

**Who pays the piper calls the tune:  
Future of financially secured art in Turkey**  
**Aysegul Guchan**  
[ayguchan@yeditepe.edu.tr](mailto:ayguchan@yeditepe.edu.tr)

(Draft)

Istanbul has become increasingly renowned for its global art stage in the past few decades. Its increasing appearance worldwide is to a great degree through the organisation of a series of art festivals and the Istanbul International Art Biennial, almost all of which have been organised by a private foundation. These financially secured arts events and the establishment of private art museums undoubtedly raised Istanbul's brand value as well. On the other hand, unpredicted turn of events presented a less debated face of the interconnection between art and business world and raised questions about the future of freedom of speech and autonomy of the artists challenged by financial authority.

This paper aims to cast a fresh light on the current state of the contemporary arts scene and hopes to open up debates over financially secured art in Turkey.

**Key words:** cultural policy, contemporary Turkish art, corporate sponsorship, artistic freedom, arts censorship.

## **Introduction**

Suggesting artistic practice immersed in wider economy, the relationship between culture and economy has been extensively discussed especially in the last two decades. The literature on the issue reflects rather positive dimensions of the complicated connection. Impact of the global economic developments on culture and growing patronage of the private sector have also been widely debated issues in Turkey both in academia and arts media, especially after the establishment of private art museums.

Corporate sponsorship of the arts and patronage have been increasing rapidly in Turkey. It intensified specifically in the second half of the 1990s. International large-scale events and blockbuster exhibitions in private museums have attracted long-term private sponsorship from top corporations<sup>1</sup>. In addition to sponsorship they provided, private corporations raised their visibility in arts sphere by claiming ownership of the arts in various ways. Starting from the 1970s, they established art foundations, museums, art centres, and galleries to this end. Although this close relationship has received very warm welcome from arts sphere, in time,

---

<sup>1</sup> Istanbul International Art Biennial's main sponsor became Koç Holding, number one corporation in Turkey (<http://www.boylesiyok.com/turkiyenin-en-buyuk-5-holdingi/>). 1,2,3,4,5...

the true nature of corporate sponsorship and its impacts on artistic freedom began to raise serious questions.

Casting a critical light on the much-celebrated private sponsorship in arts, this article primarily focuses on the involvement of the private sector in the arts after 1980s in Turkey. It aims to reveal how the cultural shift between 1950 and 1980 enabled the private sector to play the most important part in shaping the arts sphere and gain a massive power on art, and concludes that dominance of the private sector in arts might end up with the loss of artistic freedom.

### **Paradoxical nature of arts patronage**

Cultural patronage<sup>2</sup>, which has long been a focus of attention in academia, has quite a long story. The close relationship between art and the business world has been greatly appreciated since the Renaissance. The Medicis, a powerful Italian family of bankers whose patronage enabled the Renaissance, became the synonym of cultural sponsorship. Their supporting system resonated in different ages and found counterparts in different countries until today.

However, the history of art patronage goes back further than the Renaissance. Artists have always had patrons throughout the history of art. From Gaius Maecenas, Roman diplomat and counsellor to the emperor Augustus, and wealthy patron of poets Virgil and Horace, to Sheika Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani, sister of the emir of Qatar<sup>3</sup>, wealthy patrons have given substantial financial support to artists by either commissioning works of art or simply acquiring existing ones.

Early patrons were very specific in making their donation public. For instance, patrons, who commissioned works of art in medieval ages and the Renaissance, wished to appear within the commissioned painting positioning themselves next to Jesus Christ, Virgin Mary, or saints. 'Madonna of Chancellor Rollin' by Jan Van Eyck makes a characteristic example of donor-patron holding a prominent place in the commissioned work of art. Despite the fact that the scheme of patronage has changed dramatically throughout the ages, explicit dominance of the patron on art and their appearance in public as the patron have remained unchanged. Controversial ArcelorMittal Orbit, which was designed and erected for the 2012

---

<sup>2</sup> According to Marjorie Garber, 'the English word "patron" quickly acquired the meaning of 'one who takes under his favour and protection, or lends his influential support to advance the interests of some person, cause, institution, art, or undertaking' (Garber 2008, p. 2). As she emphasises, the word 'patron' stems from the Latin *pater* (italics original), 'father', so, patriarchy, is embedded in the word itself.

<sup>3</sup> Sheika Al Mayassa has an 'uber-impressive art collection and museum landscape'. Amongst her collection are Damien Hirst, Mark Rothko, Andy Warhol, Cezanne, and many others.

<http://www.forbes.com/profile/sheikha-mayassa-al-thani/>

<http://www.theguardian.com/culture/2015/feb/27/the-10-best-art-patrons>

London Olympic and Paralympic Games in Olympic Park, is the most recent example on the issue. Designed and named Orbit by Anish Kapoor<sup>4</sup>, its name was changed to ArcelorMittal, which refers to Lakshmi Mittal, the steel magnet of Britain, after his 19,000,000 £ massive donation to the tower's structure.

### **State Patronage of Art and Shaping the Citizen in Turkey**

As it was in many other European countries in the years of the emergence and establishment of nation states, patronage of the arts was assumed by the state in the early decades of the Turkish Republic. After the declaration of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, an extensive cultural policy was planned and put into practice until 1950, the beginning of the multi-party era in the country. In this very first cultural policy, art was given an educational as well as political purpose, during the decades of nation building.

Shortly after the proclamation of the Republic, the CHP (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi / Republican People's Party) government, the architect of the new regime, developed an extensive modernisation project as part of the abovementioned cultural policy. In other words, the new regime's cultural policy was a tool through which the modernisation project was applied. In the kernel of the project was a thorough social and cultural transformation and forging of the modern Turkish citizen through extensive exposure to art<sup>5</sup>.

The main target of this radical national project of the young Turkish Republic was nation building and 'attaining the level of contemporary (Western) civilization and even surpassing it'<sup>6</sup> (Ondin 2003, p. 57; Yildiz 2011). Creating a homogenous society and a national bourgeoisie through which national economy and art could be developed were amongst the earliest targets of the Republic<sup>7</sup> as well (Keyder 1997, p. 47). Briefly, the main objective of the Republic was to build a nation-state with a 'new concept of Citizen, or rather developing a new culture for people' (Tekelioglu 1998, p. 194).

Art in this new construction would play an important role as the most powerful tool to shape and educate this imagined modern citizen of the new regime. Mainly for this reason, art was not only an aesthetic issue in the early decades of the Republic, but also an instrument that

---

<sup>4</sup> Anish Kapoor worked in co-operation with British architect Cecil Balmond of Group Arup in Britain's largest public art.

<sup>5</sup> Statements of Mustafa Necati Bey, the then Minister of Education, exemplifies how the state was prepared to put this policy in practice. He stated on several occasions that the art was a necessity and in order to create a cultural sphere through which great artists could appear and that this necessity should be felt by the majority of the people (Inan 1980, p. 121).

<sup>6</sup> Attaining the level of contemporary civilization and its prerequisites were expressed in several speeches by Atatürk. Visit [http://www.ata.tsk.tr/content/media/01/soylev\\_ve\\_demecleri.pdf](http://www.ata.tsk.tr/content/media/01/soylev_ve_demecleri.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Modernisation project of the Republic in fact goes back to Tanzimat, the first phase of the Westernisation of the Ottoman Empire. Many art and cultural establishments were founded in the nineteenth century and kept by the Republic. See Guchan 2015.

assumed the role of teaching the principles of the new regime that aimed to modernise the nation. Since the art would be an implement to raise the cultural level of the young nation, then it should be under the patronage of the State. In order to regulate artistic activities, two directories, Directory of Fine Arts and Council of Fine Arts were established under the Ministry of Education in 1926. Atatürk's speeches delivered in many occasions reveal the profound belief in art and its role in attaining the level of civilised nations<sup>8</sup>.

In accordance with the project, an elaborate artistic reflection of the new Republic promptly developed. Apart from the extensive presentation of Atatürk's imagery in the public realm through sculptures and portraits<sup>9</sup>, calls for creating a national art reflecting cultural and political change were reflected by the artists of the time through a large number of works of art. Themes of art varied from learning the new alphabet to changing capital of the new country, from the powerful leadership of Atatürk to the new lifestyle and changing role of Turkish women. All of these subjects in art were also encouraged by the painting competitions and exhibitions organised in the early decades of the Republic.

In addition to the abovementioned public art to shape the citizens of the Republic and extensive public art to reinforce loyalty to the cultural ideals of the new regime, further cultural programmes were planned and put into practice. All of them aimed to enable this desired outcome expressed by the minister<sup>10</sup>, which was supposed to help people civilise.

### **Art education**

Since young artists were supposed to bring the most recent art trends to the country and energise the arts sphere, art education would have to become an important part of the new cultural policy. From the very beginning of the Republic, art students would generously be supported as the main actors of the arts sphere. Gifted young artists and arts students were granted scholarships for further art education in European countries, especially Paris, the then art capital of the world.

The new government pursued the same way as the Ottoman Empire in giving foreign artists and art educators important positions in the Academy of Fine Arts and other cultural

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://atam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/SÖYLEV-ORJINAL.pdf>  
<http://www.atam.gov.tr/dergi/sayi-02/onuncu-yil-nutkunun-son-sekli>

<sup>9</sup> Atatürk's statues were erected in every prominent square of Istanbul, Izmir and Ankara, the largest three cities of the country and small towns and villages. They were also seen in the schools' grounds at every level. According to a directive published in 1928 by the Ministry of Education in Official Gazette, all schools should place and protect a bust of Atatürk. All the classrooms require an Atatürk portrait hung on the wall (Primary Education Association Regulations paragraph 145). Apart from this, Turkish money has Atatürk's portrait on the front side since 1952. See Wilson 2013, p. 8.

<sup>10</sup> See footnote 5.

institutions, especially, museums. It would become a significant part of the modernisation project, as it was in the Empire<sup>11</sup>.

In addition to the renewal of the Academy of Fine Arts and long-term state scholarship for young artists, three national projects were put into practice for targeted widespread art between 1932 and 1943: People's Houses, Village Institutes, and Homeland Tours<sup>12</sup>. All of these three projects were two-fold: establishment of the art sphere throughout Anatolia and shaping the citizen through art<sup>13</sup>.

State patronage in the early decades of the Republic climaxed with the establishment of the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture in 1937 on Atatürk's directive in the Quarters of the Crown Prince of Dolmabahce Palace, residence of the Ottoman prince in the imperial past of the country. The fact that the Quarters of the Crown Prince became the home to the new national modern art museum reveals how the Republican narrative began to unfold. The magnificent building once built as the residence of the last Ottoman sultans with public money and remained closed to the public turned a focal point by 1937:

Visitors wandering around the displays of nude paintings and sculptures, on the grounds of the former Ottoman State, not only felt the victory of the new Republic, but also an urge to prefer secularism to Islamic rules (Köksal 2014, p. 242).

Apparently, the museum presented the new national narrative of the Republic of Turkey and the transformation of the Ottoman Empire to modern Turkish Republic through both the building and the art works it owned and displayed.

Although art and cultural projects were achieved by the State, some implications and calls for private sector's involvement in art and culture began to take place towards the end of the 1930s. For example, the minister of education Hasan Ali Yucel stated his view regarding the issue in his speech delivered in the first National Publishing Congress in 1939 strongly

---

<sup>11</sup> Details for the state's patronage in the Ottoman Empire see Inalcik 2003, for modernization project see Shaw & Shaw 1977.

<sup>12</sup> People's Houses were organisations founded for making people familiar with the republican regime and cultural development in 1932. Majority of the nine directories were in charge of artistic organisations. Village Institutes, which were founded in 1940, were established for in situ education in Anatolia. They were intended to raise teachers, who were supposed to remain in their villages to educate rural people and make people familiar with the arts. They were established after the government observed that People's Houses served people living in the cities only. Homeland Tours, the third part of the widespread art project of the new regime, was put into practice between 1938 and 1943. 48 artists selected by the Academy of Fine Arts were given the task to produce art with local people all over Anatolia. As local people practiced art with the help of artists, artists became familiar with the social, economic, and cultural aspects of the country. 675 paintings were made during the project. As some of them are in the State Museum of Painting and Sculpture in Ankara, most of them are missing.

<sup>13</sup> Detailed research by Lisanne Gibson reveals how art is instrumentalised to shape citizen in Australian, American and British contexts. See 1997, 2002.

emphasizing the necessity of a close co-operation between state and private sector<sup>14</sup> (Cikar 1998, p. 81). In this period, in addition to the non-Muslim businessmen who had always been visible in the art world, specifically as bidders in the art auctions, famous Muslim businessmen also began to appear in the art world as buyers (Büyükdal 1992, p. 241).

### **From 1950 to 1970**

1950s indicate a clearly seen break from the cultural policies of the early Republican period. After the Second World War concluded and multi-party politics was established in Turkey, the role of the state in the economy came out as the main discourse. It culminated in the shift of political mindset about etatism.

Economic development plans were also amongst the debates of the time. A plan detailed in 1947 strongly emphasized the necessity of the private sector involvement in any sector of national economy (Altunisik & Tur 2014, p. 73). Thus, when the Democratic Party (DP) came to power in 1950, it championed the principles of the not-implemented 1947 Development Plan and reduced the role of the state in the economy and supported the private sector. The first five-year development plan openly expressed that the Turkish economy was a mixed economy in which the state and private sector would work side by side<sup>15</sup>.

One of the main results of these shifts was the development of the commercial bourgeois class, which would also be the new patron of the arts. That being so, the period between 1950 and 1980 would be characterised by the fact that the field of art and culture would no longer be defined solely as a function of the State.

In addition to removing almost all the barriers between art and the private sector, the DP government, which was in power between 1950 and 1960, prepared incentive schemes for it towards 1960s. Thus, in the 1950s, the field of art and culture began to become less dependent on patronage from the state. This shift towards channelling financial resources to the private sector in case of involving art and culture resonated well in the first Five-year Development Plan in 1963<sup>16</sup>.

Briefly,

(...) This period saw the gradual development of an art market in Turkey in the capitalist sense, in stark contrast to the ideologically motivated state art exhibitions of the early Republican period. As art education dispersed beyond the traditional

---

<sup>14</sup> This call was replied by a private bank, Yapi Kredi Bankasi, by establishing Dogan Kardes Kids' Magazine in 1945. Private theatres were also led by the same bank. Küçük Sahne theatre, which was established in 1951, was an initiative of Yapi Kredi Bankasi (see Kosemen 2012).

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/9/plan1.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> See Kantarcioglu1990 for development plans.

See also <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/9/plan1.pdf>

confines of the Academy of Fine Arts in Istanbul and the Gazi Teachers' College in Ankara into various fine arts departments of new universities, cutting-edge artistic developments began happening outside these institutions altogether, in rapidly multiplying private studios. Many art historians and critics observe that the individuality of the artist emerged as a major force in this period, in contrast to the predominance of groups or schools in the early Republican period (Bozdogan 2008, p. 445).

### **1970s and the beginning of a new era in the arts sphere**

1970s marked the unprecedented development of the art market and private art galleries especially in Istanbul, which have considerably changed the contemporary arts stage. As newly established art galleries displayed large-scale contemporary art exhibitions, a number of banks published art books. Increase in the number of art journals of the time also contributed to prolific art debates amongst arts professionals and the interested public.

Establishment of the Ministry of Culture in 1971 was considered a vital shift of the time. After the establishment of the ministry, articles on changing cultural policy agenda towards the diminishing role of the state in art and cultural issues began to come out in governmental papers. For example, incentives for private sector in case of their involvement in cultural issues took significant place specifically in the third Five-year Development Plan of 1973<sup>17</sup>.

1973 also indicates a keystone in the development of the involvement of private sector in arts and culture: the establishment of IKSv (Istanbul Kültür ve Sanat Vakfı / Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts). It was founded by the Eczacıbaşı Group, one of the biggest corporations in Turkey, for the celebration of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Republic. Its foundation and initial aim are defined on their website as follows:

Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (IKSV) is a non-profit, non-governmental organisation founded in 1973 by seventeen businessmen and art enthusiasts who gathered under the leadership of Dr. Nejat F. Eczacıbaşı, with the aim of organising an international arts festival in İstanbul<sup>18</sup>.

Establishing a large number of festivals and the Istanbul International Art Biennial<sup>19</sup>, IKSv is a foundation through which large corporations provide sponsorship for these events<sup>20</sup>. Launched as the initiator of all of the large-scale art events in the early early 1970s, it gave

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalkinma%20Planlar/Attachments/7/plan3.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.iksv.org/en/aboutus/history>

<sup>19</sup> History of the biennial once began as an art festival.

<sup>20</sup> Koç Holding, for instance, the largest private corporation in Turkey, assumed sponsorship for the Biennial until 2026. Visit <http://bienal.iksv.org/en>

artists a powerful motivation to present their work internationally through the Istanbul Biennial. In any kind of publication in Turkey, printed or online, academic or not, IKSŞ receives such an acclaim no other art institution ever had. This article suggests another perspective regarding the positive effects of the private sector's intervention in the arts in the case of the Turkish context. The point is the fact that, starting in 1970s, the private sector, including IKSŞ, gained such a sturdy status that implicitly and gradually dictated what kind of art to be made or not.

### **2000s, censors, and a new type of art**

2000s are the years of the formation of the art market in Turkey. Despite the fact that an art market began to form before, it was not that extensive and international. Starting in the 1980s, neoliberal policies implemented by ANAP (Anavatan Partisi / Motherland Party) paved the way for withdrawal of the state from many areas including art and culture, which the first seeds were sown in the 1950s, as DP came in power<sup>21</sup>. After AK Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi – Justice and Development Party) came in power in 2002, incentives for the private sector, in case that they involve in art, considerably increased.

In this sphere, where the state's involvement decreased, big corporations' attachment to art and culture increased by leaps and bounds. Competing corporations for market share began to compete in being key actors in the arts sector as well. Once started getting involved in art 'by collecting paintings and other works of art, as all financial elites in the world do' (Seni 2009, p. 97), they began to establish their museums to showcase their collections. The establishment of IKSŞ in 1973 and the way Eczacıbaşı Group's made the corporation visible in the international arts sphere had created an ideal for the rest of the big corporations. First they began to appear at the stage through substantial sponsorships for the events IKSŞ organised later they one by one established their museums and cultural centres<sup>22</sup>.

These are all deemed positive impacts of the involvement of the private sector in art. However, along with the positive contributions, a brief register of negative aspects might provide useful insights over the affair.

Censorship of art by private funders is one of these aspects. Censorship in Turkey gained such an almost 'normal' status that, in 2011, preoccupied with the censorship imposed by any kind of institutions, state or private, a group of art and communication volunteers established an initiative called 'Siyah Bant' (Black Censor Bar) that chronicles censorship incidents in art, similar to those in other European countries<sup>23</sup>: They describe their mission as follows:

---

<sup>21</sup> See footnote no 16.

<sup>22</sup> The number of private museums is 200 according to the latest statistics provided by Turkey Institute of Statistics. Visit <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=21553>

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.siyahbant.org>

Black censor bar is an initiative, which was founded in 2011 by a group of art and cultural workers with the purposes of researching the actors and methods of censor, documenting the incidents through its website and publications, and defending freedom of speech in art.

Black Censor Bar uses the concept of censorship in the widest sense possible. It comprises all of the methods of censorship imposed not only by law, but also by a diversity of actors. Punishing, banning, pointing as a target, threatening, intimidating, humiliating, violating, and delegitimizing are deemed amongst methods used in censorship incidents. Amongst those actors who impose censorship are state institutions, political parties, political groups, concerned citizens, local neighbourhood residents, art and cultural institutions, curators, trade bodies, sectors' representatives, and funding bodies<sup>24</sup>.

As explicitly expressed above, the state is not the only actor who imposes censor, but also other actors from the private sector are listed. Censor incidents that occurred in recent years and documented on the website appear to come not only from the state, but also from art and cultural institutions including IKSŞ. I chose the two most striking and debated censorship examples from the art world.

The first incident I kept track of was the cancellation of a classical music concert by composer and pianist Fazıl Say, planned to take place at the opening of the 2008 Frankfurt Book Fair. The organisation of this concert was delegated to IKSŞ by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Without informing the composer, IKSŞ replaced it with a Sufi music concert. Say was supposed to perform his Nazım Oratorio, to commemorate Turkish poet Nazım Hikmet, who died in exile in Moscow due to his left-wing stance.

The second example has to do with a censor imposed by a museum, Istanbul Museum of Modern Art<sup>25</sup>, established by Eczacıbaşı Group like IKSŞ. A censorship incident occurred in 2011 causing heated discussions about the current state of the arts in Turkey and the raised the question about the negative impact of private funding on artistic creativity. It was about a work commissioned by Istanbul Modern to be granted to the museum in order to help fundraise for the educational programme of the institution through a special exhibition, a powerful satire criticising political power. It was immediately rejected by the museum on the grounds that it was not in accordance with the concept of the exhibition. This incident started a series of heated debates between various actors of the art world, which made headlines about art censorship for a while. Ten artists withdrew their work from the

---

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.siyahbant.org/proje-hakkinda/>

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en>

exhibition that took place in the museum and made strong statements on the issue<sup>26</sup>. What was striking in these debates was the fact that representatives of artists' and art critics' associations<sup>27</sup> made appalling explanations. They claimed that museums have the right to decide on the works that should take place in exhibitions despite the fact that that work was commissioned and added that it did not count as censorship. According to these representatives, it could have counted as censorship if it would be imposed by the state only. These debates are of utmost importance in revealing the extent to which relationships between artists and private art institutions can cause a re-definition of art and restriction of artistic freedom through a kind of self-censorship.

### **Re-definition of art?**

What concerns the author of this article is the explicit turn in the stance of the contemporary artist in the Turkish context after the private sector has gained massive power in the art world. It is widely known that from the earlier beginnings of art in Turkey, artists have always taken a critical stance against any kind of power. In more recent times, especially after the interim regime in 1980, contemporary art became overtly politicised and used as an instrument for intellectual debates with regard to the political power of the state and social changes.

On the other hand, after the private sector's takeover of artistic realm, a new era is likely to begin on the contemporary arts stage. What made me think about it is a work of art that was displayed in the 56<sup>th</sup> Venice Biennale, themed 'All the World's Future'. It was an installation by Kutlug Ataman, an internationally acclaimed Turkish artist. His work, 'The Portrait of Sakip Sabanci'<sup>28</sup>, a work in the form of the flying carpet of Ali Baba fairy tale, was made of approximately 10,000 portraits of people who worked for Mr Sabanci, founder and late CEO of Sabanci Holding, the second biggest corporation in Turkey. According to the artist's website, it was 'created for the tenth anniversary of the death of the Turkish business leader Sakip Sabanci'<sup>29</sup>. As a noted philanthropist, Mr Sabanci was, without doubt, an important person in terms of Turkey's economy and creation of a national bourgeois class. With a number of cultural investments, Sabanci Holding made significant contributions to the Turkish cultural sphere through a number of investments and donations. However, when a contemporary artist, who is known for his critical interpretation of Turkish cultural life, makes a portrait of a business tycoon, this should be considered a new type of art about to emerge in Turkey and a new form of relationship between the artist and the business world, which can be described as a kind of self-censorship.

---

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.siyahbant.org/istanbul-modern-olayi-ve-sansurun-sinirlari/>

<sup>27</sup> UPSD (International Association of Plastic Arts) and AICA Turkey branch were among these associations.

<sup>28</sup> Quite a high technology and a highly skilled staff must have been utilised during its production. It comprises 9,216 LCD panels configured in 144 modules of 64 LCD panels each.

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.kutlugataman.com/site/artworks/work/254/>

## Conclusion

This article does not aim to provide a thorough account of all the positive and/or negative aspects of the involvement of the private sector in art in Turkey. Instead, it attempts to reveal that the private sector's complete takeover of the artistic realm might have corrosive effect in the arts scene (Caputi et al 2013, p. 18). That is not to say private funding or patronage is entirely bad in terms of art, or, the state's involvement is absolutely preferred. In an era of cultural cuts, indeed, generous funds for art from the private sector work wonders, at least in Turkey.

An article published in the New York Times strongly recommended those who are interested in contemporary art to visit Istanbul and see both Istanbul Modern and Istanbul Biennial specifically, ranking the city as the nineteenth place amongst thirty-one<sup>30</sup>, for example. Contribution of the private corporations' enterprise cannot be denied at this stage. On the other hand, various times, art theorists and scholars emphasised the fact that the private sector's involvement in art might not as good as it looked. Pierre Bourdieu and contemporary artist Hans Haacke got together and made a work to draw attention to the fact that how artists might be exposed to the threats from private funders and how they could lose their critical stances and autonomy in case of 'increasingly subtle strategies of business to subordinate or seduce artists' (Bourdieu & Haacke 1995, pp. 15-16). A statement by a celebrated artist, who pioneered the artist-as-businessman, Andy Warhol, can put the situation in picture by summarising his position as 'Art Businessman or Business Artist'<sup>31</sup>.

## Resources

Altunisik, Meliha Benli & Tür, Ozlem (2014) Turkey: Challenges of Continuity and Change. Taylor & Francis (place of publication not identified).

Bonnafous-Boucher, Maria, Cuir, Raphael, and Partouche, Marc (2011), "The New and the challenge of the market or the non-instrumental function of creation. In: Art Entrepreneurship, pp. 23-49.

Bourdieu, Pierre, Haacke, Hans. 1995. Free Exchange. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University.

Bozdogan, Sibel (2008) Art and Architecture in Modern Turkey: The Republican Period. In The Cambridge History of Turkey, Vol 4 (Ed.) Kasaba, Resat. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

---

<sup>30</sup> [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/10/travel/10places.html?ref=travel&\\_r=0&pagewanted=5](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/10/travel/10places.html?ref=travel&_r=0&pagewanted=5)

<sup>31</sup> Warhol's words. He is the first contemporary artist agreeing art is absolutely a business. David W. Galenson shows how contemporary artists adopted Warhol's 'pioneering embrace of commercial success' in his book (2009, p. 332).

Büyükunal, Feriha, 1992. Sordum. İstanbul: Sanat Cevresi.

Caputi, Mary et all (2013) 'Derrida, Deconstruction, and the University'. In: (Eds.)Caputi, Mary and Del Casino, Vincent, Jr. (2013) Derrida and the Future of Liberal Arts. New York. Bloomsbury.

Cikar, Mustafa, 1998. Hasan Ali Yücel ve Türk Kültür Reformu. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası.

Galenson, David W. (2009) Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art. New York: Cambridge University.

Garber, Marjorie. 2008. Patronizing the Arts. Princeton: Princeton University.

Gibson, Lianne (2002) Managing the People: Art Programs in the American Depression, The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 31:4, pp. 279-292.

Gibson, Lianne (1997) Art, Citizenship and Government: 'Art for the people' in New Deal in America and the 1940s in England and Australia, Culture and Policy, 8:3, 41-55.

Guchan, Aysegul (2015) Interwoven Ottoman and British Cultural Policies in the Case of Crimea Memorial Church, International Journal of Cultural Policy, 21:5, 577-592.

Inalcik, Halil (2003) Şair ve Patron. Ankara: Doğu Batı.

Inan, M. Rauf (1980) Mustafa Necati, Kisiligi, Ulusal Egitime Bakisi, Konusma ve Anilari. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası.

Kantarcioğlu, Selcuk (1990) Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Hükümet Programlarında Kültür. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Keyder, Çağlar. 1997. 'Whither the project of modernity? Turkey in the 1990s'. In (Eds) Bozdoğan, Sibel & Kasaba, Resat, 1997, Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey. Seattle: Washington University.

Kosemen, Begum, 2012, Türkiye'de Özel Sektörün kültür ve sanat alanındaki artan görünürlüğü. Marmara Üniversitesi İ.İ.B. Dergisi, xxxiii, Sayı ii, pp. 145-172.

Lane, Jeremy F. 2006. Bourdieu's Politics: Problems and Possibilities. London: Routledge.

Scherdin, Mikael, Zander, Ivo (2011) Art Entrepreneurship. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Seni, Nora (2009) Oryantalizm ve Hayırseverliğin İttifakı. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi. (Çev.) Elif Ertan.

Shaw, Stanford & Shaw, Ezel K. (1977) History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Stallabrass, Julian.

Tekelioglu, Orhan, 1998. The Rise of a Spontaneous Synthesis: The historical background of Turkish popular music, pp. 194-215. In: Turkey: Identity, Democracy, Politics. (Ed.) Sylvia Kedourie. London: Frank Cass.

Wilson, Christopher S. (2013) Beyond Anitkabir: The funerary architecture of Atatürk. The construction and maintenance of national memory. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.

Yildiz, Necip (2011) The relation between socioeconomic development and democratization in contemporary Turkey, Turkish Studies, 12:1, 129-148.

### **Web sources**

<http://www.boylesiyok.com/turkiyenin-en-buyuk-5-holdingi/> accessed: 07.04.2016

<http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/7/plan3.pdf> accessed: 11.04.2016 (Third five-year development plan 1973-1977)

Law on promotion of cultural investments and initiatives / 5225 no'lu kanun

IKSV – tax-exempt organisation

<http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.5225.pdf> accessed: 11.04.2016

[http://www.ata.tsk.tr/content/media/01/soylev\\_ve\\_demecleri.pdf](http://www.ata.tsk.tr/content/media/01/soylev_ve_demecleri.pdf) accessed: 13.04.2016

<http://atam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/SÖYLEV-ORJİNAL.pdf> accessed: 17.04.2016

<http://www.atam.gov.tr/dergi/sayi-02/onuncu-yil-nutkunun-son-sekli> accessed: 17.04.2016

<http://www.e-flux.com/announcements/kutlug-ataman-at-the-56th-venice-biennale/> accessed: 18.04.2016

<http://www.theguardian.com/culture/2015/feb/27/the-10-best-art-patrons>

accessed: 20.04.2016

<http://www.forbes.com/profile/sheikha-mayassa-al-thani/> accessed: 20.04.2016

<http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/9/plan1.pdf> accessed:  
21.04.2016

<http://www.iksv.org/en/aboutus/history> accessed: 19.05.2016

<http://bienal.iksv.org/en> accessed: 19.05.2016

<http://www.siyahbant.org> accessed: 19.05.2016

<http://www.istanbulmodern.org/en> accessed: 19.05.2016

<http://www.siyahbant.org/proje-hakkinda/> accessed: 19.05.2016

<http://www.siyahbant.org/istanbul-modern-olayi-ve-sansurun-sinirlari/> accessed:  
19.05.2016

<http://www.kutlugataman.com/site/artworks/work/254/> accessed: 22.05.2016

<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=21553> accessed: 23.05.2016

[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/10/travel/10places.html?ref=travel&\\_r=0&pagewanted=5](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/10/travel/10places.html?ref=travel&_r=0&pagewanted=5) accessed: 25.05.2016