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IZMIR –
A HUB FOR
HUMAN-CENTERED
DESIGN TO
IMPROVE
WELL-BEING IN
THE CITY
IZMIR CULTURE WORKSHOP AND IZMIR DESIGN FORUMS

The city of Izmir (Turkey) has been positioned as a hub for human-centered design in compliance with the vision developed during the Izmir Cultural Workshop¹ that was realized in 2009. Under the guidance of the Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, the workshop involving scientists, artists, and intellectuals from Izmir and around produced a new vision for the city of Izmir. This vision rests on three principles, that Izmir:

1. Becomes a city of innovation and design, and gains the capacity to drive these forward in the future;
2. Establishes even closer ties with other cities in and around the Mediterranean; and
3. Reaches a level where it can set an example for democratic and participative practices in urban policy making.

In support of this vision, highly attended design forums were organized in Izmir in 2011-2012. During these events, the roles of various actors, who would take part in Izmir’s transformation into a design city, were clarified. Izmir Metropolitan Municipality took the responsibility of developing awareness among the citizens of Izmir with respect to living in designed environments and in line with this vision, established the Izmir Mediterranean Academy², which has since developed and implemented projects such as “Izmir-Sea” and “Izmir-History”.

IZMIR MEDITERRANEAN ACADEMY: PROMOTING DESIGN FOR QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE CITY

The Izmir Cultural Workshop addressed the need for the development of new interfaces, intermediate institutions and new communicative strategies to enhance communication and cooperation between the different actors and cultural institutions of the city, whether they belong to the public sector, the private sector or the universities. Following this vision and principles, the Izmir Mediterranean Academy, Branch of Izmir Metropolitan Municipality, was founded in 2012, both as a think-tank and a democratic platform for realizing Izmir’s new vision of “Mediterranean’s city of innovation and design, culture and art”.

Its unique organizational structure was established as an autonomous branch of the Municipality by regulation and is considered to be an innovation in the structure of local governance for culture in Turkey. It has two sections; “the coordination unit” – consisting of hubs for policy production in the areas of design, arts, culture, ecology and history, all defined in accordance with the new vision, and “the administrative unit”. Members of the managing board of the Academy are high-level managers, such as deputy general secretaries, appointed by the Mayor, whereas scholars represent the scientific board. The managing board appoints a coordinator for each of the specific areas. The coordinators then invite the members of the advisory boards who are scholars, experts, researchers, artists, and representatives of NGOs active in the aforementioned thematic areas. The coordinator and the board members work voluntarily, for the promotion of their respective fields.

1. Izmir Cultural Workshop: http://www.izmeda.org/Upload_Files/FckFiles/file/kultur_calistayi_ing_WEB.pdf
2. Izmir Mediterranean Academy: http://www.izmeda.org/
The ideas and proposals drafted in the advisory board are brought before either the scientific committee or the managing board of the Academy. The annual programme of the Academy is produced collectively within these mechanisms of governance.

**Izmir Sea Project**

At a scientific meeting organized in Izmir, the importance of a stress-free quality of life in Izmir was emphasized. This is a rather valuable characteristic of Izmir and bears instrumental importance to Izmir’s status as a design city.

Two factors were identified to be effective in the formation of an Izmirian stress-free quality of life:

1. The relationship between the sea with both the city and Izmirians themselves
2. The fact that Izmirians do not confine themselves to their living spaces and spend a substantial amount of their lives outside their homes. Both the poor and the wealthy of Izmir stroll on the shores of the city, outside working hours, and spend most of their times this way. During these strolls they exhibit themselves, take care of the way they dress for this purpose and develop a moral sense of coexistence.

Based on these factors, preserving and improving Izmirian’s lifestyle by strengthening their relationship with the sea has become central component of the project. More than one hundred designers contributed to “Reinforcement of Izmirians Relationship with the Sea (Izmir-Sea) Project”. It has been produced collectively by the design community in Izmir for improving the quality of life of inhabitants of the city.

**Izmir History Project**

Under the “Izmir-History Project”, two main objectives have been identified:

1. To strengthen the relationship of the people of Izmir with history, which is achieved through the development of memories associated with their city. The resources used for this purpose are the archaeological cultural heritage and historical building stock in the project area.
2. To prevent the formation of depressions in the project area and to reverse this process during the transition from single-centre city of Izmir’s industrial society to multi-centre urban areas of information society.

As the project area largely embodies cultural heritage, it is necessary to stimulate the development and conservation objectives as a combination. A design atelier has been established in the historical centre of Izmir dedicated to these objectives. Under this atelier, the projects have been produced through participatory practices including the contribution from the local design community and the residents of the area.

In accordance with its new vision, Izmir Mediterranean Academy collaborated with WDO to organize a World Design Talk™ and World Industrial Design Day celebration.
A STUDY OF CO-LIVING IN FIVE PARTS
The World Design Organization™ (WDO) held its fifth World Design Talks™ at the Historical Gasworks Culture Center in Izmir (Turkey) on 29 June 2018. Through a series of participatory and collaborative work, the event gathered 150 participants, which was hosted by the Izmir Mediterraneaean Academy, Branch of Izmir Metropolitan Municipality in coordination with WDO Members: Izmir University of Economics, Department of Industrial Design; Industrial Designers’ Society of Turkey, Izmir Branch; and Vestel Electronics, as well other design communities from Izmir.

Over the course of three meetings held in February 2018, the theme began to take shape as the character of the city of Izmir and its particular local challenges and the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were discussed.

The “co-living” theme not only reflects the history and culture of co-living in the city of Izmir, but also refers to a global issue that would be addressed through the lens of Izmir’s own local issues and challenges of the city.

In light of humanity’s biggest challenges as defined by the UN SDGs, as well as the character of the city of Izmir, the theme of “co-living” came forward as calling for both an opportunity and a challenge that would enable a study for Izmir within a conceptual, global, and local framework from a design perspective.

While focusing on existing local challenges within the city of Izmir, five sub-themes or workshops were identified: “Co-living with nature”, “co-living within society”, “co-living in the city”, “co-living with heritage”, and “co-living with technology”.

Specific local challenges that could be studied within these workshops, were further discussed and determined at a meeting held in April 2018 of around 30 participants from the design communities of Izmir.
THE WORKSHOPS

1

CO-LIVING WITH NATURE
This workshop sought to find new ways of protecting the balance in the ecosystem, in which humans give priority to nature in their economic, social, and cultural activities. The cases proposed to be studied were Izmir Gulf, Izmir Bird Paradise, and the fish farms.

2

CO-LIVING WITHIN SOCIETY
This workshop explored new ways of communication through shared experiences in daily lives, in which different groups of people act mutually in their economic, social, and cultural activities. The cases proposed to be studied were: Migration, social-class equality, and gender equality.

3

CO-LIVING IN THE CITY
This workshop sought to present more equal accessibility to services and resources; as well as to identify means to facilitate random encounters between citizens. The cases proposed to be studied were: Izmir Gulf as a coastal living, Izmir Culture Park as a public space, co-working spaces, co-housing, and urban transportation.

4

CO-LIVING WITH HERITAGE
This workshop explored new ways of learning from and engaging with the past. The cases proposed to be studied were: Agora-Basmane-Kemeralti region as the ancient and historic centre, industrial heritage of Izmir, and the population exchange in the history of Izmir.

5

CO-LIVING WITH TECHNOLOGY
This workshop focused on the relations between people and technology. This was a broad topic considering how technology brings people together globally and within the media, how emerging technologies such as machine learning impose new relations between humans and machines, and how all other sub-themes of “co-living” can be studied through the digital age.
WORKSHOP SUMMARIES
CO-LIVING WITH NATURE

Facilitators

– Mine Ovacik (Facilitator)
– Derya Irkdas Dogo (Facilitator)
– Beyza Baran (Reporter/Notetaker)

Introduction of the theme

The İzmir Bird Paradise, where 289 bird species live, spreads around an 8,000-hectare area in the Çiğli Çamaltı Salt Marsh. It is an area where more than 50 thousand birds stop by annually on their migratory route. It is also an archaeological and natural protected area. The facilitators also provided background on Izmir’s coastal regeneration project noting that the village itself, the natural elements that represent the project is not benefitting from the initiative.

Within the context of designing for nature rather than ourselves, responsible design, ecological-centred design and the concept of being together with nature, the following questions were presented for discussion:

Workshop questions

1. How does urban design enhance the relationship between nature and habitat?
2. How do we design the intersection between city and nature?
3. How can we design to raise awareness and change behaviour?
4. How can/does bridge-and-tunnel design effect nature in bay cities such as Izmir?
Round 1 – Individual contributions and mind mapping

Key insights identified by the participants have been summarized below:

- Count trees – tree mapping – show the tree population
- Aim to protect the natural area /Ecological park / island for birds
- Create knowledge about nature to raise awareness
- Birds Sea – species – create an app, toy or game to provide information and/or notifications about the species, their natural habitat, migration times, etc. (exp. the time of the migration of the geese is approaching…)
- Allow people to grow their own food, rent places in cities and parks
- Tourist training local people about nature /care nature
- Sport and art @sasali active
- Demolish skyscrapers and let the nature recover itself and observe it.
- Empathy with nature – Empathy tools – Feel like a tree* experience the nature
- Teach design political investigators
- Create a plan to show that design is a solution making tool
- Learn from history /Teach the history

Round 2 – Group discussion

During the second session, participants broke out into smaller groups to address a new question:

- Can homo-sapiens design for nature (i.e. for animals, plant life, and so on)?

Each group came up with recommendations for future discussion addressing the following Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in particular:

- SDG 14: Life below water
- SDG 15: Life on land
- SDG 17: Partnerships for the goals

Group 1

- Nature is Bigger than City /Homo-sapiens
- Demolish/reduce number of buildings

1- Expanding nature physically at an institutional level

A- Demolish the city and:
   - Build higher - Surround with gardens
   - Outside the city borders, allocate to agriculture (Garden City)
   - Low-rise spread
   - Reduce building area
   - Shared spaces
   - Urban Culture

B- Design for nature: demolish the city and DO NOT build for human but build for NATURE
   - Habitats for non-humans
   - Support a polyculture
2- Go back to nature to learn about nature

- Summer schools in nature
- Nature activities
- Water sports

A- Raise awareness at an individual and group level
- Digital documentation
- Info Apps for individuals and groups

Group 2

A- Individual level
- VR – system can be designed to raise awareness – Digital Warp/dairy

B- Group level
- Implement on-site summer school programmes about different eco-system, marine life, etc.
- Increase youth activities in diving and water sports

C- Institutional level
- Design natural habitats for species under threat
- Design more polyculture fish farms, the practice of culturing more than one species of aquatic organism in the same pond instead of monoculture farming where only one type of fish species and breed is raised. The motivating principle is that raising a combination of species having different food habits may maximize fish production in ponds. The concept of Polyculture of fish is based on the concept of total utilization of different trophic and spatial niches of a pond in order to obtain maximum fish production per unit area.
CO-LIVING WITHIN SOCIETY

Facilitators

– Onur Mengi (Facilitator)
– Mehmet Penpecioğlu (Facilitator)
– Lacin Aksoy (Reporter/Notetaker)

Introduction of the theme

The facilitators introduced four questions around subjects such as migration, social-class and gender equality/inequality in Izmir. These questions were further discussed under urban spatial scales such as, apartment, street, neighbourhood and city and subsequently examined under the parameters of individuals, groups, governmental and non-governmental.

Summary of the session

The facilitators suggested the following questions for discussion:

Workshop questions

1. What are the main challenges and opportunities of designing an inclusive and democratic society for all?
2. How can we deal with the problems of social inequality, poverty and lack of capacity by stimulating the networks of social support and solidarity?
3. How can we design for/against gendered responsibilities in urban public space?
4. Is it really possible to design cities for all?
Facilitators and participants discussed all four questions, but ultimately focused more specifically on ‘What are the main challenges and opportunities of designing an inclusive and democratic society for all?’

**Round 1 – Individual contributions and mind mapping**

Participants were asked to write down six thoughts relevant to the question selected. The main highlights of the conversations in response to this question were:

- Empathy and raising awareness: “How we see them, how they see themselves”
- Sharing the culture/history/memories
- Repurposing social systems and services
- Incorporating migrants into the system: To give refugees a ‘voice’
- Local government legislation and municipality law
- Invisible borders of the city: “Some parts of the city you wouldn’t want to/ prefer to go because of variety of reasons”
- Safety/ “feeling of safety” (e.g: city lights and how we prefer to walk/not to walk in certain areas/neighborhoods
- Learning from refugees and their everyday life practices

**Round 2 – Group discussion**

In the last round of the workshop, participants were divided into four colour-coded groups. Each group picked a subject in response to the main question. These subjects were derived from the findings of the first round of conservation and Mind Map.

The subjects addressed were:
- **Group Green**: Creating opportunities through fostering innovation
- **Group Black**: Creating common values for mixed communities
- **Group Blue**: Dissolving the boundaries (visible/invisible)
- **Group Red**: Creating a network between different communities to enhance safety for all.

**Conclusions**

The workshop participants and facilitators collectively agreed that there is a need in Izmir to sustain community values without losing identity (heterogeneity). This conclusion also referred to coming together without touching one another.

When asked to describe Izmir in one word in terms of society, the word selected was ‘mixed’ - but not dissolved.

**Recommendations**

In the last round of the workshop, under the selected subjects, each group came up with recommendations for further discussion:

**Group Green**
- Take ‘lazy’ space and turn it into a third space such as libraries, educational spaces, etc.
- Create innovation centres, networks and legal support groups for refugees
**Group Black**
- Find common values and identities for local people and also for refugees
- Bring people together by creating common activities

**Group Blue**
- Get to really know each other
- Overcome the prejudges between locals and refuges in terms of culture
- Enhance capacities for the solution

**Group Red**
- Recognize the existence of “others”
- Respect and realize the needs of others
- Create platforms for public voice and representation of themselves. In order to do so, there is a need to explore what they need and how they feel safe to meet on a common ground.
CO-LIVING IN THE CITY

Facilitators

- Can Özcan (Facilitator)
- Melis Örneköğlu (Reporter/Notetaker)

Introduction of the theme

“Co-living in the City” focuses on the built environment and the service systems of the city that bring the citizens together. It does not only seek for more equal accessibility to services and resources, but also aims at random encounters of citizens to build a shared civic pride. The cases proposed to be studied were İzmir Gulf as a coastal living, İzmir Culture Park as a public space, co-working spaces, and urban transportation.

Summary of the session

In the first part of the session, the facilitator briefly introduced the topic to the participants, as well as shared information about İzmir as a city. It was explained that the city is perceived as a construction site because of the increasing number of buildings. It is stated that İzmir does not have a centre and to have/not to have a centre provides both advantages and disadvantages to the city. Some examples were also given by the facilitator from other cities like Dubai which is recently popular with its 3D printed buildings and driverless cars.

Workshop questions

The following question was suggested for discussion:
What can be done for the city individually, collectively (i.e. by groups) and institutionally?
Round 1 – Individual contributions and mind mapping

Participants were encouraged to write keywords that came to mind about the city on post-its, which were then arranged by the facilitator where related ones were gathered together into a mind map.

As a result of this brainstorming session, four main topics around co-living in the city emerged:

1. Services
2. Waste
3. Identity
4. Space

Related to “waste” as a primary issue for the city to address, it was stated that cities are becoming a waste-producing organisms, even time is a lux and we should reduce everything that is wasted.

Participants also discussed that it was only after the hunter-gatherer period when people began settling that they created cities started to gain ownership of objects, lands and streets as “theirs”. Thus, according to this point of view, “identity” and possession are also important issues for the city. In the future, we will have to focus more on designing “services” over “objects” – a notion of designing more solutions and less products or at least more utile products.

It was also discussed that residents are not always aware of what is happening within or what is unique about their city. Foreigners perceive the city differently than residents. It is about experiencing the “space”, the city.

Round 2 – Group discussion

In the second session, the emphasis was more on what can individuals, groups and institutions do about these four topics for the city.

Conclusions

As a result, individuals should:
- Increase services
- Reduce waste and space
- Reuse identity.

Groups should:
- Share services
- Reuse in order to reduce waste
- Share space
- Reuse identity.

Institutions should:
- Promote, regulate, as well as provide education and information for services, waste, space and identity.
CO-LIVING WITH HERITAGE

Facilitators

- Emre Gönlügür (Facilitator)
- Daniele Savasta (Facilitator)
- Kardelen Aysel (Reporter/Notetaker)

Introduction of the theme

“Co-living with Heritage” focuses on the complex relationship between people and heritage (and in a larger sense ‘cultural memory’) in an attempt to explore new ways of engaging with the past and learning from it. How can aspects of cultural heritage (both tangible and intangible) become more integrated into the daily life of the city? The cases studied were: Agora-Basmane-Kemeraltı region as the ancient and historic center, industrial heritage of Izmir (electrical plant, Sümerbank, Tekel plant), and the population exchange in the history of Izmir.

Being a welcoming city throughout history, Izmir (historically known as Smyrna) is also a longed for city. İncirlioğlu (2017) states in Meltem Journal: “Smyrna also has a very special place in Armenian, Jewish, Levantine and especially Greek imagination, a mixture of sadness and pride, of feelings projected to a distant past by the descendants of Smyrniots all over the world”.

Summary of the session

The workshop was briefly introduced by the facilitators who presented the topic and suggested the following questions to be discussed:
Workshop questions

1. How can cultural heritage become more integrated into the daily life of the city to promote cohesion and cooperation among diverse communities, as well as help city dwellers learn from different memory communities?
2. What do you think are the most important issues that relate to Izmir’s cultural heritage and what potential do different branches of design offer in addressing those issues?

Round 1 – Individual contributions and mind mapping

The proposals developed individually by the participants were summarized under the following categories:

1. Permanent/impermanent interventions
2. Micro/Macro scale
3. Physical/digital enhancements

Permanent impermanent interventions

The combination of permanent and impermanent interventions are suggested in the forms of events that involve the society at large through events in historical places (including factories and recent industrial architectural sites, as well as more traditionally acknowledged archeological and historical sites); and the creation of stable exhibition centers and museums that unveil not only the romantic memories of a multicultural city but also the economic reasons that allowed this culture connected to trade and goods exchange. The museum is also conceived as representative not only of the city, or even the country, but as a geographical area defined by its Aegean sea. Highlighting this aspect of trade and production focuses inevitably on the design factor both as a contemporary activity, as well as for its value in the past.

Micro/macro scale

In contrast to the museum as a large scale intervention other small scale suggestions included the creation of book exchange and chat booth in public spaces where cultural memories can be traded for smiles and laughs. Further memories can be conveyed through street names, which in Izmir carry only few important historical figures next to a mainly numerical toponymy.

Physical/digital enhancements

The experience of heritage not as a static thing, but as something amplified through digital means that facilitate enjoyment, education and interest was discussed. Different concepts about mobile app design, as well as more static wayfinding and informative signs were also considered to communicate the value of architectural, social and cultural memories.

Round 2 – Group discussion

During the second session, participants broke out into smaller groups to refine their proposals combining the previous ideas and enriching them with the group contributions.

Additional keywords/topics raised during this session were hacking heritage, gamification strategies, environmental memories and indigenous vegetation. These challenging concepts try to set off from views of heritage as nostalgia and are willing to enact a dynamic memory to strengthen the cultural identity of the city (and the area).
Conclusions

The participants identified that there was a lack of awareness among the public about Izmir’s heritage (both tangible and intangible). Discussions centred around how to tackle this major issue and find ways of cultivating affection for different aspects of Izmir’s heritage.

Proposals can be classified into two groups:

1. **Hardware solutions**, which involve the setting up of institutions (e.g.: museums, cultural centres, etc.) or physical interventions into the city in the form of urban furniture or wayfinding signage
2. **Software solutions**, which involve cultural programming or digital means of engagement with heritage.

The participants stressed the importance of the city’s historic identity as a commercial and industrial centre whose connections had historically extended beyond national borders and branched out across the larger geography of the Eastern Mediterranean. It was unanimously agreed that local authorities and non-governmental organizations should work towards making this identity more prominent.

A key point that emerged from the discussions was that established meanings of heritage might offer the public rather limited ways of engaging with it. Alternatively, heritage could be “hacked”, which is to say that innovative ways of experiencing heritage could be designed so that people can interact with different aspects of a common past, identify with it and even create new meanings out of it. The notion of “hacking heritage” might provide the public with more dynamic and pluralistic ways of engaging with heritage.

A final, but no less important, point that came out from the discussions was that Izmir’s tangible and intangible heritage could be characterized as dynamic, eclectic and ever changing, able to adapt to the increasing diversity of the cultural traditions of its inhabitants. Thus, Izmir’s heritage could be thought of in terms of an unending process of “exchange” that includes the exchange of ideas, exchange of commodities, exchange of culture, and exchange between communities.
CO-LIVING WITH TECHNOLOGY

Facilitators

- Ceren Kayalar (Facilitator)
- Can Uckan Yuksel (Facilitator)
- Ezgi Ezdar Onur (Reporter/Notetaker)

Introduction of the theme

From the moment a person wakes up, and even during sleep, technology plays an increasingly significant role in our daily life. Innovations in hardware and software offer new devices, interfaces and interaction methods that raise ethical questions in terms of privacy and at different levels and lifestyles of society. Most people (including those in rural and isolated areas) use a cell-phone, a computer to access data daily over Wi-Fi/cellular networks. Houses and cities are becoming smarter and increasingly connected while technology behind becomes more hidden and ubiquitous. In addition to daily life scenarios, industries are challenged with using more intelligent machines in the workforce. Humans are building new scenarios to co-exist with technology and paradoxically, are trying to adapt to them while so many important questions are being raised.

Summary of the session

The workshop was briefly introduced by the facilitators who presented the topic and suggested that each participant generate six thoughts to address the following questions:

Workshop questions

1. How can designers, engineers and inventors co-live/co-create sustainable and innovative solutions? (Thinking about possible physical conditions
and form of opportunities to co-create/ co-work in trans-disciplinary environments).

2. What are the challenges of 4th Industrial Revolution?
3. How can local communities use open source design and technology to create change? (Considering the latest developments with maker movements, fab-lab groups and co-working platforms, are there examples of projects that are applicable to Izmir?)

**Round 1 – Individual contributions and mind mapping**

In this first session, participants were encouraged to think about the questions as it relates to three Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in particular:

- SDG 11: Sustainable cities and communities
- SDG 9: Industry, innovation and infrastructure,
- SDG 17: Partnerships for the goals

As a result of this brainstorming session, five main topics around co-living and technology emerged:

- Trust
- Information pollution
- Humanity
- Nature
- Education

**Round 2 – Group discussion**

During the second session, participants broke out into three groups of four to address a new question, formulated by the facilitators, as from an individual, group and governmental/ non-governmental level:

- How can designers/ engineers/ inventors cope with the challenges of 4th Industrial Revolution (with the help of open-source design and technology)?

As the first group has taken “information pollution” as a critical issue that is brought up by 4th industrial revolution with technology; they decided to coin that problem as “infolution” and listed their problem solutions.

The second group brought “trust & no trust” issue meaning lack of trust in new social fabric that technology plays an important constructive and deconstructive roles.

The third group pointed health and environmental issues caused by technological products such as cell phone, batteries, etc. cemeteries in certain big mass production countries.

The fourth group explained a phenomenon tagged as “individual innovators”; where designers have become self employed, working from anywhere, not necessarily living in big cities or attached to industry. In the last decade, customized individual design and production has taken over mass production.

**Conclusions**

Outcomes are listed below at individual, group and governmental levels:

As everyone has the right to access “clean” information, individuals should take responsibility of the information they create and should not share untrustworthy sources. At a group level, online forums can detect and expose false information, which could be facilitated by plugin apps. In order to reach anti-polarized distribution of knowledge, there should be no visa and internet restrictions at the governmental level.
Trust between individuals and machines can be learnt with more experienced interactions. In that manner, non-group designer clusters can be grouped and education seminars at local communities could be given about how data is used and shared.

At an individual level, Life Cycle assessment (LCA) for products could be done and people can inform themselves and learn to use products. Each individual should act as a hub to spread about LCA and maximum efficient use of products. Governments should start an education campaign about environmental lessons and LCA.

Also at an individual level, innovators (external/internal) and traders (internal) are wanted. As people have to earn money (commercialized) and a physical area needs to be created to develop innovation. It can be manifested as “work local, connect global”. Designers, engineers and innovators should work together to create sustainable products in a sustainable work network. Creative villages, cooperatives and collectives could be structured, which might result changing the type of income. In these creative hubs, knowledge would be extracted from data and sold to industry. It is a framework for the trade of information and services where knowledge and creative services are provided by communities. Governments would give incentives, promotions, tax free trade clusters and such special regulations to sustain these networks of local communities of designers, engineers and traders working together.
ABOUT THE CITY OF IZMIR
A STRATEGIC PORTAL CITY

Izmir is located on the Aegean Sea in the westernmost part of Anatolian Peninsula. It is the third most populous city of Turkey after Istanbul and Ankara with a population over 4 million. It is the second leading port after Istanbul with its large and sheltered harbor. It is one of the oldest port cities of the Mediterranean. During the Ottoman period, it became a major international port and attracted significant overseas business.

BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST

Along with the trade came the diversity of backgrounds – Levantines, Greek Orthodox, Armenian, Jewish and Muslim Turks, who together formed a city of tolerance. Izmir has long constituted a borderland between civilizations, ethnicities, and religions in its process of evolution from Smyrna (the name of the ancient city) to Izmir. The current urban identity of Izmir and its population has been deeply influenced by its historical heritage and multicultural past.

A WINDOW ON MODERN TURKEY

Izmir has fully embraced Western values and lifestyle. Izmir inhabitants take pride in their image as the most democratic and western face in Turkey. The city enjoys a liberal and secular atmosphere in which the appreciation of art and design holds a central place in the population’s worldview and daily life.

A CITY BY THE SEA

Izmir shares the Mediterranean climate, food, and healthy life. It is a living city known for its ‘life on the streets’. This life is combined with the culture of all citizens using the sea and the waterfront. The sea is part of the daily life of the people. Perception of a slow and calm lifestyle is part of the culture, which sometimes contradicts with its global economic ambitions. This is what makes the city unique.
KEYNOTE SPEAKERS
Presentation title: The Right to Settle and Share Life: Living Together

Prof. Nilgün Toker Kılınç obtained her Ph.D. from Paris VIII Saint Denis University. Her interest area of research includes history of philosophy, continental philosophy and contemporary political philosophy. Dr. Toker Kılınç is the author of the book titled Politics and the Responsibility (2012), and she has several articles in different journals.

Dr. Toker Kılınç was dismissed from Ege University on January 6, 2017, with the Decree Law No. 675 on the ground that she had signed a statement text called “we will not be a party to this crime”, also known as the “Peace Statement”. When she was dismissed, she was serving as the chairperson of the Department of Philosophy. She still carries on her studies within the Solidarity Academy in Izmir and the Human Rights Foundation of Turkey.

Presentation title: Design for Conviviality: an Afrikan perspective

Prof. Mugendi K. M’Rithaa is an industrial designer, educator and researcher at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology. He studied in Kenya, the USA, India and South Africa and holds postgraduate qualifications in Industrial Design and Higher Education, as well as a doctorate in Universal Design. He is widely traveled and has taught in Kenya, Botswana, South Africa and Sweden, and is passionate about various expressions of socially conscious (and responsible) design, including: Designerly Strategies for Mitigating Climate Change; Design for Social Innovation and sustainability; Distributed Renewable Energy; Indigenous Knowledge Systems; Participatory Design; and Universal Design.

Dr. Mugendi K. M’Rithaa has a special interest in the pivotal role of design thinking in advancing the developmental agenda primarily on the African continent. He is associated with a number of international networks focusing on design within industrially developing (or majority world) contexts. Dr. Mugendi K. M’Rithaa is Africa’s first President of the World Design Organization™, who focused on the importance of WDO in supporting the aspirations of younger designers worldwide during his presidency between 2015 and 2017. He is the Convenor of the Senate of WDO.

Presentation title: The Culture of Co-living in Izmir

Assoc. Prof. Serhan Ada a faculty member in the Department of Arts and Cultural Management at the Istanbul Bilgi University, which offers BA/MA/PhD programs. Dr. Ada is the director of the Cultural Policy and Management Research Center, and is the head of the newly founded UNESCO Chair on Cultural Policy and Management.

He was previously a board member of the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO and served as the head of the Committee on Cultural Diversity. In addition, Dr. Ada was the founder of Cultural Industries Development Platform (KEGeP) representing Turkey in the International Federation of Coalitions on Cultural Diversity (IFCCD). Dr. Ada is the editor of the book titled Turkish Cultural Policy: A Civil Perspective (2011) focusing on civil society’s perspective of Turkey’s cultural policy as an alternative to the National Report. He also edited and co-authored the first publication on the Turkish national cultural policy titled Introduction to Cultural Policies in Turkey (2009).

Dr. Ada is currently the executive editor of the Cultural Policy and Management Yearbook, and he is the coordinator of Culture and Arts of Izmir Mediterranean Academy.
The World Design Organization (WDO) is an international non-governmental organization founded in 1957 that promotes the profession of industrial design. WDO advocates industrial design driven innovation that creates a better world, engaging our more than 140 member organizations in collaborative efforts and carrying out international programming—World Design Capital®, World Design Talks, World Design Impact Prize, World Industrial Design Day, and Interdesign. World Design Organization has United Nations Special Consultative Status.
FOR MORE INFORMATION

Interested in the World Design Talks?
Read more about WDO’s World Design Talks Programme and previous World Design Talks.

CONTACT US

Interested in hosting a Talk?
Follow the guidelines in the World Design Talks Handbook.
You can also contact communications@wdo.org; let us know what you’re thinking, our team will be delighted to support your initiative!

World Design Organization
455 St-Antoine Street West, Suite SS10
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Z 1J1
Tel: +1 514 448 4949
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