

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

1 Zeki Sayar, "İç Kolonizasyon: Kolonisation Intérieure," *Arkitekt* 62, no. 2 (1936): 46–47.

2 M. Bülent Varlık and Cemil Koçak, eds., *Umumi Müfettişler Konferansı'nda Görüşülen ve Dahiliye Vekâleti'ni İgilendiren İslere Dair Toplantı Zabıtları ile Rapor ve Hulâsası 1936*, 1. Baskı, Dipnot Yayınları Yakin Tarih, 91 6 (Ankara: Dipnot, 2010).; Uğur Ümit Üngör, *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913–1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Veli Yadirgi, *The Political Economy of the Kurds of Turkey: From the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic*, 2017; Joost Jongerden, *The Settlement Issue in Turkey and the Kurds: An Analysis of Spacial Policies, Modernity and War* (Brill, 2007).

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.³ 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.⁴ Besides, the modernization and nationalization of the country through the establishing of a genuine "Turkish Village" was repeatedly discussed by Turkish architects and planners

3 Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, ed. by Ahmet Kuyaş, Yapı Kredi Yayınları Cogito, 1713 117, 7. baskı (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005), İstanbul; Feroz Ahmad, *From Empire to Republic: Essays on the Late Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, İstanbul Bilgi University Press; History, 218–219. 25–26, 1st ed. (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press, 2008), İstanbul; Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford University Press, 1961); Erik Jan Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, New rev. ed (London; New York: I.B. Tauris: Distributed by St. Martin's Press, 1998), London; New York.

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 addresses⁷, 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 These

- 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 *Ülkü* provide significant resource.
- 6 There are significant resources to unveil state's endeavor in Turkification and modernization of rural communities through the new village planning strategies and settlement policies: Varlık and Koçak, *Umumî müfettişler*; Jongerden, *The Settlement Issue in Turkey and the Kurds*; Ramazan Hakkı Öztan, "Settlement Law of 1934: Turkish Nationalism in the Age of Revisionism," *Journal of Migration History* 6, no. 1 (February 17, 2020): 82–103, <https://doi.org/10.1163/23519924-00601006>; Engin Bulut Çağdaş, "Devletin Taşradaki Eli: Umumi Mütettişlikler," *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 11, no. 21 (Bahar 2015) (2015): 83–110; Hüseyin Koca, *Yakın Tarihten Günümüze Hükümetlerin Doğu-Güneydoğu Anadolu Politikaları*, Bilimsel Araştırma Dizisi 04 (Konya: Mikro, 1998).
- 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 Grift 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 inquiries 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. thesis⁹, 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 discord 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.¹⁰ Yet, this volume aims to involve the most

9 Özge Sezer, "Idealization of the Land: Forming the New Rural Settlements in the Early Republican Period of Turkey, 1923–1950" (Dissertation, Berlin, Berlin Technical University, 2020), <http://dx.doi.org/10.14279/depositonce-9811>.

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, *Mübadele Konut ve Yerleşimleri*, 1. baskı (Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Mimarlık Fakültesi, 2004); Ali Cengizkan, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kırsal Yerleşim Sorunları: Ahi Mes'ud 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, İstanbul

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

bul, İstanbul Technical University, 2008); Zeynep Eres, "Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Çağdaş Kırsal Kimliğin Örneklenmesi: Planlı Göçmen Köyleri," *Mimarlık, Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarlığı*, 375, no. Ocak-Şubat (2014), http://www.mimarlikdergisi.com/in_dex.cfm?sayfa=mimarlik&DergiSayi=389&ReclD=3306; Zeynep Eres, "Türkiye'de Kırsal Alanda Çağdaşlaşma ve Mübadil Köyleri," in 90. Yılında Türk-Yunan Zorunlu Nüfus Mübadelesi Sempozyumu: Yeni Yaklaşımlar, Yeni Bulgular Sempozyum Bildiri Metinleri, 16–17 Kasım 2013, ed. Bilge Gönül et al. (İstanbul: Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı Yayınları, 2016), 174–201. Zeynep Kezer fills a significant gap in Turkey's architectural history with her study on the position of Elazığ in early republican politics, pointing out its strategical development in strengthening governmental power over the people in this region. Her contribution furthers the discussion on forceful state interventions, referring not only to the physical suppression of Kurds but also to the cultural propagation of "Turkishness." Kezer's study also clearly exemplifies the role of architecture in the state's interventions and top-down decisions during the nation-building processes. Zeynep Kezer, *Building Modern Turkey: State, Space, and Ideology in the Early Republic*, Culture Politics and the Built Environment (Pittsburgh, Pa: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015); Kezer, "Spatializing Difference."

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 socio-cultural 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 concentrates on the tradition and progress in the methodology, the legislation, and policies in the architectural practice of the “Turkish village.” Firstly, early legislation – the 1924 Village Law and the 1926 Settlement Law – are introduced regarding village construction, and the practices of these organizations are discussed 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 demographic program and accompanying the new village construction program are critically examined in this chapter. These practices are investigated by analyzing 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 historiography 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 architectural documentation.

