

Chapter 3 addresses the emergence of state orphanages that served as early vocational training institutions or institutions of public education (*islahhane*) for orphaned, refugee, or poor children throughout the provinces from the 1860s until the end of the Ottoman Empire. The chapter provides a corrective to earlier studies that primarily treated such institutions as sites of incarceration for boys. Instead, it situates them as part of an effort to “reform” male children and youth begging, playing, or hanging out in urban spaces into “productive” workers and citizens. Maksudyán makes important connections between early “humanitarian” efforts to address the influx of refugees into urban centers in Danubian cities following the Crimean War (1853–56) and subsequent wars fought throughout Ottoman lands, and the emergence of modern state efforts to police and reform youth through education and work. She also traces the expansion of the *islahhane* through mixed private charitable and state support, successfully arguing that these institutions came to be self-supporting because of the skills that predominantly boys and male youth gained and the work they carried out producing goods for local police, the military, or local consumption. Less fully fleshed out in this chapter, however, is how such boys and youth may have expressed their views and agency while being forced to move from largely unregulated lives in urban neighborhoods to “reformatory” orphanages that operated much like sites of early industrial production.

Chapter 4, “The Internationalization of Orphanages,” contributes important new analysis of the growth of orphanages funded through foreign missionaries, which expanded considerably during the “Armenian massacres in the Eastern *vilayets* of the Ottoman Empire during 1894–1896” (p. 118). This chapter underscores the emergence of contemporary forms of humanitarianism as matters of transnational concern, focusing on the 1890s. The author argues that quickly establishing orphanages for Armenian children was deeply politicized, with multiple engaged parties, including the Sublime Porte, Gregorian Armenians, and varied groups of Protestant and Catholic missionaries from the United States and Europe. Maksudyán notes that “humanitarian relief campaigns are always campaigns for particular humans, even when advocates speak the language of universality” (p. 146). She unpacks missionary rivalries in post-1896 orphan relief efforts and argues that only certain Armenians were singled out for support by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions—namely, those who would be likely to convert to Protestantism. Maksudyán underscores that their “philanthropic works were motivated and determined by their loyalty to the cause of proselytizing,” and discusses the challenges this posed for local Ottoman authorities and Armenian religious leaders alike.

This monograph is a valuable contribution to our understanding of the emergence of modern child welfare regimes in the late Ottoman Empire. Maksudyán’s account compels us to reconsider late Ottoman history in light of the increasingly significant roles that children played and the heightened interest paid to orphaned and destitute children. As such, it is critical reading for anyone who seeks to better understand children as actors in the Ottoman Empire and how their lives were shaped by new forms of regulation and institutional control.

ESRA AKCAN, *Architecture in Translation: Germany, Turkey and the Modern House* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2012). Pp. 408. \$89.95 cloth, \$24.95 paper. ISBNs: 9780822352945, 9780822353089

REVIEWED BY NAMIK ERKAL, Department of Architecture, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey; e-mail: [namik.erkal@gmail.com](mailto:namik.erkal@gmail.com)  
doi:10.1017/S0020743816000702

In this excellent book on cultural theory and architectural history, Esra Akcan draws on the concept of translation from linguistics and philosophy to advance a new theoretical approach in visual

studies and architecture. Motivated by the current overexposure of cultural flows in architecture and urbanism within a globalizing world, Akcan focuses on an exemplary case from the history of modern architecture. The book offers a vivid and comprehensive reappraisal of the intertwined architectural histories of German-speaking countries and Turkey from the 1920s to the 1950s, with a special emphasis on models of modern residential buildings.

Akcan conceptualizes translation as the processes of transformation that takes place under conditions of cultural flow from one place to another. In her words, translations establish “contact zones,” providing the possibility of cultural exchange, and “contested zones,” exposing geopolitical tensions and psychological anxieties under the perceived inequalities between places. She mentions three common narratives on crosscultural relations as needing to be approached critically: the colonial terms of cultural criticism; the myth of problem-free modernization and westernization of the world, premised on the promise of smooth translatability; and the convictions of untranslatability that glorify traditional origins and closed borders. The author elaborates the various positions between the theoretical possibility and impossibility of translation, which may also serve as templates for analyzing architecture: smooth translatability from above; untranslatability, appropriating translation, and foreignizing translation; melancholy as a tension produced by translation; translation for the sake of hybridity; and translation for the sake of a cosmopolitan ethic. To comprehend the complexities and singularities of acts of translation, their contextualization in geopolitical realms, including the agencies of all parties taking part in the cultural exchange, is essential. Akcan, in her choice of houses on which to focus and housing as a topic that conveys the complexity and singularity of crosscultural encounters, presents an example par excellence of this kind of multiplicity. The book, in addition to making a theoretical contribution to the field, provides an up-to-date review of the intertwined histories of German and Turkish residential architecture and urbanism in the interwar period. Akcan collected almost all the available archival material on German and Turkish architecture at personal and institutional archives in thirteen cities across six countries, and she represents these literary and visual materials in clear academic prose, with perfectly economic summaries of their content. Such discipline in the representation and interpretation of the material, and in situating it within complex, overarching debates, gives the work the quality of a source book.

The history of urban and architectural translation between Germany and Turkey from the 1920s to the 1950s is not uniform; encounters took place on different occasions and under different circumstances. Akcan outlines the defining episodes, which form the structure of the book, while at the same time describing in detail different theoretical definitions of translation. The first and largest episode, “Modernism from Above,” covers the Kemalist Westernization project in Turkey through an analysis of the construction of a new capital city—Ankara—by German-speaking professionals. According to Akcan, both the Kemalist state and the modern architects shared conviction in the smooth translatability of culture. One found its ideal model in the West; the other believed in the international relevance of its own solutions and premises. Tracing the archaeology of the garden city model in the German sphere from Britain to Turkey, Akcan demonstrates that the planning model that Hermann Jansen applied in Ankara was the prewar German garden city, which projected low density and dispersed settlements with freestanding single houses in large private gardens. Unlike garden cities in the West, which were designed to address the problems of industrialization and working-class housing, the garden city in Turkey was translated for accommodating the state elite. Analyzing this act of *foreignizing translation*, Akcan demonstrates how Jansen’s attempts at *appropriating translations* from the local residential context were dismissed by local clients and how within two decades the prewar German garden city model in Turkey had been “lost in translation,” giving way to denser apartment blocks. The first episode also covers the ideal house imagined by the state elite (a translation from Viennese cubic architecture) within the garden city and the architecture of President Kemal Atatürk’s residences by Clemens Holzmeister and Seyfi Arkan. As a Turkish architect sent to Germany for

education, Arkan was one of the few to experience the German modern architectural milieu in place. Displaying architectural criticism at its finest, Akcan traces Arkan's projects, from when he was educated in Germany to when he served as Turkey's state architect, detecting immanent elements of *appropriating translations* within their apparent modernist forms.

The second episode, "Melancholy in Translation," covers the contested zones within the context of smooth translatability from the West. In these zones, the non-Western subject's psychological crisis unfolded in different forms. Akcan describes the sentimental reactions in Turkish literature for the abandoned old capital, Istanbul, and how a similar mentality shaped the experience of Sedat Hakkı Eldem, another architect sent to Germany for education. Excavating Eldem's notebooks before and during his travels in Europe, as well as his earlier projects, Akcan describes his modes of melancholy between self-hate and self-love, between fascination for and resistance to the West. She also describes how, in search of modern values within local architectural history (*appropriating translation*), he tried to construct an ideal out of the traditional "Turkish house." Akcan proposes and theorizes the notion of "melancholy" to convey the tensions experienced by the non-Western subject, who feels excluded or lacking possible perfection in asymmetrical translations from the West. Melancholy is a significant theoretical notion, and opens new debates in studies on cultural history, Westernization, and orientalism.

The third episode, "*Siedlung* in Subaltern Exile," focuses on the indirect consequences of German politics through the story of a group of protagonists of modern architecture who moved to Turkey after the National Socialist regime's takeover in 1933. As the prewar garden city model was being applied in Turkey in the 1920s, a different kind of mass housing was theorized and applied in Germany and Austria: the socialist *siedlung* model with middle density units around shared urban parks. The *siedlung* as an up-to-date model was translated into Turkey within the studios of architectural education and several unrealized proposals for the state. Given that most of these translations, with their internationalist claims, were intentionally foreign to local contexts (such as the uniform *siedlungen* that were proposed to replace the historical residential fabric of Istanbul), the book raises a few cases where site-specific features were appropriated (as in Bruno Taut's studio works in the academy). The third episode also questions the possibility of translation from below with a consciousness of the subaltern—nondominant, nonhegemonic, nonelite groups of society—in Germany and Turkey (as positively manifested in the Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky's village-school projects in Turkey).

The fourth episode, "Convictions about Untranslatability," is on the emergence of the notion of Turkish architecture from individual melancholy to nationalism over a span of two decades. Akcan shows how the traditional Ottoman Istanbul house was translated into a modern architectural taxonomy and how the architecture of the "Turkish house" emerged as the core of nationalist architecture in and outside the domestic sphere. Ironically, the only applied mass-housing project in the 1940s was realized by Paul Bonatz (a sympathizer of the regime in Germany) in the language of the reinvented Turkish house. For Akcan, this is an important example of translation for the sake of hybridity, a mixture of the *siedlung* model (without its original socialist intentions) and the nationalist imagery of the Turkish house.

The fifth episode, "Towards a Cosmopolitan Architecture," is on the writings, projects, and buildings of Bruno Taut during the last five years of his career, which he spent in Japan and Turkey. Taut was outside of mainstream modernism with his Berlin *siedlungen*, through which he developed a consciousness of the form of publicly shared places as well as heterogenizing issues such as the use of color. Akcan describes the melancholy of Taut in the East, pointing to the difference of his architecture in translation. Rather than maintaining a nationalist position, the architect embraced the possibility of the foreign as a rejuvenating force and demonstrated a cosmopolitan ethic in his work. In this way, Taut emerges as the "Rosetta Stone" of Akcan's theory and history of architecture in translation—he is key for advocating cosmopolitan architecture in the current conditions of a globalizing world.

An important contribution to cultural theory and architectural history, *Architecture in Translation* is specifically recommended for those interested in cultural translations in the history of the Middle East. Given the richness of its literary and visual references as well as its fluent writing style, it is an intellectual joy to read.

TARA POVEY, *Social Movements in Egypt and Iran*, Palgrave Studies in the History of Social Movements (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). Pp. 256. \$90.00 cloth. ISBN: 9781137379009

REVIEWED BY YOUSSEF EL CHAZLI, IEPHI-CRAPUL, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland; e-mail: [youssef.elchazli@unil.ch](mailto:youssef.elchazli@unil.ch)  
doi:10.1017/S0020743816000714

Tara Povey's *Social Movements in Egypt and Iran* is a succinct and clear book that retraces the political history of two central Middle Eastern countries through the lens of political contention and protest. It is thus a useful book for students of the region trying to make sense of the contemporary mass mobilizations that have shaken the two countries, as well as those looking for an introduction to and further references on these two cases.

Povey makes the case for the use of controlled comparison for understanding contemporary politics in the Middle East. The author shows that systematic comparison allows us to successfully disentangle what is specific to each case (i.e., what is contingent to each historical development) and what is common to them (and probably many others), thus revealing macroprocesses such as contemporary imperialism or neoliberal economic policies that go beyond the specificity of Egyptian or Iranian politics (or, for that matter, "Middle Eastern" politics). The book also challenges common narratives about social movements in the region by normalizing them, thus moving away from the "Arab exception" bias.

Povey demonstrates clearly that modern repertoires of protest are not *essentially* European and that they have been present in the region for at least the past two centuries. She refutes the all-too-easy binaries between Muslim and secular, modernist and traditionalist, as well as radical and reformist, showing instead the fluidity of such notions.

The author proceeds to historicize movements—to analyze "sectors of the reform movement in Iran and the groups and organizations that have formed the basis of the Egyptian opposition movement since the early 1990s in their historical contexts" (p. 1). She argues that the mass mobilizations that occurred in both Iran (2009) and Egypt (2011) were "the culmination of over twenty years of mobilization by social movements" (p. 1). In this respect, she does not fall into the "spontaneous" movements trap. Povey also moves away from certain trends in the social movements and revolutions literature, which is generally "geared towards trying to identify one major causal factor underlying the uprising," by providing a sociohistorical analysis, thus trying to see how "history can illuminate the current trajectories of 21st century movements" (p. 3).

The book intends to link the development of states, elites, and movements in the Middle East to neoliberal policies and the nature of contemporary imperialism. Consequently, contexts (national or international) appear to be central in understanding the emergence and development of social movements in Egypt and Iran. In showing continuities between different movements in the 20th and 21st centuries, Povey convincingly builds on social movements literature focused on repertoires and learned forms of claim making. This leads her to make sound assessments of present-day events, such as the Egyptian mass mobilizations of June 2013. Rather than looking at these events from a normative point of view, she views the protest waves of January 2011 and June 2013 as two parts of "an on-going revolutionary struggle in Egypt" (p. 187).