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.
2 Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts into Air, The Experience of Modernity* (London, UK: Penguin Books, 1988), p. 16.
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 endeavor[8], 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

---

6   Hans Kohn, *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History* (Toronto, Canada: Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1955), p. 9.

7   Kohn, p.11.

8   Max Weber, *The Nation*, 1948 in: *Nationalism*, ed. by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, Oxford Readers (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 24.

9   Weber, in: Hutchinson and Smith, 25.

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".[10]

Ellie Kendorie 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.[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 sociocultural 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."[12] Thus, nationalism as a benign aspect[13] contributes to the current social structure's consolidation. It leverages the force of unfore-

---

10   John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State*, 2nd ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), p. 415.

11   Ellie Kendouri, *Nationalism and Self-Determination*, in: Hutchinson and Smith, p.55

12   Ernest Gellner, *Thought and Change: The Nature of Human Society* (London, UK: Wiedenfeld and Nicholson, 1964), 157.

13   Gellner, 166.

seen historical occurrences by fusing new ideas with social change for a certain set of people.[14]

Once placed in historical context, nation-building evolved into a dynamic interplay that sparked a variety of reactions in the ethos of the 19th and 20th 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".[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 was somehow violated, it was often translated as an invasion of the nation.[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

---

14   Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny, "Introduction: From the Moment of Social History to the Work of Cultural Representation," in *Becoming National: A Reader*, ed. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 9.

15   Ernest Renan, *What is a Nation?* [Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?], 1882, in: Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny, eds., *Becoming National: A Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 53.

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."[17] 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."[18] 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.[19] 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."[20] 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.

18   Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication*, 1966, in: Hutchinson and Smith, p. 28.

19   Karl Deutch, in: Hutchinson and Smith, pp. 27–28.

20   Anthony Giddens, *The Nation as Power Container*, 1985, in: Hutchinson and Smith, 34.

nations. … 'Living together' and being 'rooted' in a particular terrain and soil become the criteria for citizenship and the basis of political community."[21]

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."[22] 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."[23] 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"[24] and established for the nation state, "sanctioned by law and direct control of the means of internal and external violence."[25] 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"[26] – 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-

---

21   Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity*, Ethnonationalism in Comparative Perspective (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991), 117.

22   Smith, 16.

23   Smith, 16.

24   Giddens, 1985, in: Hutchinson and Smith, *Nationalism*, 35.

25   Giddens, 1985, in: Hutchinson and Smith, 35.

26   Original in German: "**Heimat: a)** Land, Landesteil od. Ort, in dem man [geboren u.] aufgewachsen ist od. sich durch ständigen Aufenthalt zu Hause fühlt. Duden, Das große Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, Band 3: Fas – Hev, 1993, Duden Verlag, Berlin, Germany, p. 1510.

thorized behaviors within the nation-state.[27] Simultaneously, it refers to "the sentimental demeanor for a harmonic unity which has been lost and sought."[28]

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 18th 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.[29] 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.[30]

Moreover, the literary term had been related to the rural life and strongly associated with the countryside, township, and peasants from the late 18th century. During the period of emancipation, which triggered the economic transmission, 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.[31]

In late 19th 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.[32] 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.[33] 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.

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.[34] It was a democratic aspect mainly affirmed as the "public primarily have the possession of land".[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;[36] second, it was

---

34   Thomas Spence, *Das Gemeineigentum am Boden*, trans. by F. Eichmann (Leibzig, Germany: Hirschfeld, 1904), p. 23.; T. M. Parssinen, "Thomas Spence and the Origin of English Land Nationalization," Journal of the History of Ideas, 34, no. 1 (1973): 136.

35   Parssinen, "Thomas Spence and the Origin of English Land Nationalization," 138.

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 *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, *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 19th and early 20th Centuries. Burchardt, "Agricultural History, Rural History, or Countryside History?", p. 474.
Another significant representation of rurality appears in George Sturt's writings. In *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 *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, *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 sentimentality. Was the social atmosphere after all anything but a creation of

altered into "a practical and pressing issue for social reformers"[37] 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"[38] 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.[39]

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.

37   Parssinen, "Thomas Spence and the Origin of English Land Nationalization," 138.

38   M. Beer, 'Introduction', in *The Pioneers of Land Reform* (London, UK: G. Bell & Sons, 1920), p. v.

39   Ebenezer Howard, *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, ed. F. J. Osborn (London, UK: Faber, 1965).

istics during the various nationalization and modernization programs intro-
duced by states in their legitimation politics.[40]

Internal Colonization

Undoubtedly, the 20th century witnessed how the "rural depopulation, anx-
ieties 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 investi-
gation 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. Ac-
cording 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 (underde-
veloped 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)

---

40   Stephen V. Ward, ed., *The Garden City: Past, Present, and Future* (London: Routledge,
      2011).

41   Jeremy Burchardt, "Editorial: Rurality, Modernity and National Identity between Wars,"
      Cambridge University Press, Rural History, 21, no. 2 (2010): 147. Burchardt, "Agricultural
      History, Rural History, or Countryside History?," 465–81.

42   Burchardt, "Editorial: Rurality, Modernity and National Identity between Wars," 147.

territories within state borders."[43] 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.[44] 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"[45] 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

---

43   Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536–1966*, International Library of Sociology (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), 34.

44   Liesbeth van de Grift, 'Introduction: Theories and Practices of Internal Colonization, the Cultivation of Lands and People in the Age of Modern Territoriality', International Journal of History, 3.2 (2015), p. 141.

45   Grift, 142–43.

and communist regimes alike perceived of these projects as the exemplification if their political values and ideologies."[46]

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.[47] 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."[48] In other words, the fascist government intended to accomplish an "agricultural, medical, and social utopia"[49] in the region.[50]

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,

---

46   Liesbeth van de Grift, 'Cultivating Land and People: Internal Colonization in Interwar Europe', in *Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe*, ed. by Liesbeth van de Grift and Amalia Ribi Forclaz (New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2018), pp. 68–92 (p. 69).

47   Carl Schmidt, "Land Reclamation in Fascist Italy," *The Academy of Political Science* 52 (1937): 340–63. Ruth Sterling Frost, "The Reclamation of the Pontine Marshes," *American Geographical Society* 24 (1934): 584–95.

48   Frank Snowden, 'Latina Province, 1944–1950', *Sage Publications*, 43. Relief in the Aftermath of War (2008), 509–26 (p. 510).

49   Snowden, 509.

50   Diane Yvonne Ghirardo, *Building New Communities: New Deal America and Fascist Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989). Daniela Spiegel, *Die Città Nuove Des Agro Pontino Im Rahmen Der Faschistischen Staatsarchitektur*, Berliner Beiträge Zur Bauforschung Und Denkmalpflege 7 (Petersberg: M. Imhof, 2010).

the new towns emerged as a clear example of the practice of internal coloniza-
tion, in which the demonstration of fascism occupied a leading prominent po-
sition.[51]

Internal colonization in Germany evolved out of changing dynamics of
economy, as in the production of agriculture and as a model for Germaniz-
izing and developing the rural population economically in specific regions,
especially in the Polish borders.[52] During the late 19th century and early 20th
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 impor-
tance. 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.[53]

Together with Great Depression, anti-urbanist and ruralist campaign of
National Socialists also lead a series of internal colonization enterprises in Ger-
many. Until the party announced its land reform agricultural plan in 1930, the
National Socialists already started to advocate for a land reform, which essen-
tially involved middle class German farmers and workers in the rural areas con-
trolling the enlargement in the states.[54] From the late 1930s to the early 1940s,

---

51   Özge Sezer, "Imagining the Fascist City: A Comparison between Rome and New Towns
     in the Pontine Marshes during the Fascist Era," in *History Takes Place: Rome: Dynamics of
     Urban Change*, ed. Anna Hofmann and Martin Zimmermann (Berlin: Jovis Berlin, 2016),
     96–107.

52   Dieter Gessner, "Agrarian Protectionism in the Weimar Republic," *Sage Publications* 12,
     no. 4 (1977): 763.

53   Susan R. Henderson, 'Ernst May and the Campaign to Resettle the Countryside: Ru-
     ral Housing in Silesia, 1919–1925', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 61.2
     (2002), 188–211 (pp. 190–92).

54   Johnpeter Horst Grill, "The Nazi Party's Rural Propaganda before 1928," *Central European
     History* 15, no. 2 (1982): 153–55, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4545955.

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.[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.[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.[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-

---

55   Gerhard Wolf, "The East as Historical Imagination and the Germanization Policies of the Third Reich," in *Hitler's Geographies: The Spatialities of the Third Reich*, ed. Paolo Giaccaria and Claudio Minca (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), 95–105.

56   Gerhard Fehl, "The Nazi Garden City," in *The Garden City: Past, Present and Future* (London: E & FN Spon, 1992), 93–95.

57   Grift, "Cultivating Land and People: Internal Colonization in Interwar Europe."

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.[58] 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.[59]

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[60], 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.

59   Raluca Muşat, "Lessons for Modern Living: Planned Rural Communities in Interwar Romania, Turkey and Italy," *Journal of Modern European History* 13, no. 4 (2015): 537–41; Raluca Muşat, "The 'Social Museum' of Village Life," in *Governing the Rural in Interwar Europe*, ed. Amalia Ribi Forclaz and Liesbeth van de Grift (New York: Routledge, 2018), 117–41.

60   For agrarian politics under the Tsarist regime, see Hans Rogger, *Russia in the Age of Modernisation and Revolution, 1881–1917*, Longman History of Russia (London; New York: Longman, 1983), 71–99. Gareth Popkins, "Peasant Experiences of the Late Tsarist State: District Congresses of Land Captains, Provincial Boards and the Legal Appeals Process, 1891–1917," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 78, no. 1 (2000): 90–114, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4213009. For the place of peasantry in the 1917 Revolution in Russia see Orlando Figes, "The Russian Revolution of 1917 and Its Language in the Village," *The Russian Review* 56, no. July (1997): 323–45. Amalendu Guha, 'Lenin on the Agrarian Question', *Social Scientist*, 5.9 (1977), 61–80. The projects of Hannes Meyer in the Soviet Union plays crucial role in demonstrating the ideals of planning and also the internal colonization practices in the country. Hannes Meyer was firstly commissioned of reconstruction and development plan of Moscow in 1931–1932. Afterwards he developed several plans for the rural regions within the Soviet territory: Planning of Satellite town

ter the Second World War in the Israeli Kibbutz[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 20th 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

---

of Nishniy-Kurinsk in 1932, Development Plan of Sozgorod Gorki in 1932, Development Plan of the Capital of Birobidjan State in 1933–1934 and Planning for industrial zone of Perm in 1934; see Claude Schnaidt, *Hannes Meyer: Bauten, Projekte und Schriften; Buildings, Projects and Writings* (Stuttgart: Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1965), pp. 61–76.

61 Here Israeli Kibbutz is considered as a concept in terms of rural community. The concept can be also interpreted as a spatial practice of internal colonization from many angles. For a further reading on this perspective see Paula Rayman, *The Kibbutz Community and Nation Building* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981).; Tal Simons and Paul Ingram, "Organization and Ideology: Kibbutzim and Hired Labor, 1951–1965," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1997): 784–813.; C.W. Efroymson, "Collective Agriculture in Israel," *Journal of Political Economy* 58, no. 1 (1950): 30–46.; Amitai Etzioni, "Agrarianism in Israel's Party System," *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science / Revue Canadienne d'Economique et de Science Politique*, 23, no. 3 (1957): 363–75.; Elihu Katz and S. N. Eisenstadt, "Some Sociological Observations on the Response of Israeli Organizations to New Immigrants," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (1960): 113–33.; Israel Bartal, "Farming the Land on Three Continents: Bilu, Am Oylom, and Yefe-Nahar," *Jewish History* 21, no. 3/4 (2007): 249–61.; for the reading on the scheme of organizations: Josh van Soer and Michael Marek, *Kibbuzhandbuch: Leben und Arbeiten in Kibbuz und Moshav; Hinweise für Volunteers*, 5. Aufl (Stuttgart: Zündhölzchen Verl, 1985).; Richard Kauffmann's works in Kibbutz and early Israeli rural settlements play a crucial role to grasp the subject in architectural and planning terms. Also, M. Uriel Adiv, 'Richard Kauffmann (1887–1958): Das Architektonische Gesamtwerk' (Dissertation, Technische Universität Berlin: Fachbereich 8 Architektur, 1985).

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.