiye'deki sosyal bilimlere etkilemesiyle birlikte İstanbul'un küreselleşmesi ve küresel şehir projesi konusuna yönelinmiştir (Keyder & Öncü 1993; Aksoy & Robins 1994; Keyder 1999; Aksoy 2008 and 2012; Göktürk, Soysal & Türeli 2010). İstanbul'un kültür-sanatın ve turizmin merkezi olarak kurgulanmasının önemli sonuçlarından biri, şirketlerin ve şirketlere bağlı hayırseverlerin İstanbul'da sanat ve kültür alanında kendi inisiyatiflerini almaları ve kendi merkezlerini kurmaları yönünde rekabet etmeleridir (Aksoy 2008 and 2012). Bu süreçte şuna da değinmekte yarar var. 1994 yılında Refah Partisi'nin adayı olarak İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediye Başkanı seçilen Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, her ne kadar başlangıçta küresel-şehir projesini benimsemeyen tek adayken, iktidara gelmesiyle birlikte sermayenin şehri bir iş fırsatı olarak gören ve küresel sermayeyle bütünleşme amaçlarıyla bir uyum içine girmiş ve İstanbul'u küreselleştirme projesini benimsemiştir (Bora 1999). Erdoğan'ın 2002'den sonraki başbakanlığı süresince de İstanbul AKP'nin neoliberal değerler ve küreselleşme amaçlarıyla belirlenen politikalarını uygulamanın merkezi olmuştur (Aksoy 2012). Aksoy'a (2008, s.80) göre, bir yandan bu süreçler İstanbul odağında, küresel İstanbul vizyonu üzerinden, bu zamana kadar zıt kutuplarda yer alan laik elit profesyoneller ve AKP içinde filizlenen yenilikçi İslami odaklı grupları biraraya getirirken, şehrin kültürel alanının dünyaya açılması neoliberal rejimin sınıf odaklı soylulaştırmasıyla sağlamlaştırılmıştır.

İstanbul'un küresel bir merkez olarak tasavvur edilmesinin yanında, AKP döneminin özel müzelerin ve özel sermaye içinde sanata destek vermeye yönelik ilginin artışındaki önemi, sanatta girişimciliği, sanata desteği, destek verenler açısından ekonomik açıdan kazançlı hale getiren politikaların ortaya çıkmasıdır. 2004 yılında yürürlüğe konan 5225 sayılı "Kültür Yatırımlarını ve Girişimlerini Teşvik Kanunu", 2005 yılında yayınlanan "Kültürel alandaki destek (sponsor)

faaliyetlerinin teşvik edilmesi hakkında genelge” ve 5228 sayılı “Bazı Kanunlarda ve 178 Sayılı Kanun Hükmünde Kararnamede Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanun” ile değiştirilen Kurumlar Vergisi Kanunu ve Gelir Vergisi Kanunu sanat alanında yatırım yapan ve sponsorluk faaliyetlerinde bulunan gerçek ve tüzel kişilere önemli vergi avantajları ve teşvikler sağlamıştır. Hukuksal altyapıdaki özel sektörün kültür ve sanat alanına müdahalesini kazançlı hale getiren bu değişikliklerin yanısıra 2006 yılında Özel Müzeler ve Yönetimleri Hakkında Yönetmelik’te yapılan çeşitli değişiklikler, devlet dışındaki aktörlerin ve en önemlisi sermaye sahiplerinin özel müze kurmasını kolaylaştırmıştır.

Her ne kadar 1980 sonrası toplumsal koşullar özel müzeler kurulmasını mümkün kılrsa da, özel müzelerin bir örgütsel form olarak oluşmasının tarihi 1980 öncesindeki gelişmelere bağlıdır. 1980 öncesinde özel sektörün kurumsallaşma süreçleri ve bu süreçlerde vakıfların, büyük aile holdinglerinin kurumsallaşma biçimlerinden biri olarak ortaya çıkışı özel müzelerin bağımsız bir örgütsel alan olarak kurulmasında belirleyici özelliğe sahiptir. Bu bulgu, tezin kapsamını oluşturan üç özel müzeyle ilişkili ailelerin holding şirketlerinin kurucuları Vehbi Koç, Sakıp Sabancı ve Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı’nın otobiyografilerin ve bu bireylerin kurulmasında önyak oldukları sırasıyla Vehbi Koç Vakfı, Sabancı Vakfı, Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı Vakfı ve İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı’nın kuruluşuna, tarihine yönelik belgelerin detaylı incelemesine dayanmaktadır.

Vehbi Koç, Koç Holding’i kurarak Türkiye’nin ilk holding şirketini kurmasının yanısıra, Türkiye’de vakıf sisteminin canlanması açısından çok önemli olan 1967 yürürlüğe konan Vakıflar Kanunu’nun oluşturulmasındaki rolüyle öneme sahiptir (Çizakça 2000). Çizakça’nın tartıştığı (2000, s.86-110) ve Vehbi Koç’un otobiyografilerinde ortaya çıktığı üzere, İslami vakıf sisteminin farkındalığına sahip Vehbi Koç, Amerika’ya iş sebebiyle İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında gittiği bir dönemde, Ford Vakfı’nın hastanesi ile karşılaşır ve bunun üzerine Türkiye’de Amerikan sistemi bir vakıf kurmanın gayretine girişir. Vehbi Koç ve dönemin önemli hukukçuları biraraya gelerek, modern bir vakfin kurulmasına olanak sağlayacak bir vakıflar kanunu üzerinde çalışırlar. Bu kanun büyük çabalar ve

uzun yıllar sonunda, pek çok kez değiştirilerek yürürlüğe konur. Bu kanunun temel getirilerinden biri Türkiye’de şirketlerin bir vakıf kurabilmesi ve Bakanlar Kurulu Kararı’nca çeşitli şartları yerine getirmek suretiyle vakıflara vergi muafiyeti sağlama olanağının sağlanmasıdır. Bu kanun çerçevesinde örgütlenen vakıf yapılanması, vakıf sisteminin holding şirketi örgütlenmesine eklemlenmesini sağlamış, böylelikle, holding şirketlerinde kurucu ailenin gücünün devamlılığını da olanaklı kılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, Vehbi Koç, vakıfların örgütlenmesine önyak olarak gelecek kuşaklar tarafından vakıf sisteminden sanat ve kültürel yatırımlar için yararlanılmasını sağlamıştır.

Vehbi Koç’un bir diğer katkısı, Türkiye’nin vakıf çatısı altında, ilk özel aile müzesini kurması olmuştur. Eşi Sadberk Koç’un geleneksel kıyafet, işleme, tuğralı gümüş koleksiyonuyla oluşturulan müze Sadberk Hanım Müzesi ismiyle 1980 yılında Vehbi Koç tarafından, eşinin vefatının ardından kurulmuş, holding şirketine sahip bir aileye ait ilk özel müze olması sebebiyle önemli bir örnek teşkil etmiştir. Vehbi Koç ve Sakıp Sabancı arasındaki rekabet alanları yalnızca iş dünyasında, iki şahsın yönettiği holding şirketleri arasındaki çekişmelerden ibaret değildir; ve sanat alanında da kendisini göstermektedir (Buğra 1994, s.185). Her iki sermayedarın otobiyografilerinde bu çekişmelere yer verilirken, özellikle müzayedelerde sanat eseri alımı sırasında iki ailenin yaşadıkları çekişmeler de dikkat çekicidir. Bu çekişmeye en güzel örnek, Sakıp Sabancı’nın babası Hacı Ömer Sabancı ile Vehbi Koç arasında bir müzayede sırasında yaşanan rekabettir (Sabancı 1985, s.120). Bu müzayede sırasında, bir at heykelini alma konusunda yarışan iki sermayedardan Hacı Ömer Sabancı at heykeline sahip olurken, Vehbi Koç kapışma sırasında fiyatı bir hayli yükselen bir geyik heykelini satın almış; her iki işadamı da satın aldıkları heykelleri mülklerinin önüne, güçlerinin simgesi olarak yerleştirmişlerdir. Bugün söz konusu at heykeli, Sabancı Müzesi’nin yer aldığı İstanbul Emirgan’daki *Atlı Köşk*’ün bahçesinde bulunmakta, geyik heykeli ise Koç Holding’e ait İstanbul’daki Divan Otelі’nin önünde yer almaktadır.

Sakıp Sabancı, Vehbi Koç’u pek çok açıdan örnek almış, ilk olarak Vehbi Koç’un oluşturduğu holding modelini, sonrasında da Vehbi Koç Vakfı’nın ilk örneğini temsil ettiği holdinge ait vakıf modelini Sabancı şirketleri için uyarlamıştır. Vehbi Koç ve Sakıp Sabancı’nın kendi kendini yetiştirmiş işadamı profili, Buğra’ya göre

(1994, s.77) genel olarak eğitimli bireylerden oluşan Türk işadamı profiline aykırıdır. Bu iki işadamının sanatla olan ilişkisine bakıldığında, kariyerlerinin daha geç bir döneminde güzel sanatlarla ilişki kurdukları görülür. Sakıp Sabancı'nın otobiyografisinde, kır kökenli ailesinde ve yetiştiği çevrede batı sanatının örneklerinin görülmediğine yönelik değerlendirmesi, resim sanatına ilgi duymaya başlamasının babası Hacı Ömer Sabancı'nın sanat tacirliği yapan Portakal ailesiyle kurduğu ilişkiler vesilesiyle ortaya çıkışı, hat sanatı, el yazması Kuran-ı Kerim, tesbih, Türk resim sanatı koleksiyonerliğine de danışmanların yönlendirmesiyle başlaması yer almaktadır. Vehbi Koç ise, eşi Sadberk Hanım'ın koleksiyonerlik merakı, kendisinin müzayedelerde alıcı olarak yer almasıyla güzel sanatlarla ilişki kurmuştur. Bu iki işadamına kıyasla Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı'nın güzel sanatlarla daha yakından ve daha doğrudan bir ilişkisi olduğu görülür. Üç işadamı arasındaki farklılıklar, Bourdieu'nun (1984) kültürel sermaye kavramını kuramsal olarak ilintili kılmaktadır. Bourdieu'nun öne sürdüğü üzere, sosyalizasyon, yetiştirilme tarzı, eğitime erişim gibi, bireylerin estetik zevkleri ve beğenileri belirlemekte rolü olan süreçler, sosyal sınıf temellidir ve bireyler arasındaki iktidar mücadelesinde, bir güç biçimi olarak kültürel sermaye ortaya çıkmakta ve bireylerin temayüzünde etkin olmaktadır. Her ne kadar söz konusu üç sermayedar birey, üst sınıfa mensup bireyler olsalar da Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı'nın kent kökenli, İzmir'de bir ailede yetişmiş olması, itibarlı okullarda eğitim görmüş olması diğer iki işadamıyla mukayese edildiğinde, kültürel sermayesinin hacminin daha fazla olması, kültürel pratikleri ve stili ile diğer işadamları arasında sıyrılmasını sağlamaktadır.

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı'nın özel müzelerin ileriki yıllarda kurulmasını sağlayacak altyapının oluşturulmasında pek çok açıdan katkısı bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan ilki, 1973 yılında kuruluşunu öncülük ettiği İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı'dır. İkincisi, özel sektörün sanat alanına destek sağlamasının “gerekliliğini” ve “önemini” iş dünyasında yayma çabası ve bu alanda çeşitli reçeteler hazırlayıp, sanat sponsorluğu üzerine işadamlarına önerilerde bulunmasıdır. Vehbi Koç örneğinde olduğu gibi, Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı'nın, İKSV'yi kurmasının ardında yabancı örneklerin etkisi büyüktür. Almanya'da eğitim gördüğü sırada Avusturya'daki Salzburg Festivali'ni takip eden Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, böyle bir organizasyonun

İstanbul’da oluşturulması isteğinden hareketle, İKSV’yi işadamlarıyla birlikte kurar. Gerek, özel sektörün sosyal alanda ve özellikle sanat alanındaki yatırım yapmasını savunmasıyla, gerekse sanata desteği, “toplumsal yarar” ilkesiyle açıklamasıyla Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, özel teşebbüsün varlığını ve girişimcilik kültürünü, özellikle sermayenin sanata yatırım yapması koşulunu sağlamasıyla, meşrulaştırmaktadır. Avrupa’nın, festival organizasyonu konusunda ve İKSV’nin bir vakıf olarak kurulmasında etkin olan temel esin kaynağı olmasının dışında, özel sektörün sanata yatırım yapması fikrinin kaynağı, Nejat F Eczacıbaşı’nın eğitim için ABD’de geçirdiği sürede Başkan Franklin Roosevelt’in önyak olduğı Yeni Düzen (New Deal) prensibinden etkilenmiş olmasıdır. Bu noktadan hareketle Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, yalnızca özel sektörün sanata yatırım yapmasını değil, aynı zamanda Türkiye’de özel sektörün varlığını da sağlamlaştırma isteğindedir. Böyle bir savunuculuğa girişmesinde Eczacıbaşı’nın toplumsal statüsünün ve bu bağlamda sanatla özdeşleştirilen kişiliğinin de yararı olmuştur.

Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı önderliğinde kurulan İKSV’nin bu çalışmanın konusu açısından önemi büyüktür. DiMaggio (1991) Amerikan sanat müzelerinin bir örgütsel alan olarak kurulmasında vakıfların öncülük ettiğı yapılanma süreçlerinin altını çizmektedir. Bu önermeye benzer bir şekilde Türkiye’de vakıfların sürece katkısı, özel müzelerin kurulmasında, gerekli hukuksal ve finansal altyapıyı sağlayan çatı kurumlar olmasıyla sınırlı değildir. Aynı zamanda belli varlıklı ailelerin, kurumsallaşmak, ailenin iktidarının devamlılığını sağlamak ve toplumsal statülerini koruma ilgilerini de somutlaştırmaktadır. Bu durumu, Bourdieu’nun (1984) tanımladığı haliyle bireylerin ve grupların edimlerine meşruiyet sağlayan *sembolik sermaye* kavramıyla ilişkilendirmek yanlış olmayacaktır.

İKSV’nin özel müze örgütsel formunun kurulmasına nasıl bir katkı sağladığı sorusu, İKSV’nin tarihine ilişkin bilgi ve belgelerin incelenmesiyle ortaya konmuştur. Özetle İKSV, kültür sanat alanında başvuru, profesyonel bir “otorite” (Yardımcı 2007) olmasının yanısıra, özellikle İstanbul’da kültür-sanat endüstrisinin yaygınlaşması, sponsorluk olgusunun özel sektör arasında yaygınlaştırılması ve meşrulaştırılması, organize ettiğı festivallerin ve aktivitelerin

ihtiyalarıyla kltr sanat alanında profesyonellerin, yeni mesleklerin ve bylelikle profesyonellerin oluřması gibi yapılanma ve profesyonelleřme srelerine katkı saėlayarak, zel mzelerin nc kurumu ve gerekli altyapının kurucusu olmuřtur. Aynı zamanda, zel mze rgtsel alanında da bu altyapısal zelliklerden ve profesyonellerden yararlanılmaktadır.

te yandan İKSV, vakıf atısı altında bir modern sanat mzesi kurma fikrinin ne srldė kurumdur. 1980'lerin sonunda, 1. İstanbul aėdař Sanat Sergileri'nin kentte yarattıė canlılıktan hareketle Nejat F. Eczacıbařı bir zel mze kurma fikrini ortaya atar, ancak bu proje İstanbul Belediye'si tarafından 1991 yılında vakıf iin tahsis edilen Feshane Binası'nın mimar Gae Aulenti tarafından yenilenmesine raėmen, 1994 yılındaki yerel seimlerden sonra vakıf ynetiminin, İstanbul Bykřehir Belediyesi ile dřtė anlaşmazlık sonucu gerekleřemeden kalır. İstanbul Modern 2004 yılında ilk olarak, 1980'lerin sonunda ortaya atılmış bu projenin hayat bulmuř hali olarak İKSV atısı altında kurulmuřtur. İstanbul Modern ileriki yıllarda vakıfla baėlarını kesmiř olsa da, yine zel mze kurumsallařması vakıf sisteminden yararlanmıř; yine nitelik ve organizasyon ve idari yapı itibarıyla benzer bir vakıf kurulmuřtur. Yani bir diėer deyiřle, İKSV, organizasyonel biimiyle İstanbul Modern Sanat Mzesi'nde ve bylelikle zel mze rgtsel alanında temsil edilmektedir.

İKSV'ye ve onun nclk ettiėi kltrel alanın zelleřmesi meselesine ynelik eleřtiriyi burada belirtmekte yarar gryorum. Yardımcı (2007, s.5-6) İKSV tarafından organize edilen festivallerin finansal olarak zel aktrler tarafından desteklenmesinin, festival organizasyonu sırasında kurumun, siyasi olarak marjinal projelerden kaınmasının ve tehlikesiz grlen eėlenceden, ılımlı siyasete varan uluslararası kltrel biimleri tercih etmesinin iliřkili olduėunu belirtmektedir. Yardımcı'ya gre (ibid), bir yandan İKSV'nin festivaller aracılıėıyla belli elitist bir yařam tarzını yayması, bir yandan da bu sreler hem kltrel alanda artan zelleřmeyi hem de sosyal dıřlanma ihtimalini gndeme getirmektedir.

İKSV'nin yapılanma ve profesyonelleşme süreçlerine desteği dışında, özel müzelerin organizasyonel yapısını destekleyen kurumsal yapılanmaların bir diğeri de bankalardır. Türkiye'de cumhuriyetin ilk yıllarından itibaren sanat alanında devlet bankalarının resim koleksiyonu oluşturmalarıyla başlayan, bankaların sanatla olan ilişkisi, ilerleyen yıllarda koleksiyonların zenginleşmesi, bankaların kendi bünyelerinde sergileme mekanları oluşturmaları, galeri ve sanat platformları oluşturmalarıyla ilerleyen süreç 1990'lardan itibaren bankaların çağdaş sanata yönelmesi ve bu yönde inisiyatif almaları sonucunda oluşan mekanlar ve bankaların sanat alanındaki yayıncılık faaliyetleri, küratör, sanat danışmanı gibi uzmanlık alanlarının gelişmesini sağlamış, az sayıda uzmanın kurumlar arasında geçiş yapmalarına, uzmanlar arasında etkileşimin artmasına ve bu uzmanların, özel müze kurumsallaşması içinde çeşitli pozisyonlarda (danışman, küratör gibi) yer almalarına önayak olmuştur.

Son olarak doğrudan üç özel müzelerin kuruluşuna, amaçlarına, müzenin yer aldığı binaya, ve organizasyonel ve idari yapısına odaklandığımda temel bulgularım şunlar olmuştur: (1) Türkiye'de holding ve ona bağlı olarak kurulan vakıf yapılanması, özel müzelerin hem finansal hem de kurumsal en önemli kaynağını ve dayanağını teşkil etmektedir. (2) Vakıf kurumsal yapısı holdingler ve sermayedarlar açısından sağladığı imtiyazlar dışında, sağladığı fonlarla profesyonelleşme süreçlerine katkısı sebebiyle de özel müze yapılanmasını desteklemiştir. Özel müze, ayrı bir organizasyonel biçim olarak, vakıf kurumunun içinden doğmuştur. (3) İncelediğim üç iş adamı tarafından, vakıflar açısından belirlenen temel amaçlar, eğitim, toplumun gelişimine katkı, özel müze kurumunda da temsil edilmektedir. (4) Müzelerin ilişkili olduğu holdinglerin ekonomik hayattaki rekabeti, özel müze kurma, müze için koleksiyon oluşturma, ses getiren geçici sergi organize etme, İstanbul'un önemli bir sanat merkezi olma gibi isteklerle özel müze alanında yansımaktadır. Her ne kadar söz konusu üç özel müze, koleksiyonları üzerinden ayrı "kulvar" larda olduklarını ve bu nedenle aralarında rekabet olmadığını iddia etseler de, müze kurma pratiğinin ta kendisi rekabetin temelini teşkil etmektedir. (5) Devletin kurumlarının iki açıdan özel müze alanında özellikle önem taşıdığı görülmektedir. Birincisi Sabancı Müzesi

örneğinde görüldüğü üzere, kamu kurumlarından uzman transferidir. Kamu kurumlarında yetişmiş personelin sağladığı sosyal ağlar ve bürokrasinin işleyişine dair edinilen tecrübe, özel müze alanına aktarılmıştır. İkincisi ise, yerel ve merkezi yönetimlerin özel sektöre, sanat ve kültürel yatırımlarında yer sağlama meselesinin özel müze kurumunda da izlenmesidir. Sabancı Müzesi ve Pera Müzesi müzelerin kurulduğu binanın mülk sahipleri, İstanbul Modern’in belediye tarafından tahsis edilen bir binada faaliyet göstermesi, siyasi kararlara ve belirsizliğe karşı risk taşımaktadır. (6) Üç özel müzenin organizasyonel yapısına ve idari yapısına bakıldığında, holdingleri kuran ailelerin mensuplarının üst yönetimde ve karar verme süreçlerinde etkin oldukları görülmektedir. (7) Bunun yanı sıra özel müze örgütlenmesinin idari yapısı, içinde barındırdığı yönetim kurulu, danışma kurulu gibi iş ve vakıf dünyasına ait terminolojiyi ve yapıları kullanmasıyla özellikle vakıf yapılanmasına ve bununla birlikte iş dünyasından aktörlerin (holding, vakıf, özel müze) çeşitli kurumsal örgütlenmeler arasında yönetici konumlarında bulunmaları itibarıyla de şirket örgütlenmelerine benzemektedir. DiMaggio ve Powell’ın (1983) kurumsal benzeşme (institutional isomorphism) konusunda öne sürdüğü hipotezlerden biri kurumlar arası benzeşmede finansal kaynak bağımlılığının önemini vurgulamaktadır. (8) Buradan hareketle, hem holdingler hem de holdinglerin kurucu ailelerine mensup bireyler müzelerin temel finansal kaynaklarını sağladıklarından, özel müzelerin yapısının şirketlerin yapısına benzediği iddia edilebilir. Son olarak tüm bu süreçlerin önemi, Türkiye’de özel sanat müzesi alanının, liberal ekonomik düzenin bir yansıması olarak, üst sınıfların iktidarıyla sağlama alındığını göstermesidir. Özel müze alanı, rekabet düzeninin sanat alanına taşınmış halidir ve incelediğim üç müzenin arkasındaki ailelerin “modern Türk sanatı”na ve ülkenin modernleşmesine ilişkin taşıdığı sembolik anlamlara sahip olma isteklerinin bir göstergesidir.

APPENDIX F

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı :
Adı :
Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: