# THE GOLDEN HORN: HERITAGE INDUSTRY VS. INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE

**Zeynep Günay**[1]

## Abstract

The aim of the research is to evaluate the role and the impact of heritage industry in the revitalisation of the post-industrial spaces of Istanbul, with a case study on the Golden Horn as empirical evidence. The results of the research are related to the questions: What role the industrial heritage play in the revitalisation of historic environments? What are the ways to turn such industrial heritage into sources of social and economic development? What are the likely impacts on the local economy and local community? The conclusion gives an overview of the extent of the impacts that industrial heritage has on the Golden Horn, and in turn relates this back to the wider idea of heritage industry being promoted for the wider urban policy-making in Istanbul.

Keywords: Heritage industry; industrial heritage; Golden Horn; Istanbul.

## 1. Introduction

The revitalisation of former industrial areas has been one of the crucial tasks facing the urban policy agenda throughout the world since the mid-1970s; whereas the "heritage industry" has become the new orthodoxy in the shift from production to consumption as means for the restructuring and reimaging of post-industrial economies in the global order. The increasing tendency to link heritage and conservation with economic development has brought new meanings to cultural assets, the value of which has started to become related solely to the economic value it sustains or generates. In particular, the commodification and instrumentalisation of industrial heritage by the heritage industry has turned out to be the determining factor in the creation of "opportunity spaces" in post-industrial economies. At the same time, many academics are critical of attempts to reform post-industrial spaces of consumption with privatised spaces and commodified cultures.

Within this context, the aim of the paper is to evaluate the role and impact of the heritage industry in the revitalisation of the post-industrial spaces of Istanbul, with a case study on the Golden Horn industrial heritage as empirical evidence. The results of the research are related to questions regarding the role industrial heritage plays in the revitalisation of historic environments as well as ways to turn such industrial heritage into sources of social and economic development, and the likely impacts on the local economy and local community. Regarding these questions, the first two

[1] Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey – gunayz@itu.edu.tr

sections are devoted to the theoretical discussions to question the role of the instrumentalisation of industrial heritage in the revitalisation of post-industrial economies. The third section explores reflections of these theoretical discussions regarding the Golden Horn industrial heritage in relation to the Istanbul heritage industry. The conclusion gives an overview of the extent of the impacts that industrial heritage has on the Golden Horn, and in turn relates this back to the wider idea of heritage industry being promoted for the wider urban policy-making in Istanbul.

## 2. The Heritage Industry: Instrumentalisation of Cultural Heritage

In a world, where the value of a cultural asset depends on the economic value it generates, it is not surprising that heritage has become "the" industry itself. The revitalisation of former industrial areas has been one of the crucial tasks facing the urban policy agenda throughout the world since the mid-1970s; whereas the "heritage industry" has become the new orthodoxy in the shift from cultural production to consumption as means for the restructuring and reimaging of post-industrial economies in the global order. Since the mid-1970s, the industrialized world has experienced the effects of the deindustrialisation process through the restructuring of the global economy and its associated production and technology developments. While these deindustrialised areas have been turned into derelict and brownfield lands, communities have faced severe economic, social and spatial detoriation through the lack of economic development potential and reduced quality of life. The urban policies of the 1980s have put these derelict areas on the development agenda within the framework of socio-cultural and economic regeneration initiatives. In particular, deindustrialisation has given them the opportunity to attempt to reinvent themselves within a new role through the use of culture, and especially heritage, more broadly as part of place-marketing, the growing emphasis of which is stimulated by urban entrepreneurship, as well as urban competition.

The economic exploitation of heritage is not a new phenomenon, however the economic function has come more to the forefront in recent times as a result of the global urban agenda and economic imperatives in policy formulation. There is even an increasing amount of research that focuses on the necessity of evaluating cultural heritage as an instrument for economic development in response to the challenges brought by globalisation and neoliberalisation. According to Tiesdell et al. (1996), the rational economic and commercial choice starts with the desire to conserve historic landscapes. Similar to the governments' increasing focus on economic returns, the role of heritage in economic development has also become the primary policy agenda both for international and national conservation expert institutions (i.e., UNESCO, 2010; ICOMOS, 2011; English Heritage, 2005a; 2005b). The development of cultural sector as an industry has led to profound changes in urban policy through the utilisation of regeneration as a driving force to emphasize the role of heritage as an opportunity space. According to Hall (1998), cultural industries may provide the basis for economic regeneration; filling the gap left by vanished

factories and warehouses and creating a new image that would make them more attractive to mobile capital. The relationship between heritage and the rising tendency of heritage industry is well-defined by Rypkema (1992). According to him, conservation primarily involves buildings; historic buildings are real estate, and real estate is a commodity. For a commodity to attract investment capital, it must have an economic value; for an economic value, there is a need for scarcity, purchasing power, desire and utility. Thus, heritage has it all.

The growing articulation between heritage and industry is stimulated by a number of factors (OECD, 2009): First, there is an increased interest in culture, particularly as a source of identity and differentiation in the face of globalisation. Growing levels of cultural capital, stimulated by rising education levels, postmodern consumption styles, and increased mobility creates a high demand for culture. Secondly, the evidence for the economic contribution of culture reveals high supply potential which includes the development of cultural tourism to stimulate jobs and income, and which projects the external image of regions and nations. The OECD study (2009) on the economic importance of culture indicated that in several major economies, the value of the cultural industries is between 3% and 6% of the total economy. Similarly, WTO/ETC estimates that cultural tourism accounts for nearly 50% of international tourism (2005). In the USA, the surveys of cultural travellers indicate that 30% of domestic tourists are influenced in their choice of destination by a specific artistic, cultural or heritage event or activity. In Africa, Latin America and Asia, cultural tourism is often seen as a means of supporting heritage conservation as well as raising local incomes (Richards, 2007). In addition, the tourism industry is a sector that demands less costs in comparison to other industrial sectors (Urry, 1999). According to Urry, the cost of creating labour in tourism and leisure is only 1/8 of manufacturing. The heritage sector, which represents an important part of the cultural industries, provides jobs for 8.5 million people in the EU, and contributes 4.5% to Europe's GDP (OECD, 2009).

While culture has become the business of cities as evident from the figures above, one of the most important consequences of neoliberal policies on urban conservation is the transformation of cultural heritage into a "cultural product" with a marketing value under the name of cultural capital. In this way, it is possible to define the heritage industry as the management of historic environments and cultural heritage as consumption spaces that are rearranged and organised to promote consumption. The increasing tendency to link heritage and conservation with economic development has brought new meanings to cultural assets, the value of which has started to be related solely to the economic value it sustains or generates. According to Pendlebury (2009), there is a great tendency to perceive heritage as producing immediate and instrumental benefits, rather than conceptualizing it as important for its own sake. While cultural heritage has been turned into a concept that is related to present conditions as a result of interpretation of history, it also becomes an inseparable part of the global consumption models through the "packaging of history" (Walsh, 1992). This, according to Urry (1999), is the reconstruction of culture.

## 3. Reimaging Industrial Heritage as an Industry

> "*Holland in just one day!!: The Netherlands Open Air Museum uses authentic buildings, objects and true stories to bring the past to life. Come with us on a journey through the last two hundred years. The museum, with its farmyards, farmhouses, cottages and businesses, farmer's café and shops, is a hive of activity.*"

Industrial heritage is the witness of the industrialisation process of nations. It has affected and continues to affect all social, cultural, technological, and economic dynamics of life. It explains not only the past, but includes present and relates to the future (Alfrey and Putnam, 1992). As the material evidence of this industrial culture, it has become the new opportunity space in the revitalisation strategies of post-industrial economies by providing a unique chance of conversion in the shift of cities and countries from being centres of production to centres of consumption.

This significant role has been well documented by international conservation institutions. For example, 52 of the 936 UNESCO World Heritage areas listed in 2012 are industrial properties. The scope of industrial heritage consists of buildings and machinery, workshops, mills and factories, mines and sites for processing and refining, warehouses and stores, places where energy is generated, transmitted and used, transport and all its associated infrastructure, as well as places used for social activities related to industry such as housing, religious worship or education. According to the Nizhny Tagil Charter for Industrial Heritage (TICCIH, 2003), the values of industrial heritage consist of "universal values" as they are evidence of activities which had, and which continue to have, profound historical consequences; "social values" that provide an important sense of identity; "technological and scientific values" in the history of manufacturing, engineering, construction; "aesthetic values" for architectural quality, design or planning; "intrinsic values" contained in human memories and customs; and "rarity (scarcity)", in terms of the survival of particular processes, site typologies or landscapes. The fundamental that differentiates industrial heritage from other heritage is its nature, which is closely related to individual areas, as well as its social identity and history (Köksal and Ahunbay, 2006).

There has been not only an increased awareness of the importance of industrial history in understanding heritage in recent years, but also the growing tendency to use industrial heritage. This tendency has emphasised the importance of sustaining historic buildings and any remaining industrial uses, while attracting new investment and introducing high-quality new designs. There are important examples throughout the world that build conscience to restore and reuse existing industrial heritage stock in order to stimulate cultural and economic regeneration such as London Tate Modern Museum (former electric plant), Swansea National Waterfront Museum and Liverpool Merseyside Maritime Museum (former entrepots), Big Pit National Coal Museum in Blaenavon (former coal mine), Gar D'orsay in Paris (former train station), World Heritage Site Zollverein in Essen (former colliery and coking plant), Notthingham Lace Market and Birmingham Jewellery Quarter (former lace and jewellery manufacturing sites), Shanghai M52 (former warehouses) or Birmingham

Back to Backs (former worker lodgements).

The reason for this increasing interest in industrial heritage is that they are stated to be more interesting than regular office spaces (Zukin, 1989). According to Zukin (1989) their structure has both a solidity and a gracefulness that suggests a time when form still identified place rather than function. Moreover, the scarcity factor highlights the fact that the process of deindustrialisation after a process of rapid industrialisation has left many places that are in need of reuse; and the value of converted industrial buildings have held their value and remained saleable in depressed housing markets (Tiesdell et al., 1996). Reusing existing buildings is also a simple way of achieving sustainability by saving waste and reducing the need for new building materials (English Heritage, 2005b). Finally, there is the governmental desire that the heritage industry creates attraction zones not only for visitors but also for enterprises and workers. Industrial heritage may provide opportunity spaces to increase the competitive advantage of cities through the deployment of tourism investments and the branding of space. Even the industrial landscape is emphasized as a strategy to reclaim and validate a post-industrial site in order to turn it into a multifunctional landscape. For instance, UNESCO (2010) states that the Tate Modern is estimated to bring in revenues of over €125 million to London every year. The Birmingham Jewellery Quarter has introduced the role of industrial heritage as an instrument in local economic development. English Heritage (2005a) states that the Quarter has turned out to be one of the most important tourist nodes of Birmingham, creating 1500 businesses and 6000 jobs. In the Nottingham Lace Market, moreover, 80% of the 450 firms located there are still in the cultural production and consumption sector, while the property values have risen by 28%.

However, many academics are critical towards attempts to reform post-industrial spaces of consumption with privatised spaces and commodified cultures which focus on conservation and social consequences. The commodification and instrumentalisation of industrial heritage by the heritage industry, in particular, has turned out to be the determining factor in creating opportunity spaces in post-industrial areas. It has increasingly been threatened with the loss of its functional values due to technological, economical and social changes. The industrial heritage has even become too industrial. This is related to the debates on history versus heritage, which underlines the fundamentals of authenticity values (Alfrey and Putnam, 1992). The process, which started with the model of Disneyland, finds new arenas of use. Examples for the modification of heritage for heritage museums or parks include the change of the Manchester Castlefield Heritage Park, Netherlands Open-Air Museum in Arnhem, or Abu Dhabi Heritage Park. Today, the similar pattern is evident even in shopping malls such as Forum Shops of Ceasar's Palace in Las Vegas. Thus, heritage industry commodifies the past and its architecture into new forms, and stylizes historic areas through abstract and artificial forms. Unless industrial heritage can retain some of its original functions, its intrinsic qualities are lost. According to Lowenthal (1985), even conservation practice has turned into an artificial modification of the past, while ripping away the connection between the conserved and the past. Hewison (1987) emphasizes the examples like the Wigan

Pier Heritage Centre as the promotion of British rural life as a romanticized and exaggerated industrial past. According to him, the heritage industry is regarded as responsible for devaluing the cultural worth of cultural objects as they are repackaged for mass consumption. This is romanticisation and commodification of the past which shows itself in Laura Ashley shops, vintage clothing, façadism in urban centres, heritage parks and the souvenir industry. In particular, Urry (1999) states that if we are interested in history, we should protect it from the preservationists. Similarly, Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000) state that the more conservation, the less locally distinctive identities. Although culture and heritage-led approaches search for distinctiveness/uniqueness, standardisation is perceived, such as in the case of thematic parks, thematic housing projects, shopping malls, and archistar museums. Boyer (1996) states that the city as spectacle is a commodified location for consumption. On the other side of all these developments, the main problems of citizens are ignored, local cultures and identities become lost. For instance, the examples of the Lace Market and the Birmingham Jewellery Quarter, which are stated as good practice examples, are criticized for the fact that the attractiveness of physical buildings has contributed to higher value users wanting to colonise the area and displace the existing buildings. This has brought a threat of gentrification and even the loss of industrial heritage to the area (Pendlebury, 2009). With regard to the reuse of industrial heritage, it is therefore important to maintain the links that areas have with their own history.

## 4. The Golden Horn Industrial [Heritage] Industry

Industrial heritage has always played an important role in the revitalisation process of the Golden Horn. In the 19th century Ottoman Empire, Istanbul and its environs was the place where industrialisation was the most dense. Due to increasing foreign investment, labour and technology in particular, the number of industrial facilities increased after the 1850s. At the beginning of the 20th century, Istanbul had 55% of the total 256 industrial complexes of the Ottoman Empire (Köksal and Ahunbay, 2006). Among these, the Golden Horn has always had an importance by virtue of its being a major natural port for economic, cultural, social and military development. Since the Byzantine period, the Golden Horn has been surrounded by shipyards, merchant houses and warehouses. In the Ottoman and Republican periods, it became one of the major industrial zones, as was especially proven by the Prost Plan of 1936. The industrial development in the Golden Horn, which continued in the 1970s and early 1980s, had profound environmental and socio-economic effects on the surrounding neighbourhoods including the deterioration of the historical urban layout, water pollution and change in the social layout. The 1980s marked another turning point in the transformation of the Golden Horn into a heritage industry. Starting with the Golden Horn Waterfront Revitalisation Project in 1986, several interventions have taken place to clean-up this very valuable area to provide a global city image. These include the reclamation and the beautification of the shores of the Golden Horn and the clearance of industries under the leadership of Bedrettin Dalan - the first Mayor of the Greater Istanbul Municipality between 1984 and 1989. As a result, 600 small manufacturing establishments were evicted, and 30.000 buildings,

100 of which were historic examples which reflected the industrialisation of the Ottoman Empire, were demolished (Bezmez, 2008, p. 821). In the period starting from the mid-1990s, the Golden Horn has once more become the central focus for city governments in need of creating a world city image for Istanbul and increasing their competitive advantage in the new global order. This was the same period when the Golden Horn was declared a "cultural valley" by Ali Mufit Gurtuna, Mayor of the Greater Istanbul Municipality between 1999-2004. Considering culture as the growing value of global economy, the goal was to reintegrate the Golden Horn with the rest of the city by providing a new culture-led attraction zone to represent Istanbul globally. The role of the Golden Horn as a culture-led attraction zone was once more mentioned in the 1/100.000 Scale Istanbul Environmental Master Plan (2009) and the Istanbul Strategic Plan 2010-2014 (2010).

The Golden Horn Cultural Valley Project plays an important role in the turning of industrial heritage into sources of social and economic development. It has different dimensions including the conservation of historical waterfront neighbourhoods, the transformation and refunctioning of historic industrial facilities, and the utilisation of cultural amenities and landscape design. This paper especially focuses on the transformation and refunctioning of industrial heritage.

The number of industrial facilities in Istanbul, which was 256 in the 19th century, decreased to 43 (Köksal and Ahunbay, 2006). Today, 15 of the remaining 43 industrial complexes are in the Golden Horn (see Fig. 1). Three of these are now used as museum complexes (Şirket-i Hayriye and Lengerhane / Rahmi Koc Industrial Museum, Silahtaraga Electric Plant / Santral Istanbul Energy Museum), three as congress and exhibition centres (Feshane Textile Factory / Feshane Exhibition Centre, Tophane-i Amire: Imperial Armory / Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University Exhibition Centre, Darphane-i Amire: Imperial Mint and Printing Office / Exhibition Centre), and one is now used as a university campus (Cibali Tobacco Factory / Kadir Has University). Silataraga Electric Plant is also accomodated by Istanbul Bilgi University. The Golden Horn Dockyards (Tersane-i Amire) are still in their original usage, which makes them the oldest dockyards still operating. On one hand, adaptation and re-use is an appropriate and a cost-effective way of ensuring the survival of industrial heritage; on the other hand, the use of original patterns and the utilization of new uses that respect the historical identity of industrial heritage contributes to the sustainability of the industrial heritage of the Golden Horn.

In economic terms, the transformation and refunctioning of historical industrial facilities has resulted in increasing economic vitality, especially by means of new retail investments and land and real estate prices (Günay and Dökmeci, 2012). In Sütlüce, where the Sütlüce Congress Hall is located, the abandoned sites have started to be transformed into offices along with new real-estate investment projects including shopping malls and hotels such as the Arçelik Company Headquarters, the Enyapı Shopping Centre, the Hilton Garden Hill, and large-scale housing projects such as the Polisan Residence, the AG Plaza and waterside residences. In particular, the location choice of the Hilton Garden Hill, as the first luxury hotel investment, is

very important for the future envisioning of the Golden Horn. Many domestic and foreign business groups such as Koç Holding, Demirören and Ulusoy are also attempting to purchase the remaining land in the area (Hürriyet, 2010). Considering the land market values declared in the official websites of the Beyoğlu, Fatih and Eyüp Municipalities, it may be seen that the value per square metre in Karaağaç Street reached €1560 in 2011 (it was €140 in 2009 and €85 in 2004). The value per square metre in the residential areas toward the slope of the hill has increased to €570 in 2011 from €35 in 2009. In commercial areas, the prices begin at €4600 per square metre. A similar increase in the land values can be seen in the areas surrounding Kadir Has University and the Rahmi Koc Industrial Museum. In the Halıcıoğlu neighbourhood of the Rahmi Koç Industrial Museum, for instance, the price per square metre of residential area land is between €640 - €1560, while it was between €35 - €65 in 2005. This has also had an effect on the spread of arts and museum facilities along the Hasköy manufacturing zones in the environs of the Rahmi Koc Industrial Museum. While the number of visitors to the Rahmi Koc Industrial Museum reached 134,000, the Feshane Exhibition Centre receives 2 million visitors per year (Günay and Dökmeci, 2012).


Figure 1. Industrial Heritage of the Golden Horn

Figure 2. Adaptive Reuse: Rahmi Koc Industrial Museum (above); Santral Istanbul (below) (Source: Z. Günay)

Figure 3. Sutluce Slaughterhouse, after reconstruction (Source: Z. Günay)

Figure 4. Halic Dockyards (Source: Z. Günay)

Despite these economic impacts, the likely impacts on the industrial heritage and community are still under question. The most important reason for this is the fact that the Golden Horn Cultural Valley Project has not been integrated into policies for economic development or into regional planning. Moreover, there has been no comprehensive strategy for the conservation of industrial heritage. The interventions have had tendencies to compromise historical integrity or the authenticity of industrial heritage such as in the Sütlüce Slaughterhouse case. Once defined as "the gigantic ghost" (Radikal, 2002), it was demolished and reconstructed as a congress hall by the Municipality (Fig. 3). Recently, the proposals on the replacement and refunctioning of Tersane-i Amire (Fig. 4) as a privatised tourism facility have raised serious debates (Birgün, 2008). Moreover, there are still a considerable number of industrial sites to be registered and utilized such as the Kasımpaşa Flour Factory, the Cendere Pump Station or the Unkapanı Flour Factory. This shows the importance of private sector incentives in the conservation of industrial heritage, contrary to the general norms when the state is the primary enabler of conservation. In the Golden Horn case, the private sector has been able to refunction these industrial complexes by respecting their original uses, contrary to the incentives promoted by the Municipality such as the demolition of the Sütlüce Slaughterhouse.

Regarding the socio-economic consequences, one of the criticisms focuses on the fact that economic vitality is limited to specific locations. This is also related to the provision of the functional integrity of industrial heritage to the wider surrounding. For example, the opening of Kadir Has University has resulted in new functions being made available for utilization by new potential customers. The increasing number of students and visitors has increased the overall safety of the region and has encouraged further arrangements regarding transportation links in the Golden Horn. However, the local retailers complain that the closed structure of the university limits expenditures. However, the privatisation of public spaces, such as in the case of the Rahmi Koc Industrial Museum or Kadir Has University, has prevented public use and public service. These even include the changing of the name and the closing of the street in front of the University. In addition to public spaces, the emphasis on building the infrastructure for attracting visitors such as convention centres, prestige hotels or thematic parks results in the transformation of residential areas into business districts and the isolation of the community. Considering cultural participation, most of the visitors are outsiders and the accessibility of the community is limited to participating in cultural activities in their neighbourhoods.

## 5. Conclusion: Heritage Industry vs. Industrial Heritage

The fundamental that differentiates industrial heritage from other types is the fact that it is about communities own lives, identities and histories. This makes industrial heritage an issue of social phenomenon along with its potential to be a catalyst for further cultural and economic development. The research has demonstrated that there have been important investments during the previous decades to encourage the transformation and re-functioning of industrial heritage in the world, including Istanbul. However, this growing interest could not prevent industrial heritage from

becoming deteriorated. While the general tendency is to demonstrate history "in just one day", there is still a misunderstanding of the value of industrial heritage, and the lack of community conscience. The research shows that the Golden Horn projects run the risk of commodification of industrial culture and heritage; although they have played a vital role not only in improving the image of the Golden Horn, but also in being part of the branding of Istanbul. The solution is more to do with the conservation of the "industrial landscape" through the preservation of the "spirit of place", as ICOMOS (2008) states. This necessitates programmes for the conservation of the industrial heritage to be integrated into planning processes and into policies for socio-economic development; the preservation of historical integrity and authenticity and the utilization of adaptive re-use and preservation of functional integrity by creating links between areas to their own history.

## 6. References

Alfrey, J. and Putnam, T., 1992. The industrial heritage: managing resources and uses. London: Routledge.

Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge, J.E., 2000. The tourist-historic city: retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Bezmez, D., 2008. The politics of urban waterfront regeneration: The case of Haliç. Istanbul. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 32 (4), pp.815-840.

Birgün, 2008. Haliç Tersanesi de şeyhlere mi satılıyor?, 28.04.2008.

Boyer, C.M., 1996. The city of collective memory. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

English Heritage, 2005a. Heritage counts. London: English Heritage.

English Heritage, 2005b. Regeneration and the historic environment: heritage as a catalyst for better social and economic regeneration. London: English Heritage.

Günay, Z. and Dökmeci, V., 2012. Culture-led regeneration of Istanbul waterfront: Golden Horn Cultural Valley Project. Cities, 29 (4), pp. 213-222.

Hall, P., 1998. Cities in civilisation: culture, innovation and urban order. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Hewison, R., 1987. The heritage industry: Britain in a climate of decline. Methuen: London.

Hürriyet, 2010. Gayrımenkulde yeni trend Sütlüce, 16.04.2010.

ICOMOS, 2008. Quebec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place, 04.10.2008.

ICOMOS, 2011. The Paris Declaration On Heritage as a Driver of Development. Paris, 01.12.2011.

Köksal, G., Ahunbay, Z., 2006. İstanbul'daki endüstri mirası için koruma ve yeniden kullanım önerileri. İTÜ Dersgisi/A, 5 (2), pp.125-136.

Lowenthal, D., 1985. The past is a foreign country. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

OECD, 2009. The Impact of Cultural Heritage on Tourism.

Pendlebury, J., 2009. Conservation in the age of consensus. London: Routledge.

Radikal, 2002. Dev kültür merkezi hayaleti, Korhan Gümüş, 26.06.2002.

Richards, G., 2007. Cultural tourism: global and local perspectives. New York : Haworth Hospitality Press.

Rypkema, D., 1992. Rethinking economic values. In: A.J. Lee, ed. Past meets future: saving America's historic environments. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation/The Preservation Press, pp.205-212.

TICCIH, 2003. The Nizhny Tagil Charter for the Industrial Heritage, 17 July 2003.

Tiesdell, S., Oc, T. and Health, T., 1996. Revitalizing historic urban quarters. Oxford: Architectural Press.

UNESCO, 2010. The Power of Culture for Development.

WTO/ETC, 2005. City Tourism and Culture: The European Experience. Brussels, February 2005.

Urry, J., 1999. Mekanları tüketmek. Istanbul: Ayrıntı.

Walsh, K., 1992. The Representation of the past: museums and heritage in the post-modern world. London: Routledge.

Zukin, S., 1989. Loft living: culture and capital in urban change. NJ: Rutgers University Press.