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Introduction

In 1936, Turkish architect Zeki Sayar enthusiastically announced the state's program for rural settlements as notable examples of Turkey's internal colonization enterprises.¹ He particularly described the new settlement built in the Harbato village in Diyarbakır, which Kurdish people still populated despite the state-organized deportations that accelerated after enacting the 1934 Settlement Law.² The new settlement of Harbato Village was merely an agglomeration of houses on a bare landscape. It contained no school, nursery, or sanctuary like a mosque, but the houses were thoroughly constructed as the state intended. The new settlement’s houses with white walls and hipped and tiled roofs radically differed from the adobe plastered walls and earth shelters of the rural houses of Diyarbakır and its surroundings. New village residents were state-supported Turkish-speaking Balkan immigrants who were largely settled in the region during the second half of the 1930s. They were placed in this rough landscape that belonged to the people whose language, customs, and traditions differed entirely from the newcomers. It was one of the remarkable examples of forming the modern Turkish village, which dramatically changed the rural landscape together with the lives of many people in Turkey during the early republic. The period – from the proclamation of the republic on 29 October 1923 under the government of the Republican People's Party to the transition of the
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government to the Democrat Party on 14 May 1950 – was defined by state attempts to reform the demographic, economic, and cultural realms of the country in which the majority still inhabited rural regions. During the republic’s first years, the lack of urbanization, industrialization, or infrastructure inherited from the Ottoman Empire led the state to focus on rural communities to generate a new structure based on ideals of nationalization and modernization for the whole country. Following social and political reforms intended to construct a nation-state and to distance the country from all imperial aspects of the Ottoman state, the regime of the 1930s legislated a series of policies improving the country towards a “modern” status, as well as reinforcing the central government, not only in developing cities but also in towns and villages. First, the political and economic context of the country, and second the socio-cultural picture of Anatolia and East Thrace were reflected in planning and construction interventions for the modern Turkish village in rural society space. In other words, the state ran programs building new rural settlements and reconstructing demolished villages and promoted studies on cultural and social facets of rural life. The idea was to develop the village community to achieve the state’s objectives.

Forming the modern Turkish village was a significant field of building practice, closely bound with the realization of the modernized and nationalized rural ideal. The early republican cadre – politicians and elites – mostly followed Eurocentric examples for a developed countryside. German-speaking experts, who participated in architectural and urban planning projects as well as in scientific studies, became influential figures in the exchange of knowledge during the process of shaping the new republican environment, not only in the urban forms but also in the rural. Besides, the modernization and nationalization of the country through the establishing of a genuine “Turkish Village” was repeatedly discussed by Turkish architects and planners.


4 Eurocentric aspects, early republican state channeled for the welfare and political strength, can be discussed in various cases. Here, the thesis subject reads the state’s intentions via village planning and rural program in this period.
who heralded local and regional aspects in architectural concepts to sustain the rural community, culturally and economically.\(^5\)

On the other hand, the state principally founded new rural settlements with sanitary, economical, immediate, and effortless solutions. It integrated demographic programs such as the population exchange between Greece and Turkey in the republic’s first years, the deportation of Kurds from Eastern provinces to other regions of the country, and the encouragement of immigration of Turkish-speaking people from Balkan countries into Turkey starting from the early 1930s. The new rural settlements were considered modernized places in terms of space and Turkified places in terms of the nation.\(^6\)

Moreover, planning the rural settlements is not a unique subject in Turkey’s cultural history. Considering this act as an expression of nation-building and modernization and a form of general “consequences of modernity,” as Anthony Giddens addresses\(^7\), it undoubtedly resembles the radical changes in the rural landscape. Even though they are distinguished by their historical, geographical, and cultural contexts, there are still common impulses to trace and track. Especially the first half of the 20th century was characterized by similar practices in transforming the rural landscape on behalf of the nation-states.\(^8\)

\(5\) For a specific reading on the reactions of Turkish architects to the government’s program for village planning, 1930s and 1940s’ volumes of magazines such as Arkitekt and Ulku provide significant resource.


\(7\) Giddens’ approach towards the outcomes of modernity, including nation-building and state’s modernization attempts is crucial for this study regarding to form a ground for the case of Turkey. Anthony Giddens, The Consequences of Modernity, Reprint (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008).

\(8\) This volume “Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe” generates an outstanding resource to grasp how the rural landscape and people were instrumentalized within several governance methods during the 1920s and 1930s in European context. Liesbeth van de Graft and Amalia Ribi Forclaz, eds., Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe (London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018).
examples generate a global vocabulary to translate the patterns and motivations in Turkey during the early republic and better understand the Turkish cases by looking through the transcultural lenses.

Following these points, this book inquires about how the trajectories of modernization and nation-building shaped Turkey’s rural built environment. In so doing, it concentrates on the village as a core of the early republic’s cultural, demographic, and economic programs and demonstrates how the politics of these programs formed a new spatial understanding of the rural settlements for a modern Turkish village. This book is produced from the author’s Ph.D. thesis, which critically scrutinizes early republican tactics for nation-building and modernization of rural Turkey that instrumentalized settlement planning as an idealized practice. Similarly, this volume aims to demonstrate the planned rural settlements as the manufactured forms of rural architecture built within the subtle political atmosphere of the 1930s in Turkey. Finally, it uncovers a sort of disaccord between the foundational theories on the modern Turkish village and the reality of state implementations in the countryside.

Moreover, many scholars have thoroughly examined the architectural historiography of the early republican period of Turkey, engaging the themes of culture, politics, social and economic transformations. Some of these researchers have recently contributed to the presentation of rural architecture and planning, as well as the reformation of the village community within the frame of early republican dynamics. Yet, this volume aims to involve the most


10 Ali Cengizkan presents the motivations for building new rural settlements and reconstructing the pre-existing villages during the time of population exchange, examining the legislative traditions which had been established during the late Ottoman Period at the beginning of the 20th century. Ali Cengizkan, Mühadele Konut ve Yerleşimleri, 1. baskı (Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Mimarlık Fakültesi, 2004); Ali Cengizkan, “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kırsal Yerleşim Sorunları: Ahi Meşud Numune Köyü,” Arredamento Mimarlık, no. 06 (2004): 110–19. Zeynep Eres opens up the discussion of planned rural settlements built in east Thrace in early republican Turkey by emphasizing their value as crucial subjects of the cultural heritage of Turkey. She also documents the historiography of planned rural settlements from the first years of the republic with a view to the previous practices through integrated archival research. In her field research in the region, she catalogs not only houses, but also other building typologies in the villages. Zeynep Eres, “Türkiye’de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu” (Dissertation, İstan-
significant perspectives to demonstrate the layers of village planning and fill in critical blanks in Turkey’s architectural culture and history. It weights the 1934 Settlement Law and investigates its nationalization and modernization tones that shaped planning strategies. This angle also utilizes field research in İzmir and Elazığ, where Turkification and modernization were emphasized, and the 1934 Settlement Law was implemented differently in particular ways. Investigating the village planning in the early republic of Turkey manifests the self-legitimation steps of the state. Therefore, looking at examples in İzmir and Elazığ also helps examine these steps while cities’ demographic and physical characteristics changed through the state’s Turkification and modernization procedures. Namely, the study of this book directs toward an unspoken, new dimension of the theme by showing the genuine bond between ‘Forming the Modern Turkish Village’ and ‘Nation-Building and Modernization of Rural Turkey during the Early Republic’ by introducing the planning examples in İzmir and Elazığ, which have not been specifically and differentially included in the debate before.

The first chapter discusses concepts and analogies linked to the motivations behind the nation-building and modernization in rural Turkey during the early republican period. It is examined in this chapter how nationalism, with its subordinate ideas such as territory, border, and homeland to spatial context, can be used to determine particular interpretations for the definition...
of the Rural. It first reopens the discussions on the theoretical relationship between nationalist suggestions and modernization processes; then, it continues showing the localization of land as a physical, solid notion in the context of nationalization and modernization programs, and last to the democratization of land. Being a familiar concept to the cases in Turkey, “Internal colonization” is highlighted here, referring to its facets of modernist and nationalist interventions in the rural.

The second chapter presents a priori patterns of the nationalization process in Turkey. It seeks to answer questions about how Anatolia became a reference point in defining Turkish identity and which notions, mediums, and institutions were used for instrumentalizing the nation-building in early republican Turkey. It shows an integrated picture, from establishing nation-building and modernization agendas to implementing them in the Anatolian landscape. The roots of early republican ideology were nourished by nationalist theories of the late 19th century and were crystallized in government activities in rural Turkey. This chapter points explicitly how the nationalist agents were used as powerful tools in the modernization process of the country, and it briefly introduces the methods and conceptions echoed in the rural sphere during the early republican period.

The third chapter introduces approaches in spatial planning in rural Turkey that were integral to the country’s modernization process. It underlines the construction activities in the rural space, such as reconstructing small Anatolian cities and towns and building railways, highways, and bridges in the countryside. However, it primarily focuses on conceptualizing the Turkish village through spatial causes. Socio-cultural planning of the Turkish village is detailed with the efforts of the Republican People's Party and their special program of the People's House and its Village Affairs Branch. This was meant to engage local communities with specialists who participated in the sociocultural reconstruction of the rural community. In this context, newspapers and magazines are examined as tools for rural people's education, and the Village Institutes' establishment is reviewed as a new schooling model for the village children. The economic planning of the Turkish village is illustrated in the economic development concepts during the republic's first years, including statist solutions during the 1930s and country planning grounded in agricultural development and agricultural industry. The architectural conceptualization of the Turkish village is specified within the debates on village architecture and the rural house that were underlined as the origin of national
identity, as well as the architectural practice to modernize the countryside by
the Turkish architects.

The fourth chapter investigates the legislative scheme of village planning
and its implementations in the rural from the early years of the republic. It con-
centrates on the tradition and progress in the methodology, the legislation, and
policies in the architectural practice of the “Turkish village.” Firstly, early legis-
lation – the 1924 Village Law and the 1926 Settlement Law – are introduced re-
garding village construction, and the practices of these organizations are dis-
cussed with a focus on the role of population exchange. Secondly, this chapter
analyzes the concept of “republican villages,” pointing to the state programs
that resulted in architectural regulations. After enacting the 1934 Settlement
Law, the operations determined this concept and reflected on the changes to
the rural landscape. Therefore, government decisions regarding the new de-
mographic program and accompanying the new village construction program
are critically examined in this chapter. These practices are investigated by ana-
lyzing the official documents and announcements, the regulations, news, and
journal articles.

The fifth chapter presents the state operations in constructing new rural
settlements in İzmir and Elazığ with a deeper focus on the positions of the
two cities in nation-building and modernization projects. Lastly, the histori-
ography of the villages – Yeniköy, Havuzbaşı, and Taskesik in İzmir; Kövenk,
Vertetil, Etminik, and Percenç in Elazığ, in which the field research has been
conducted, is introduced with official documents and the results of architec-
tural documentation.
Chapter 1 – Concepts and Analogies

Nationalism: A Repercussion of Modernity

Modernity denotes “to modes of social life or organization which emerged in Europe from about the seventeenth century onwards and which subsequently became more or less worldwide in their influence.”¹ It is fully affiliated with “great discoveries in the physical sciences; the industrialization of production; immense demographic upheavals; rapid and often cataclysmic urban growth; increasingly powerful nation states; an ever-expanding, drastically fluctuating capitalist market.”² The modern society, that encompasses “the subjects as well as the objects of modernization,”³ is segmented by new policy instruments, and untethered from the tradition in a “radicalized and universalized way.”⁴ The claims that separate new organizations from conventional social orders in modern society take many forms including, the extreme swiftness and wide scope of change in circumstances, the propagation and connectivity of this social transformation, and their political and economic returns.⁵

Throughout history, the growth of nation-states has served as a political stimulus, especially during the 19th century, altering the foundations of modern life simultaneously with other mechanisms molded modernity. By fostering the notion of nationalism, the nation state also produced an emotional tie between individuals and ideologies which culminated in the feeling that

¹ Giddens, The Consequences of Modernity, 1.
³ Berman, p. 16.
⁴ Giddens, p. 3.
⁵ Giddens, p. 6.
“the supreme loyalty of the individual is [...] due the nation state.”⁶ Therefore, citizenship became associated with a strong sense of belonging to a national group. As a result of their intertwined relationships, nationalism, and modernity merged into one another during this period of social, economic, and administrative upheaval. An historiographic overview by Hans Kohn depicts this consensus:

“In the 19th century Europe and America and in the 20th century Asia and Africa have the people identified themselves with the nation, civilization with the national civilization, their life and survival with the life and survival of the nationality. From this time on nationalism has dominated the impulses and attitudes of the masses, and at the same time served as the justification for the authority of the state and the legitimation of its use of force, both against its own citizens and against other states.”⁷

Along these lines, the nexus between nationalism and modernity occurs in the process of creating national identity, which has frequently been an assignment for elites. A nationalist credo is typically composed of many key parts referring to a particular culture. During social restorations, the elite views defining these aspects, cultivating a national psyche among the society, and establishing a common identity as critical tasks. Max Weber connects the intelligentsia to the nation’s sense of empowerment and dominance over the masses. The concept of country as a collective endeavor⁸, which inherently incorporates cultural elements, and executing nation-building advantageously for a group during the self-determination stage are central to the concept of authority. Then, the intelligentsia promotes and/or supports the concept of a nation, “a group of men who by virtue of their peculiarity have special access to certain achievements considered to be ‘culture values’, and who therefore usurp the leadership of a ‘culture community’”⁹ while boosting the state’s political priority. Additionally, John Breuilly agrees:

“[Especially in the non-Western World the] intelligentsia can construct a new political identity from nationalist ideology which makes the Western claims

⁷ Kohn, p.11.
to independence and freedom whilst at the same time relating those claims to a distinct national identity which is asserted to be of equal value with anything to be found in the West. Within this framework this intelligentsia can literally feel itself 'at home' and can, as nationalists, play a leading role in directing the fight for independence and re-creating the national culture in its fullest form.\textsuperscript{10}

Ellie Kendouri contributes to this perspective by stating that the elite, particularly in middle- and far-eastern societies, self-identify as a counter-power to the former state while intentionally taking on the responsibility of nation-building. Concurrently, they maintain a contradictory separation from the majority of society.\textsuperscript{11}

Hence, the process of developing a nationhood occurs within a faceted environment that promotes diverse dynamics throughout societal structure. This construction also encompasses initiatives to establish the link between the past and the present at a time when society has already undergone a dramatic transformation in terms of political and social life. The difficulty of connectedness, a common manifestation of modernity due to rapid transition, is alleviated by committed nationalism. Subsequently, nationalist movements help modernization by catalyzing an understanding of modernity's heterogeneity.

As noted earlier, nationalism provides a feeling of self and a path onward. It results in a renewed emphasis on education, the economy, and the socio-cultural dimensions of the modern state. The relationship between nationalism, modernity, modernization, and industrialization stems from an imbalanced but unmistakable rupture with previously sanctified social behavior. In other words, the connections exist in the case of "the erosion of the given intimate structures of traditional society, an erosion inherent in the size, mobility, and general ecology and organizations of industrial society, or even of a society moving in this direction."\textsuperscript{12} Thus, nationalism as a benign aspect\textsuperscript{13} contributes to the current social structure's consolidation. It leverages the force of unfore-

\begin{flushleft}  
\textsuperscript{11} Ellie Kendouri, \textit{Nationalism and Self-Determination}, in: Hutchinson and Smith, p.55  
\textsuperscript{13} Gellner, 166.  
\end{flushleft}
seen historical occurrences by fusing new ideas with social change for a certain set of people.\textsuperscript{14}

Once placed in historical context, nation-building evolved into a dynamic interplay that sparked a variety of reactions in the ethos of the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Of these was the assumption that nationhood was a rational or necessary phenomenon, as inherent as human existence. Thus, nation-building served as a vehicle for not just designed politics to reform governmental and social life, but also as an interpersonal instrument for uniting society around the ultimate quest for the status quo. One of the first definitions, offered by Ernest Renan in 1882, exemplifies this type of interpersonal understanding by emphasizing the fact that nation was viewed as a shared sacred value owned by people, embracing everyday life as well as the past and future:

“A nation is therefore a large-scale solidarity, constituted by feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past and of those that one is prepared to make in the future. It presupposes a past; it summarized, however, in the present to make a tangible fact, namely, consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life. A nation’s existence is, if you will pardon the metaphor, a daily plebiscite, just as an individual’s existence is a perpetual affirmation of life. [...] The wish of nations is, all in all, the sole legitimate criterion, the one to which one must always return”.\textsuperscript{15}

Like Ernest Renan noted, the desire for justification also generated a new political agenda for conflicts and national wars and independence became an integral part of national notions. Namely, when self-rule of the people somehow violated, it was often translated as an invasion of the nation.\textsuperscript{16}

Evidently, self-realization is pursued in nation-building mechanisms through cultural, ethnic, and folkloric elements. Thus, legitimization serves a dual goal of identifying the customs, conventional routines, ceremonies, and collective history of a group or society. These manufactured representations


\textsuperscript{16} Eley and Suny, 4.
inspire national identity and operate as an emotive foundation for nationalism. National iconography is “something transmitted from the past and secured as a collective belonging, something reproduced in myriad imperceptible ways, grounded in everydayness and mundane experience.”

Through this principle, national emblems become more understandable to a wider group of people. Similarly, Karl Deutsch claims that nationalism is fostered by “informal social arrangements, pressure of group opinion, and the prestige of national symbols.”

He stresses the importance of the close relationship between representational conceptions in ordinary and nationalist endeavors as a catalyst for societal dialogue and a guideline for nation building to produce a strong idea of the state. From this point of view, nationalist symbols can be read as replicated facets that aid in the spread of the nation concept via natural and straightforward social interactions in public life, along with representations used as political concepts for political legitimacy of the state. Thus, nationalist symbols encapsulate concepts such as a collective past that fosters a feeling of connectedness, a common language, economic coexistence, and socialization in a designated territory that is communally owned.

### Making of the Territory, Border and Homeland

Anthony Giddens describes the modern nation state as a “bordered power-container,” adding that, “a nation [...] only exists when a state has a unified administrative reach over the territory which its sovereignty is claimed.”

Thus, the term “territory” relates, not just to the formalization of a particular piece of land, but also to the construct of nation: National territory, as a necessary component of nationalism, is defined by a physical form where the mythos is established via achievement, transmission of history in the present, and aspirations for the future. A national territory, in this sense, is defined by its political, physical, and cultural frontiers. When political assurances are formed, they result in a “particular spatial and social location among other territorial

---

17 Eley and Suny, 22.
nations. ... 'Living together' and being 'rooted' in a particular terrain and soil become the criteria for citizenship and the basis of political community.”

Throughout the legitimation courses, national land serves a “moral geography” for the people entitled to live in and initiated their economic, social, and cultural presence in. Relatedly, as in Anthony D. Smith’s words, nations “define social space within which members must live and work and demarcate historic territory that locates a community in time and space.” And this is “the place of one’s birth and childhood, the extension of hearth and home. It is the place one’s ancestors and of the heroes and cultures of one’s antiquity.” Thus, authorizing nation’s borders converts the designated terrain into a romanticized place that serves as a bridge between the country and the state’s spatial definitions. Furthermore, the continual tradition, along with the shared practices identify this designated terrain as the “home” of the state’s people. The national territory delineates the frontiers specified by “a set of institutional forms of governance” and established for the nation state, “sanctioned by law and direct control of the means of internal and external violence.” It becomes a major spatial element portrayed as the sphere which contains the sources of the culture that gave birth to the new state.

Another vein of this formulation develops in the idea of homeland (here Heimat), which addresses a sentimentalized geography in the nationalist concept. Its dictionary meaning – “the country, a part of the country or a place in the country where one is born, grown up or one feels home due to his residence” – explains how homeland can be regarded as “being at home.” More precisely, it is a structured and reformed setting that fosters a sense of security and a social, cultural, and/or physical realm free of estrangement and othering. It serves as a home, a repository for identity, and a venue for citizens’ au-

---

22 Smith, 16.
23 Smith, 16.
24 Giddens, 1985, in: Hutchinson and Smith, Nationalism, 35.
Chapter 1 – Concepts and Analogies

Authorized behaviors within the nation-state. Simultaneously, it refers to “the sentimental demeanor for a harmonic unity which has been lost and sought.”

Homeland formerly alluded to a recognized territory for a certain lordship or canton in where they had all rights to residence by birth, marriage and other assets held through money. Since the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century, it however became a subject focused and in its ideological contexts, examined by several disciplines. This sort of consciousness and scientific curiosity towards the topic brought the term as a significant fact to discuss within the transforming political systems. Traditionally, the awareness of homeland was disseminated primarily through linguistic channels such as literature and art, or as a concept straddling between folkloric and scientific aspects. Thereafter, its principles were incorporated (and included) into social and cultural activities.

Moreover, the literary term had been related to the rural life and strongly associated with the countryside, township, and peasants from the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century. During the period of emancipation, which triggered the economic transmigration, particularly across Western Europe, the phrase gained highly political implications. One of the most significant facts to develop homeland concept as a political understanding, was the demographical alteration in the rural areas chaining to the new social and economic class definitions both in the countryside and urban centers.

In late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, modern intellectuals began to associate the idea of homeland with a “lost and sought” place. This paired with arising criticisms towards forms of modernization, such as, mechanization, standardization, and professionalization. They claimed that these outcomes created isolating and unfamiliar living environments for the people, and demolished their

---

27 Ina-Maria Greverus, Der territoriale Mensch: Ein literaturanthropologischer Versuch zum Heimatphänomen (Frankfurt Am Mein, Germany: Athenäum Verlag, 1972), p. 32.
28 Greverus, 46.
29 Greverus, 28.
30 Greverus, 46.
31 Rudolf Karl Schmidt, ‘Zur Heimatideologie’, Das Heft, Zeitschrift für Literatur und Kunst, 6 (1965), pp. 36–39. Schmidt addresses the industrialization of large, cultivated areas resulting in the disintegration and reorganization of peasant groups and the eradication of small agriculture in the countryside. For such grounds, influx of migrants to industrialized cities generated a class of workers who typically worked in appalling conditions and had to adjust to a new urban lifestyle.
connection with the nature and community. In this line of thought the rural emerged as an attribution for a place where people share similar working and crafting environments, preferences, and opportunities in their local social scape that brings a profound connectedness between them. Therefore, grounding the conception of homeland on the rural characteristics occurred in a wide range of political developments; from the rural idyll to robust nationalism. This motivation resulted in facing towards the rural as the sought homeland in the nationalization and modernization processes.

**Legitimizing the Rural**

Another axis towards understanding the conceptualization of the rural emerges within the egalitarian practices that gradually paved the way for discourses about utopian society in the late 19th century. However, it later gained a nationalist tone in the 20th century. According to Thomas Spence, who pitched the idea of “land nationalization,” defending the equal and common rights on land to live, work, and pass down wealth to future generations, the land existed as a natural heritage of people, which could not be merited. Therefore, everyone should initially have the right to- and freedom of an

---

32 Fritz Pappenheim, *The Alienation of Modern Man: An Interpretation Based on Marx and Tönnies/ Fritz Pappenheim*. (New York: Modern Reader Paperbacks, 1968), 31–32. Seeking the reconnection also emerged in Ferdinand Tönnies’ analysis of societal relationships and fastened the links between the conceptions of homeland and rural realm. In his widely discussed theory, Tönnies addresses two defined consents among people: The society (*Gesellschaft*) and the community (*Gemeinschaft*). The society is characterized (*Gesellschaft*) “as a purely mechanical construction, existing in the mind” but the community (*Gemeinschaft*) attributes to “all kinds of social co-existence that are familiar, comfortable and exclusive.” Unlike society, serving as “a mechanical aggregate and artifact” community is “a living organism in its own right.” The community is therefore grounded on an intentional and volunteer alliance of people, however the society is shaped by the dynamics of a designated realm. Ferdinand Tönnies, *Ferdinand Tönnies: Community and Civil Society*, ed. Jose Harris, trans. Margaret Hollis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 17–19, [https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816260](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816260).

33 Ferdinand Tönnies underlies this sort of societal relationship by arouses in Village Community: He highlights that the organization of community occurs in the village via neighborhood: “the closeness of the dwellings, the common fields, even the way the holdings run alongside each other, cause the people to meet and get used to each other and to develop intimate acquaintance.” Tönnies, *Ferdinand Tönnies*, 28.
egalitarian life in the land where they were born.\textsuperscript{34} It was a democratic aspect mainly affirmed as the “public primarily have the possession of land”\textsuperscript{35}

The idea was further interpreted in the rural context, framing it from social and cultural angles. In other words, the Spencean scheme was examined and employed, first, as a romantic approach to the rurality of land;\textsuperscript{36} second, it was


\textsuperscript{36} Spencean discourse emerged, in many senses – and in cultural, social and economic terms, as espousing root of rural idyll and the movement of “back to the land” in England during the next century. Raymond Williams’ analysis on rural romanticism in \textit{The Country and the City} demonstrated an “active and continuous history” of relations between the country and the city starting with Industrial Revolution that dominated the metamorphosis of both urban and rural life. Raymond Williams proclaimed that even the urbanization, industrialization in the cities and agrarian capitalism in the country took power over traditional peasantry and this way of life in the country, the idealization of rural life and the rural idyll had the influence on the society. Raymond Williams, \textit{The Country and the City} (New York, USA: Oxford University Press, 1975). As Burchardt explains, Williams underlined that the contrast between country and city that had crucial place in English literature, referring to changes in the agrarian economy and its reflections on social and cultural milieu, and the rurality that became the crucial theme for English nationality during the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} Centuries. Burchardt, “Agricultural History, Rural History, or Countryside History?”, p. 474.

Another significant representation of rurality appears in George Sturt’s writings. In \textit{Change in the Village} written in 1912, Sturt observed the economic and social transformation of Bourne with romanticist eyes. He described the changes in the traditional village community due to the capitalist shift in the town. He criticized the collapsing traditional peasant system after the “common land” was priced by private investors. As a result of this, communal life alternated in commercial life in the village where one should have acquainted with three crucial concepts: “a spiritual rebirth, an intellectual expansion and political power”. John Burnett, “Introduction”, in \textit{Change in the Village} (Dover, N.H: Caliban Books, 1984), pp. xi–xiv. He presented the peasant system in economic terms to point out commercial changes, embraced by private dominancy in the countryside. See George Sturt, \textit{Change in the Village} (Dover, N.H: Caliban Books, 1984), pp. 76–83. Sturt literally emphasized the rural idyll saying that: “in all these ways the parish, if not a true village, seemed quite a country place twenty years ago, and its people were country people. Yet there was another side to the picture. The charm of it was a generalized one – I think an impersonal one; for with the thought of individual persons who might illustrate it there comes too often into my memory a touch of sordidness, if not in connection, then in another; so that I suspect myself, not for the first time, of sentimentiality. Was the social atmosphere after all anything but a creation of
altered into “a practical and pressing issue for social reformers” in economic terms on the verge of 20th century. Democratization of the land generated an essential topic in social and political discourse, predominantly concerning to implement reforms in the countryside. It was a common refrain or assumption that “expropriating the landlords and restoring the land to its rightful heirs” would lead the people to freely “trade and manufacture a flourishing agriculture, and complete democracy” on the way to achieving an egalitarian society.

The motivations for land restoration in social and economic areas generated some adaptations in urban and rural areas’ spatial planning, especially with the demand for an alternative sphere for the modernizing world. The ideas derived from the democratization of the land can also be rooted in the Garden City Movement that developed with Ebenezer Howard’s contribution “Garden Cities of To-morrow,” first published in 1898. Howard conceptualized the beneficial aspects of urban and rural qualities of a place. He suggested an alternative model that could function without the significant problems of city and country. Finally, he focused on a scheme to improve the issues of overgrowth, misplacement of industry, disorganization of housing and cultural zones, and degeneration of moral life in the city; together with poverty, lack of infrastructure and social facilities in the country. He formalized a hybrid configuration that would also contribute to social, cultural, and economic progress.

Several interpretations regenerated Howard’s suggestion under different cultural and political circumstances during the first half of the 20th century. Most of the time, the approach served as a fundamental scheme for the new town planning by being convenient for such interventions to fulfill urban and rural planning agendas. However, it lost its socialist character through time and evolved into a transcription of housing projects in the state-planned and controlled areas. In other words, the rationality of the scheme allowed it to be adopted in territorial models of politically diverging authorities all over the world. It developed into an effective architectural tool in its spatial character-

my own dreams? Was the village life really idyllic? [...] Not for a moment can I pretend that it was.” Sturt, 7.

istics during the various nationalization and modernization programs introduced by states in their legitimation politics.\(^{40}\)

**Internal Colonization**

Undoubtedly, the 20th century witnessed how the “rural depopulation, anxieties about urbanization and the impact of the agricultural depression”\(^{41}\) became common issues among the nation-states when legitimizing the rural. Most of the time, these common issues were addressed to critically motivate the regeneration of the countryside. However controversially, modernization in agricultural life appeared in social, economic, and cultural discussions. It was believed that education and practice for cultivating a country’s land would result in significant improvement that would also help solve other problems like, poverty, rural depopulation, and deviation from the cultural and national agenda of the state.\(^{42}\) The cultural and national agenda included an investigation of rural tradition, and, at the same time, facets of rural tradition were strongly echoed in the nation-building propaganda. This dynamic initially brought rural idealism to a status that could be justified with pragmatic goals such as: the modernization of the rural areas. Thereafter, it triggered the romanticization of the countryside.

Accordingly, internal colonization occurred as a strong planning strategy applied in nation-states’ nationalization and modernization processes. According to Michael Hechter, it is distinct from internal colonialism, which was an administrative model addressing the class differentiations and economic disparities between the core (developed city) and the periphery (underdeveloped country) within the borders of a nation-state. However, internal colonization had a spatial scope as a centralized control mechanism over the people in “the settlement of previously unoccupied (or semi-occupied)
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territories within state borders.”

People, who objected to the internal colonization, were also expected to be “loyal” to the city while establishing security for the state and upholding the economy in the periphery. Therefore, this planning approach was usually conceived as an integration tactic for peripheral groups to manage the people in these regions within the nationalization and modernization schemes. At the beginning of the 20th century, internal colonization became a widespread government intervention as not only an idealistic solution to nationalization, but also a pragmatic way to modernize the rural population to increase the state-beneficial factors in these regions.

The First World War and the economic crisis at the end of the 1920s led states to engage in more governmental involvement in development: Economic plans went hand in hand with the re-formulation of national identity and achieving modernity when widely concentrating on the settlement problem. During the interwar years, these interventions developed into large projects that included an expanded program of planning the land, implementing social and cultural infrastructure, building modern facilities, and settling the people.

Namely, the colonization of internal groups mostly took place intending to cultivate rural areas, to modernize the society in these territories where people of varied national or ethnic origins and modes of life inhabited. Besides its technological aspects, it was a sort of “scientific and social experimentation” that enabled the land as a tool by which national integration and economic progress of underdeveloped rural regions were legitimated. It was a matter of the fact that this idealization became a common topic in the reshaping of the built environment in the countryside, not only in highly urbanized countries, but also in young states. Especially during the interwar years, the practice of internal colonization as cultivating the wastelands and settling the rural population in these areas occurred in the development programs of states to achieve national progress. As Grift accentuates, “democratic, fascist, national socialist


45 Grift, 142–43.
and communist regimes alike perceived of these projects as the exemplification if their political values and ideologies.”

Between 1928 and 1940, Italy generated a significant program for internal colonization as a part of the agricultural development program of the National Fascist Party carried out across the country. The program began with public works in small Italian towns and villages. Infrastructure in the rural areas was modernized, and new farmhouses were built. Nevertheless, land reclamation and new town planning in the Pontine Marshes were primarily placed on the fascist agenda with a concentration on agricultural productivity and hygiene in the areas to be reclaimed and building the new rural settlements to house agriculture workers and peasants. The reclamation started with draining water in the site, followed by construction of new drainage systems, bridges, and canals. The network of public roads and the infrastructure for electricity and telecommunication were built. The land was parceled into family farms, “equipped with a two-story brick farm-house, stables, a barn, an access road, irrigation ditches, a well, a small vineyard, fencing, and electricity.” In other words, the fascist government intended to accomplish an “agricultural, medical, and social utopia” in the region.

The reclamation of the land and the development of the settlements in the Pontine Marshes demonstrate the concrete plans of Italian Fascism. Although the principles of the program were declared as realizing agricultural progress in these areas and improving hygienic conditions for the inhabitants, the new towns were organized in a scheme through which the state could direct public activities. These projects also included housing unemployed agricultural workers from all rural regions of Italy in these controlled settlements. Consequently,
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49 Snowden, 509.
the new towns emerged as a clear example of the practice of internal colonization, in which the demonstration of fascism occupied a leading prominent position.\textsuperscript{51}

Internal colonization in Germany evolved out of changing dynamics of economy, as in the production of agriculture and as a model for Germanizing and developing the rural population economically in specific regions, especially in the Polish borders.\textsuperscript{52} During the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, Prussia, Saxony, and Silesia became important areas to locate the new agricultural colonies through the state organization. Especially in Silesia, which was populated by Germans and Poles to nationalize the area on behalf of each side, the colonization program gained political and economic importance. Right after the First World War, within the Weimar Republic, Silesia was the target of new housing legislation with the goal of Germanizing the region. In 1919, the Silesian government put the new internal colonization program on the agenda and propagated the absorption of the Polish population and Germanization of the land by building model farmhouses for the German workers starting. This accelerated in 1921 with legislation of a rural housing program promoted German farmers, especially on the frontiers. For this program, Ernst May planned the rural settlements and housing typologies for the peasant families by emphasizing a national image as German and Silesian through the vernacular notions.\textsuperscript{53}

Together with Great Depression, anti-urbanist and ruralist campaign of National Socialists also lead a series of internal colonization enterprises in Germany. Until the party announced its land reform agricultural plan in 1930, the National Socialists already started to advocate for a land reform, which essentially involved middle class German farmers and workers in the rural areas controlling the enlargement in the states.\textsuperscript{54} From the late 1930s to the early 1940s,
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they instrumentalized colonization in territorial planning. During the Second World War, the Germans occupied Polish regions partly with the goals of internal colonization, in the form of building new settlements and villages, as well as the reconstruction of old towns. These interventions also included the replacement of non-Germanic people with the German population in these territories.\textsuperscript{55} Rural towns and villages built along the eastern border were significant in the realization of National Socialists’ ideological aims for the national space. They became places for agricultural experiments that were supposed to improve the country’s economy. At the same time, they were territories for replacement of non-Germanic groups on behalf of a racial clarity.\textsuperscript{56}

Land reclamation, agrarian development, and/or housing people in planned settlements was repeated in different geographical and political contexts by various regimes and state authorities. Nationalization and modernization of a rural populace occurred in several ways. In Sweden, especially after the split from Norway in 1905, the authority encouraged internal colonization models that were grounded in agricultural rural settlements in the northern regions of the country. Within these programs it was similarly aimed to reclaim marsh areas and create plowable land where small farmers and land laborers could live. Likewise, in the 1920s, the Dutch government restored the Zuiderzee and cultivated polders in this region as a central modernizing project. During the 1930s, even post-war, the gained land was developed into cultivable areas where farmers were settled.\textsuperscript{57}

In addition to the spatial practices of internal colonization that played a critical role in forming and locating the population, internal colonization also evolved into a powerful engine for developing nation-states in the process of self-determination and establishment of an economic scheme. In this respect, modernizing and nationalizing the rural in Romania occurred as a clear instance of this after the unification of the Romanian kingdoms following the end of the First World War. The new post-war Romanian state, which expanded its territorial land, and had comparably more diversity among the rural population and an agrarian dominated economy. That led to the necessity of poli-
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Forming the Modern Turkish Village

cymaking regarding the peasantry not only in economic terms, but also social and cultural terms. Therefore, beginning in the 1920s, the Romanian countryside became the subject of social engineering and the transformation of village life guided government implementations in rural planning. This resulted in the emergence of new villages or village parts in which living conditions were improved in healthier and more hygienic ways for the inhabitants. However, at the end of 1930s, the project of socially improving Romanian rural life was transformed under the totalitarian regime of the King Carol II. Some of the model rural settlements built in early 1930s were destroyed and rebuilt according to the new planning ideals of the King’s authority.

Starting from the early 20th century, the practices of internal colonization dominated the planning of the rural areas in several cases, and in countries within comparable political perspectives. The methods on every scale – from country planning to the small rural settlements – the ideals were grounded in regulating the movement of the rural populace in their economic, social, and political character. That is to say, the implementations of internal colonization, not only in Europe, but also in the modernization and nation building programs in Russia, spatial politics in the American New Deal in the USA, af-

58 Raluca Muşat, “‘To Cure, Uplift and Ennoble the Village’: Militant Sociology in the Romanian Countryside, 1934–1938,” East European Politics and Societies 27, no. 3 (2012): 353–75. In this article Raluca Muşat discusses the reformist approach of sociologist Dimitri Gusti and the ruralist movement, he generated in Romania during the 1930s.


ter the Second World War in the Israeli Kibbutz\textsuperscript{61}, and so forth, all followed a pattern which impacted and transformed rural life in cultural, social, and economic terms.

In summary, internal colonization – in theory and practice – occurred as another agent of the nation-building and modernization narratives of states in a strong wave during the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The implementations usually demonstrated the similarity in the operations across countries and in different socio-cultural and economic circumstances of the peoples. The common ground of the discussion was that the land was idealized in respect to nationalization and the political orientation of the rural people on behalf of the authorities. In addition to this, the rural masses were thoroughly instrumentalized in the development schemes of the countries.

The interrelation between modernity, nationalism, and modernization addressed above, can also characterize the general impulse for “forming the modern Turkish village.” The spatial concepts for land idealization, such as architectural interventions of internal colonization became significant facets of operations

in Turkey during the early republican period from 1923 to 1950, not only in ideology, but also in terms of active building practice in the countryside. Thus, the review of the topic in the worldwide context builds a bridge between Turkey and the other countries, where these programs served for realization of nation-building and modernization endeavors.