



Abriss des Atatürk-Kulturzentrum am Taksim-Platz. Foto: İmge Yilmaz 2018.

Interdisciplinary Colloquium »Shifting Values – Processes, Strategies and Conflicts in the Built Environment«

Veranstalter: DFG Research Training Group 1913 »Cultural and Technological Significance of Historic Buildings« (Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg; Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space, Erkner; Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)

Place: BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg, Atelier Oestreich

Date: 25–27 September 2019

Authors: Duygu Göçmen, Albrecht Wiesener, BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg

Evaluations of the built environment are always subject to a process of valuation, which is influenced by political, economic, and social factors and subject to societal processes of change. Signs of shifting values can be identified when looking at newly planned as well as repurposed, refurbished and retrofitted buildings. Based on these lines of thinking, the DFG Research Training Group 1913 »Cultural and Technological Significance of Historic Buildings« organised its annual colloquium »Shifting Values – Processes, Strategies and Conflicts in the Built Environment« from 25 to 27 September 2019 in Cottbus, to discuss, from an interdisciplinary point of view, the link between changing attitudes of valuation and the societal function of architecture.

HANS-RUDOLF MEIER (Weimar), one of the most important protagonists of the value change debate with research and publications on history and theory of

heritage conservation (namely *Werte. Begründungen der Denkmalpflege in Geschichte und Gegenwart / Values. Heritage Conservation's Reasoning in Past and Present*), co-published with Ingrid Scheurmann and Wolfgang Sonne) introduced the conference topic by presenting four perspectives. After deducing the »science of values« from macro-economics and 19th-century moral philosophy and giving an overview of value models in heritage conservation, Meier discussed in detail conflicts of value. Just looking at Alois Riegl and his fundamental building preservation value system illustrates that value change is not merely a contemporary phenomenon but has repeatedly occurred throughout history. Debates on industrial cultural heritage and, most recently, on climate change illustrate how what we value about recent history is firmly linked to the present.

ACHIM HAHN (Dresden) held the second day's introductory talk presenting the challenge of deducing generalised statements on value change in architecture when faced with the complex history and wide spectrum of meaning of the term value. After a short overview of the theoretical positions of the term value, Hahn focused on how the approach towards the built environment impacts the living environment. Based on his own research approach in architectural theory, Hahn discussed whether shifting values with regards to approaching the built environment specifically occurred, when an unexpected experience using architecture led to a situationally-motivated decision. Due to current reasoning on what the good life and good living spaces mean to the individual person, focus has recently shifted to hereto overlooked aspects of using architecture.



Eva Maria Froschauer. Foto: GRK 1913.



Moritz Röger. Foto: GRK 1913.

ÖZGÜN ÖZÇAKIR (Ankara), GÜLİZ BİLGİN ALTINÖZ (Ankara) and ANNA MIGNOSA (Rotterdam) illustrated how differing interpretations of historic structures' values lead to different societal interventions and how these in change effected a value change of the object in question, using two examples in Turkey: historic buildings in an urban environment in Tarlaşısı (Istanbul) and in Konak (Izmir). Both sites sported a diverse populace, mainly made up of immigrants. Post-intervention analysis showed that the top-down approach in Tarlaşısı resulted in an increase in economic infrastructure, but a complete loss of the social structure and its diversity, whereas, in Konak, the preferable bottom-up line of decision-making resulted in increased economic as well as social values. The analysis was based on an explanatory approach developed by the researchers themselves, the Heritage Value Circle. Using this approach, different value interpretations, milieus, and approaches for societal intervention can be analysed and formatted so as to allow further interpretation.

The second part focused on value change in the design process, shedding light on the role played by particular agents in the decision-making process and the dynamics influencing those processes. In her talk about Heinrich Hübsch, DOROTHEA ROOS (Cottbus) presented the topic of openly visible brickwork in buildings from around 1830 illustrated by the example of the Finanzkanzlei at Schlossplatz in Karlsruhe and specifically its departure from hereto common practices of construction. This design reflected an approach to architecture put down in writing by Hübsch, reaching beyond this particular time period – to build in a sustainable, climate appropriate way, true to the material used and based on functions. The notions of <being true to material> and <honest construction>, discussed within the building itself as well as through discourse at the time, seem to anticipate 20th century architectural modernity.

JOCHEN KIBEL (Berlin), at the beginning of his lecture, introduced the term <value relations>. Using the in parts controversial discussions surrounding the adaptation of Neues Museum in Berlin as an example, he managed to illustrate coexisting differing attributions of value, which resulted in conflicts regarding the actual and planned interventions during the museum's re-design. One of his findings was that even similar attributions of value regarding the significance of historicity and modernity could lead to completely different suggestions as to how the building should be dealt with, resulting in a publicly displayed conflict of values (on an interpretational level) without conflict of values (on the level of value attributions), as Kibel summed up at the end of his talk.

In his presentation about contemporary scientific buildings and the architectural concepts they are based on, MARCUS VAN REIMERSDAHL (Dresden) illustrated that the design parameters for these buildings bore striking similarities: informality, openness, interaction, visibility, etc. Van Reimersdahl asked, where these new expectations stem from and who decides on which spacial qualities are adequate for certain functions. Parallel developments could be identified in the discourse for scientific building concepts and the new type of marketing strategies based on experiences. In both cases the focus had shifted from the object and its function to the variety of experiences possible when using the object.

The third set of lectures looked at ways of sharing values by asking which strategies and instruments are being put to use during valuation processes. First up was MORITZ RÖGER (Frankfurt am Main) with his talk on the politically charged debate on Frankfurt's New Historic City. He introduced his talk with a brief overview on the Dom-Römer project, on tearing down Technisches Rathaus and on how this part of the city had then been reconstructed



Turgut Saner. Foto: GRK 1913.



Luisa Beyenbach. Foto: GRK 1913.

to resemble its shape before destruction in World War II, noting that, in his opinion, politicians blocked and outvoted the experts. The next part of the talk focused on the anatomy of the historic city using aerial views, maps and pictures dating from 1850 to around 1910 to illustrate the modernisation and, at the same time, romanticisation of the area. It became evident that subjective attributions of value have had a major impact on the historic city and on how concepts of the historic city were communicated.

OONA SIMOLIN (Helsinki) followed up on this topic with her talk on world heritage site Suomenlinna, a medieval fortress located on the outskirts of Helsinki, discussing changes in the ways of communicating values with regards to historic structures. Based on her own empirical research, Simolin was able to prove the still existing considerable gap between academically driven heritage debates and the real attributions of value on building culture and history communicated on site, making heritage site managers and tour planners the real «mediators of values».

MESUT DINLER (Turin) presented the process of establishment and institutionalisation of urban conservation in Turkey in the 1960s and 70s. Radical interventions in historic structures in the 50s had set in motion a discussion about urban make-up coinciding with the same discussion in war-torn Europe. During this period of considerable social, political, and economic transformation in Turkey, space for discussions, legislation, and institutions surrounding urban conservation had opened up – also due to the power vacuum in government administration as a result of the coup. Thus, heritage experts were able to establish new standards in a top-down process. Dinler illustrates that during this process too much emphasis was placed on expert opinion, which meant that not in every case an ideal approach could be ensured.

The last set of presentations of the day focussed on negotiating processes during the valorisation of politically and socially controversial urban areas.

LUISA BEYENBACH (Cottbus) illustrated the handling of monumental Nazi buildings after World War II using the site of the Reichsparteitag in Nuremberg as an example. Beyenbach attempted to find answers to the question of what to do with these buildings, which, with the demise of the Nazi regime, had lost their purpose and whose continuous architectural presence posed a special challenge for the Federal Republic of Germany. In her presentation, Beyenbach managed to shed some light on the varying strategies within different approaches of revaluation by looking at examples of post-usage and public discussion surrounding the site of the Reichsparteitag.

The other two presentations of this section were dedicated to two neighbouring buildings at the heart of Istanbul. First, TURGUT SANER (Istanbul/Cottbus) presented a site in the city centre, known as the starting and focal point of the Gezi protests of 2013. In the past, military barracks stemming from late Ottoman times were located there. In the course of modernistic government projects, the structures were torn down in 1940, following European examples, an esplanade was built in the name of the head of state at the time, İnönü: İnönü Park, later know as Gezi Park. With increased orientation towards Muslim principles, paradoxically, the historic barracks turned into a symbol for the demise of Ottoman times and reconstruction was propagated by the political class. Saner illustrated how existence and non-existence of a building can be a strong symbol of very different political attitudes towards valuation in the younger history of Turkey. ZEYNEP KÜÇÜK and İMGE YILMAZ (both Istanbul) focussed on the tearing down of Atatürk Cultural Centre and the construction of the new opera on Taksim square

in Istanbul. This building was completed around 20 years after İnönü/Gezi Park and in turn came to symbolise an orientation towards Western modernity (in architecture) of the Republic of Turkey. The presentation illustrated how, even in details of the original architecture, this symbolism could be identified. Currently, society in Turkey is strongly politically polarised, which has had a considerable influence on the decision for the structure to be torn down. This also means that Atatürk Cultural Centre became a symbol for the lengthy process of leaving Kemalistic and secular norms and values of the past behind. Küçük and Yılmaz then discussed the planned reconstruction of the building with the iconic façade being «conserved», the building itself, however, gaining a wholly different connotation in terms of political motivation and being publicly controversially discussed.

The last section of the conference was titled *Transformation of Values – Phenomena and Value Shifts* and featured geographically very diverse presentations.

First, STEPHANIE HEROLD (Bamberg) presented a current phenomenon: Increased appreciation for the large housing estates of the 1960s and 70s. She focussed on the question whether this was similar to the attitudes towards estates dating from the Wilhelminian period, which, for economical, aesthetical and health reasons, were strongly criticised at first, but ended up being highly appreciated. Herold pointed out that, while the processes bore similarities, the appreciated values themselves differed. When looking at Wilhelminian residential buildings, the goal was a re-aestheticization of their architecture and socially mixed neighbourhoods, whereas large housing estates came to symbolise social-utopian concepts. Herold stated that values as well as valuation are being defined based on current thinking and redefined based on current criticism.

NICOLA THOMAS (Kopenhagen) presented the transformation of urban allotment gardens using the example of Kopenhagen and the processes of value change and conflicts of interest, which can be observed in the process. First, Thomas gave an overview of the values commonly associated with urban allotments. These should, in her view, be defined from historical, ecological, spacial, and social angles. These allotments, with their history dating back to the turn of the century, based on the outskirts of the city and, in the past, commonly used by less affluent parts of the populace, have always been at the divide between devaluation and upvaluation. On the one hand, their location was of little value, on the other hand, as urban spaces, they represented community, creativity, and retreat and were socially highly valued. Following this introduction, Thomas explained the negotiating processes

surrounding the allotments of Kopenhagen, which have already lasted 20 years. At the beginning of the 21st century, following high levels of demand, a national law was passed to secure all allotments, which, however, did not result in the desired outcome (halting the upvaluation process), but led to the gentrification of allotments and a revaluation by the urban middle class of those built structures.

SHRADDHA BHATAWADEKAR (Cottbus) used the example of Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Terminal in Mumbai to illustrate how an increase in value of a historic building can drastically change how it is treated and what negative effects this can entail. She discussed the term «heritagisation» as a process, through which the station building has – since entering the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2004 – gradually changed from a functional object to an exhibit. The focus on the architecturally significant building resulted in an asymmetrical upvaluation, risking the railway heritage's holistic value, its political history, and its meaning for citizens' daily lives to be drowned out by this enthusiasm.

The conference's last presenter, BILGE AR (Istanbul), analysed the changing functions of the church Hagia Eirene in Istanbul with a specific focus on the transformations in Ottoman times. Built in the 6th century, the building formed, together with Hagia Sophia, a complex named Megali Ekklesia being one of the few ceremonial imperial churches of Constantinople. After the city's conquest by the Ottoman Empire in 1453, the complex was divided with Hagia Sophia being turned into a mosque and Hagia Eirene being henceforth used to store Byzantine war machinery. Common opinion states that, following the conquest, all churches were turned into mosques. However, Ar managed to show that many churches were turned into flats, workshops, dervish's dwellings, warehouses, etc. The building, located near the new Topkapı Palace and well protected, soon extended its function of a warehouse to a sort of museum for famous symbolic artefacts. To sum up, Ar discussed what makes a museum a museum and to what extent this building can be seen as a prime example for the ever-changing history of an «imperial museum».

The final discussion featuring SYLVIA CLAUS (Cottbus) and WERNER LORENZ (Cottbus), illustrated the diversity of the term value in the disciplines and scientific approaches represented at the conference. Lorenz' introductory remarks focussed on the way different approaches can render the term value usable for historical analysis and practical intervention. As a construction historian and practising engineer, he stated, he nearly got lost in the

«jungle» of diverging value concepts and attributions. In his opinion, using terms in pairs to underline the difference in approach and perspectives and to highlight experience and viewpoints with regard to universal terms of value, proved to be helpful. As an art historian, Claus was only too happy to follow up on this introduction and its search of the significance of experience and interactions

for the genesis of values. Unlike Max Scheler's influential ethics of values, which interprets the being-in-the-world of values through the acts of seeing and feeling quasi a priori, the conference has, in her opinion, mainly shown the breadth and daily virulence of our concepts of value based on experience, point of view, and negotiating processes.



Kamingespräch mit Sylvia Claus und Werner Lorenz. Foto: GRK 1913.

Conference Programme

Welcome Address

Eva Maria Froschauer (Cottbus)

Evening Lecture

Hans-Rudolf Meier (Weimar): On Shifting Values and the Value of Conservation

Introduction

Elke Richter (Cottbus)

Section 1: The Term Value and Value Formation

Achim Hahn (Dresden)

Living Environment and Valuating Judgement. Where Valuating Architecture and Experience are Rooted

Özgül Özçakir (Ankara), Ayşe Güliz Bilgin Altınöz (Ankara), Anna Mignosa (Rotterdam)

A Tool for Identifying Post-intervention Value Shifts in Heritage Places: Heritage Value Circle

Section 2: Shifting Values in the Design Process – Dynamics and Stakeholders

Dorothea Roos (Cottbus)

Heinrich Hübsch: Visible Brickwork in Construction around 1830

Jochen Kibel (Berlin)

Conflict of Values without Conflict of Values. Relations of Values at Neues Museum Berlin

Marcus v. Reimersdahl (Dresden)

»Collaborative Marketing«. Shifting Values in Building for Scientific Research

Section 3: Strategies of Value Communication – Media and Instruments

Moritz Röger (Frankfurt a. M.)

«Our Citizens have a Right to Timber Frame Construction!» Frankfurt's New Historic City – On the Ideology of a Debate

Oona Simolin (Helsinki)

Shifting Discussions, Sticky Values? Construction of Values on Guided Tours in Suomenlinna Fortress, Helsinki

Mesut Dinler (Turin)

Scale Matters. Emergence of Urban Conservation in Turkey

Section 4: Political Valorisation – Contradictions and Negotiation Processes

Luisa Beyenbach (Cottbus)

Please revalue. On National-Socialist Monumental Structures after 1945

Turgut Saner (Istanbul/Cottbus)

The Shifting Values around the (Non)-Existence of the Historical Barracks at Taksim-Gezi, Istanbul

Zeynep Küçük, İmge Yılmaz (Istanbul)

Monumentalization of the Present through the Case of Atatürk Cultural Center. Dialectics between Continuity and Change

Section 5: Transformation of Values – Phenomena and Shifting Values

Stephanie Herold (Bamberg)

Visions, Wishes, Values. The validation of urban planning viewed through the lens of comparative history

Nicola Thomas (Kopenhagen/Hamburg)

Urban Allotment Gardens in Europe. Transformation of a Historically Significant Urban Space

Shraddha Bhatawadekar (Cottbus)

As Heritage becomes World Heritage. Current Processes of Heritagisation at Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Terminus, Mumbai

Bilge Ar (Istanbul)

Changing Content, Shifting Meaning. Ottoman Valorizations of Hagia Eirene in Istanbul

Final Discussion

Sylvia Claus (Cottbus) and Werner Lorenz (Cottbus)