

Chapter 4 – Administering the *Rural*: Regulations for the Making of the Modern Turkish Village

Construction of Rural Settlements during the First Years of the Republic

Settlement policy and building typologies in the first years of the republican era were inherited from Ottoman operations which were executed as a result of internal migration and the arrival of refugees from defeated imperial lands into the Anatolian territories. The Ottoman state was confronted with the forced migration of 413,922 people, which required planning, starting from the end of the Balkan Wars between 1913 and 1920.¹ In order to house this group, the Ottoman parliament passed several laws in 1913: initially, a law of 18 March – *Muhacirinin Suret-i İskanı Hakkında Tahrirat-ı Umumiyye ve Talimatnamesi* (General Instructions for Settling the Immigrants) – while on 27 April 1913, within the law *Vilayet İdare-i Sıhhiye Nizamnamesi* (Regulations for Sanitary Matters of the Provinces), the housing of Balkan immigrants came under the administrative purview of the provinces. On 13 May 1913, a new law (*İskan-ı Muhacirin Nizamnamesi* – Regulations for Settling the Immigrants) was enacted to reorganize settlement policies, followed on 29 December by another regulation (*Elli Haneden Aşağı Karye Teşkil Olunmamasına Dair Tahrirat-ı Ummumiye* – Correspondence for Refusal of Village Status of Settlements with Less Than 50 Dwellings), which reorganized the villages along with the new settlements built for the newcomers.

The last legal instructions for settling immigrants were announced by the Ottoman state within the law *Ta'mim ve Talimatname* (Circular Letter and

1 Onur Yıldırım, *Diplomacy and Displacement: Reconsidering the Turco-Greek Exchange of Populations, 1922–1934*, Middle East Studies – History, Politics, and Law (New York: London: Routledge, 2006), p. 90.

Instruction) of 22 June 1916.² The Ottoman authority passed legislation to construct small houses and cottages for urgent cases, redistributing the abandoned properties of the deported population³ as building supplies for the Muslim incomers, and planning “exemplar villages” (*Numune Köyler*)⁴ in several regions.⁵

Turkey’s new parliament was elected, independent of the Ottoman authorities, in 1920 and started Turkey’s Independence War after the First World War occupations and the Greco-Turkish War. The parliament continued the Ottoman housing program for 388.146 Muslims immigrating from former Ottoman territories. On the other hand, 1.221.849 Greeks had to leave the country and vacate their houses and agricultural fields.⁶ As a result of these relocations, the abandoned properties of the deported Greek Orthodox population served as settlement resources for housing operations conducted during the 1920s.

On 26 April 1922, the 1913 law was reformulated in accordance with the new circumstances of the ongoing war, and within the new regulation it was announced that immigrants who had lived in Anatolian territories for less than six years would be housed by the government. The Ministry of Public Health and Welfare and Ministry of Interior and Economy would determine the location of settlements. In every region, settlement commissions would be established, and each commission would have a civilian authority, a doctor, an

-
- 2 Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 55–56.; A. Gündüz Ökçün, ‘İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde Yeni Köylerin Kurulmasına ve Köylerde Çevre Sağlığına İlişkin Tüzeltmeler’, in: *Prof. Fehmi Yavuz’a Armağan*, 528 (Ankara: AÜ Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1983), pp. 171–200 (p. 171).
 - 3 Referring to the Armenian deportation.
 - 4 The Ottoman authority and, later the republican regime, called the new villages, constructed in accordance with the regulations in planning, “exemplar villages” (*Numune Köyler*) with the idea that the new planned villages would be model settlements for further developments.
 - 5 Fuat Dündar, *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Müslümanları İskân Politikası, 1913–1918*, Araştırma-İnceleme Dizisi, 112, 1. baskı (Cağaloğlu, İstanbul: İletişim, 2001), p. 52.
 - 6 Yıldırım, *Diplomacy and Displacement*, 91. Turkey and Greece signed the *Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations* on 30 January 1923. The agreement contained the population exchange also proclaimed in the Treaty of Lausanne on 24 July 1923. See Article 2 in Part VI of the treaty. *Lausanne Peace Treaty VI. Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations Signed at Lausanne, January 30, 1923, 24 July 1923* <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/lausanne-peace-treaty-vi_convention-concerning-the-exchange-of-greek-and-turkish-populations-signed-at-lausanne_en.mfa>.

engineer, an agriculturist, an accountant, and a secretary. In addition to this, members acquainted with the agricultural and socio-cultural capacities of the regions would participate in the commissions, schools would be built, and dwellers would be assisted and encouraged in agrarian activities with credits and subsidiary payments.⁷ On 23 October 1923 the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing (*Mübadele ve İskan Bakanlığı*) was founded just before the proclamation of the republic on 29 October 1923. These first regulations paved the way for the legal organization of the settlements built in the following years.

The 1924 Village Law and the 1926 Settlement Law

In the first years of the republic, the Village Law (number 442), passed on 18 March 1924, played a crucial role in forming rural settlements for newcomers and the existing population. The law established the village as a legislative body of the republican administration, and the social, cultural, and economic nucleus of the country. It contained ten chapters to define the village in administrative terms: finance (self-sufficient practices and state funding), agricultural and constructive works, organization of elections, and assignments of local authority to bodies such as the council, village guard and imam. The Village Act was basically enacted to construct rural Turkey, and it became a practical guide for how to shape the new rural settlements and reshape the villages demolished in the war up until the first years of 1930s.⁸

The public works and land use plan were detailed within articles in the second chapter, including the architectonic formation of the village. The articles principally determined the border of the village territory, reconstruction methods, infrastructure, housing, hygiene, and administrative and institutional units. Architecture was introduced as a topic for sanitation, together with the construction of water infrastructure and sewage system which were a major part of the village planning. The building program included a square, two main streets crossing each other, a house for the village council, a guest-house, a school, shops, and ateliers (for a smithy, a grocery, and repairmen), a garbage treatment house outside the village, a cemetery, fountains, and

7 30 Nisan 329 Tarihli İskan-ı Muhacirin Talimatnemesini Değiştiren Nizamnamenin Yürürlüğe Konması, 1913, TCBCA 030.18.01/04.55.2.; *İskan Tarihçesi* (İstanbul: Hamit Matbaası, 1932), 20–21.; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 20, 99.

8 Köy Kanunu.

a coppice area. On the other hand, the washhouse, public bath, bazaar and shopping area, mill house and irrigation canals around farms were to be built in accordance with the requirements of the villagers and circumstances of the settlement area.⁹

The village building program elaborated in the act was implemented only in a very limited scope. During the first years of the republic, the villages were built to solve the housing problem for immigrants and veterans rather than with the aim of building ideal settlements in the countryside. Although the first implementations of the Village Law consisted of organized dwelling areas with basic infrastructure (housing plots, a school, a mosque, a fountain, and the roads), this act paved the way for the reconstruction of the country beginning with rural areas. It was one of the most significant legal changes the republican regime put on the agenda, even considering later regulations for organization and operation of infrastructure, and dwelling in the rural built environment, such as the Settlement Law of 1926, the Municipal Corporations Law and Public Health Law of 1930, and the Municipal Buildings and Roads Law of 1933.¹⁰

Following the passage of the Village Law in March 1924, the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing implemented the building program across 10 regions where the cities and towns had adequate infrastructure, areas for village construction, and properties left by the deported population.¹¹ First, the settling policy was implemented, utilizing the estates of the leaving population, and renovating houses for newcomers. In a regulation enacted on 6 July

9 Ibid, p. 239 (2. Fasil 13. Madde).

10 Eres, "Türkiye'de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu," 101.

11 Kemal Ari states that the first region included the cities of Sinop, Samsun, Ordu, Giresun, Trabzon, Gümüşhane, Amasya, Tokat, Çorum; the second region included the cities of Edirne, Tekfurdağı (Tekirdağ), Gelibolu, Kırkkilise (Kırklareli), Çanakkale; the third region included the city of Balıkesir; the fourth region included the cities of İzmir, Manisa, Aydın, Menteşe, Afyon; the fifth region included the city of Bursa; the sixth region included the cities of İstanbul, Çatalca, Zonguldak; the seventh region included the cities of İzmit, Bolu, Bileceik, Eskişehir, Kütahya; the eighth region included the cities of Antalya, Isparta, Burdur; the ninth region included the cities of Konya, Niğde, Kayseri, Aksaray, Kırşehir; and the tenth region included the cities of Adana, Mersin, Silifke, Kozan, Ayıntab (Gaziantep), Maraş. Kemal Arı, *Büyük Mübadele: Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç, 1923–1925*, Türkiye Araştırmaları 17 (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995), 52–53.

1924, the ministry declared that the government would distribute the lands after the arrival of the farmer immigrants.¹² In relatively developed provinces like Samsun, Bursa, İzmir, İzmit, Manisa and Adana, new villages were constructed consisting of up to 50 dwellings, a school, and a mosque. In 1933 there were 69 new rural settlements built by the state in accordance with the principles of the Village Law.¹³


Another crucial legislative attempt at solving the rural housing problem was the Settlement Law (number 885) enacted on 31 May 1926. The principles underlying this legislation were housing the exchanged population and seeking low-cost formulas for dwelling and reconstruction works. In other words, the law applied to the organization of existing building reserves as well as to new settlements, considering the economic circumstances and the adaptation of numerous groups into the socio-cultural and economic planning of the country. Within the 1926 Settlement Law, regulations about the new settlements addressed similar concerns as the 1924 Village Law: the building program for each village included a school, mosque, bath, bazaar, police station, cemetery, and pasture for public facilities, along with infrastructure and a dwelling area.¹⁴ Together with the 1924 Village Law, the 1926 Settlement Law shaped the measures for the planning of rural settlements, and hence villages, during the first 10 years of the republic.

12 TBMM, *Terkedilmiş Gayrimenkulün Iskan Edilme Hakkını Haiz Göçmenler ve Aşiretlere Tevzii Hakkında Yönetmelik*, 1924, TCBCA 030.18.01.01/010.33.20(1+4).; *İskan Tarihçesi*, 22–32.; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 139–44.

13 Nedim İpek, ‘Göçmen Köylerine Dair’, *Tarih ve Toplum*, 150. Haziran (1996), 15–21 (p. 19).; Kozanoğlu, ‘Köy Evleri Proje ve Yapıları İçin Toplu Rapor,’ 203.; Arı, *Büyük Mübadele*, 66.; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 28–29. Ali Cengizkan states that in 1924, 14 villages (seven in Samsun, two each in İzmir and Bursa, one each in İzmit, Adana and Antalya) were built; however, Zeynep Eres claimed that there were 32 villages under construction, with some of the settlements not having recorded place names. Eres, ‘Türkiye’de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu,’ 115–16.

14 *İskan Tarihçesi*, 76–80.

Figure 4.1. *Low-Cost House (İktisadi Hane), 1925.*¹⁵



Alongside this legislative framework, ensuring that housing in the settlements met a set standard was one of the most immediate tasks. The state prepared a dwelling typology that could be practically implemented in the given circumstances with low expenses. In 1925, *İktisadi Hane* (The Low-Cost House) was introduced with the elaboration of proposals for immigrants following the Balkan Wars and during the First World War (Figure 4.1). According to the document dated 10 February 1925, low-cost houses were constructed in several cities in Anatolia in the new rural settlements, differing slightly due to local conditions. But there were building principles that every province abided by:

15 *Low-Cost Housing Typology – TCBCA 272.80/3.9.3 (5).*

the wall to separate houses from each other should be made of mud bricks, other walls should be constructed in timber, the chimney should be made of stone, and the roof should be covered with roof tiles. Each unit included four houses, each of which had two rooms without a toilet, kitchen, and bathroom, arrayed under one roof.¹⁶

Conditions after the wars, particularly from the beginning of the 20th century, designated the program of construction of the new settlements in the first years of the republic. The regulations and instructions, determined during the last years of the Ottoman Empire, also developed a blueprint for the early republican cadre. The previous implementations were adapted to the circumstances of the country; they prepared the legislative framework for the administration of rural Turkey. The 1924 Village Law, the 1926 Settlement Law and the “Low-Cost Dwelling” of 1925 guided the first years of operations in constructing new rural settlements all over the country.

Building the Rural Settlements during the 1920s

One of the first implementations of the Village Law and the low-cost housing typology was constructed in Manisa at the end of 1924. Çobanisa Village was planned by the architect Mesut Özok of the İzmir Population Exchange and Housing Authority and constructed by the engineer Galip Bey.¹⁷

The plan for a 44.616m² area was divided into six streets along the north–south axis, five streets along the west–east axis, and 22 building parcels. Public buildings were located in the middle of the east–west axis, including 12 shops, a mosque, a guesthouse, a gendarmerie station, a school, four fountains, a barn, a bakery, and a bazaar area. The northern part was set aside for agrarian activities, with 12.000m² land for each family in the village. The cemetery and coppice were placed in the southern part of the village. The washhouse and the mill were located on the edges of the east–west axis.

The site between the northern and southern part of the village was planned as a dwelling area, with 58 houses according to the plan.¹⁸ The houses, attached

16 “Low-Cost Housing Typology – TCBCA 272.80/3.9.3 (5),” TCBCA 272.80/3.9.3 (5) § (1925); Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 182.

17 *Document on Kıyas and Çobanisa*, 1924, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/12.59.12.; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 39–40, 43, 46, 86., Eres, “Türkiye’de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu,” 130–32.

18 However, the village was built with 52 houses.

to each other along the east–west axis, were located in a parcel of 200–300m². The units were facing the street with a small garden, and backyards were attached to each other along the north–south axis with larger orchards. Housing units consisted of two dwellings under a single roof. The interior was divided into an entrance hall, two rooms, a kitchen, and a toilet partition.¹⁹ They were designed as one-storey masonry buildings with timber on the room floors and concrete slabs on the toilet partition and kitchen floors. However, the houses were built as two-storey buildings. Each house was situated according to the slope and separated into two layers along the vertical axis: the upper part was the living area and entrance facing the street, while the lower layer was used as a small corral and the backyard entrance, divided into two rooms.

The survey report of 28 April 1924 announced that the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing planned to construct new villages in several districts in Manisa, such as Soma and Bozköy. The report also focused on the settlement in Bozköy, which was demolished after the deportation of the Greek Orthodox population, but still had 15 houses and a school in the center. Although the town had been destroyed, local people were settled in the abandoned properties in the surrounding villages. But this solution could not fulfil the housing needs of the incoming immigrants. In addition to this, the site was accessible by rail, and the building materials would be easily provided by the quarry in the region. Therefore, the committee of Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing decided to build a settlement in Bozköy, Manisa.²⁰

The state sent guidance to the governors in the provinces in March 1924, including İzmir, introducing the village building principles in the city. The Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing communicated to the local authority in İzmir that two rural settlements consisting of 150–200 dwellings would be built in İzmir and Manisa by the end of 1924. To determine the building site, the ministry called the commission to İzmir to propose convenient areas where the transportation network (mostly railways), agricultural potential and resources for building material (mostly quarries) fulfilled the construction plan, and to

19 The niche in the wall separating the kitchen and the bigger room was designed as a small part for bathing and a garderobe. The kitchen was located on the wall to which the buildings were attached and here there was a hole left for chimney. This wall was thicker than other separation walls. According to the project, each unit had a 50cm basement wall. The wooden roof had a height of 300cm. The double-sided exterior walls were 240cm high and each window was 125cm X 170cm.

20 *Survey Report on Building Villages in İzmir and Manisa*, 1924, TCBCA 272.80/3.6.8.

prepare the base maps of these areas. Moreover, the ministry instructed the local commission in İzmir to prepare a survey report of demolished rural settlements to improve the living conditions of the local population in these areas.²¹

The document dated 3 December 1924 shows that these two settlements were Çobanisa village in Manisa and Kıyas (or Kayas) village in İzmir. Like Çobanisa Village, Kıyas Village was also planned by architect Mesut Özok,²² but built by engineer Dervis Bey. It consisted of 50 houses that had been constructed since early 1925 using similar methods and materials to Çobanisa Village in Manisa.²³

The survey report dated 28 April 1924 introduced the detailed planning and the schemes of other settlements, which would be built in Kuşçular (in Urla district) and Kısıkköy in İzmir. Around Kuşçular village, immigrants had already started to settle into abandoned properties, but the number of buildings did not meet the housing needs of the incoming people. The area was well cultivated, convenient for agrarian activities, and with water access. Also, it was close to the quarries that would be used in construction for building materials. According to the report, houses were planned as stone-masonry buildings with lime-plastered walls and tiled roofs. Likewise, Kısıkköy – a former Greek village demolished during the war – was presented as another suitable place for a new settlement. The area was well connected to the railway between the city harbor and agricultural lands, and close to water sources, while the site was convenient for agrarian activities. Therefore, the committee proposed building another settlement in Kısıkköy consisting of stone-masonry houses for immigrants.²⁴

Moreover, a document dated 10 February 1925 announced that the low-cost housing in convenient districts of cities like Samsun, Amasya, and Çorum would efficiently house a large number of newcomers. The construction would also continue in İzmir, the city to which the majority of the population was deported.²⁵

Samsun, which was depopulated after the War of Independence and the Greco-Turkish War, was planned to house the newcomers in the abandoned

21 Turkish transcription of the letter; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 172.

22 Ibid, p. 86.

23 Document on Kıyas and Çobanisa.

24 *Survey Report on Building Villages in İzmir and Manisa*, TCBCA 272.80/3.6.8.

25 *Low-Cost Housing Typology*, TCBCA 272.80/3.9.3 (5).

properties in the city and the former villages. However, the condition of the building reserve and the villages did not provide suitable conditions for locals or to settle the immigrants. Therefore in 1924, under the control of Ministry of Population Exchange Housing and Housing, construction of new settlements began with 50 houses in five locations, called Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, and Çırağman,²⁶ and continued until 1926.²⁷

İsmailzade Osman Bey was employed to construct masonry houses in five villages, using mud bricks as the building material. However, at the end of 1924, the construction method was changed to timber by the ministry in response to climatic conditions.²⁸ Bey continued building the houses with a timber construction and stone foundation, mud-brick infill walls, and lime plaster.²⁹

In addition to the settlements in Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, and Çırağman, low-cost houses in other villages were built for immigrants and local people who lived in severe circumstances in the city and in the rural areas around Samsun. Also, between 1924 and 1926 cottages were constructed in convenient areas around the city to address urgent housing needs.³⁰

A document dated 9 March 1924 describes the government's first attempt at the planning of villages in rural districts of Bursa. As a result of the war conditions, the center and the rural region of the province were demolished. Furthermore, the abandoned properties would not be able to accommodate the

26 *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, 18.01.1925, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/12.70.1-1. and *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/12.70.1-2; *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, 1924, TCBCA 272.11/18.87.7.

27 *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, 1926, TCBCA 030.18.01/017.94.2. Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 228.

28 *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/12.58.12.

29 *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, 1925, TCBCA 272.80/4.10.9.

30 The implementations of "low-cost houses" in Samsun started in 1925, in accordance with the sources of *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, 1925, TCBCA 272.11/21.103.15. and *Document on Canik, Aksarağaç, Ökse, Çınarağıl, Çırağman*, 1925, 272.80/4.10.15. Ali Cengizkan also pointed out that there were more housing constructions than the five settlements documented in the archives. He referred to the surveys of Nedim İpek about the population exchange in Samsun. Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 42–43. Nedim İpek, *Mübadele ve Samsun*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları. XVI. Dizi, Sayı 85 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2000), p. 85. For a reading of further documents on construction works and correspondences about the new settlements in Samsun: Eres, "Türkiye'de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu," 121–26.

needs of the incoming people and locals. The governor of Bursa declared that in the Kalder, Tepecik and Tahtalı districts in the centre, Armudlu and Kurşunlu in Gemlik district, Emirali, Burgaz and Veledler in Mudanya district, and Baş, Karacaoba, İkizce(oba), Kemberbend and the town center in Karacabey district, the agricultural land was suitable, but the housing areas had been badly destroyed. Therefore, he proposed that these areas be planned by a group of experts – an architect, an engineer, a building contractor, and a technician – from the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing.³¹

At the beginning of 1925 it was also planned to build low-cost houses in convenient areas, parallel to the construction of new villages.³² After three months, immigrants were settled in an abandoned Greek village, Filader, in the houses that had been built by the dwellers themselves. But the governor asked the ministry for permission to clear up the demolished houses and to construct an “exemplar village” here.³³

Moreover, the construction of the new settlements based on the principles of the 1924 Village Law started in the same year in Karacaoba and İkizceoba. Here, the governor of Bursa pointed out convenient locations for the new villages to the commission of the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing. According to the document dated 3 December 1924, the settlements were built and consisted of 50 timber houses in each village. The completion date of the work was set for 13 November 1924. However, due to the weather conditions, and a delay in the arrival of building elements such as windows and doors provided by the ministry, the construction work was postponed to April 1925.³⁴ The houses and the organization of dwellings and other buildings were planned by the architect Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu,³⁵ who worked in the Ministry of Popula-

31 *Document on Village Planning in Bursa, 1924*, TCBCA 272.80/3.5.2. and Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 171.

32 *Document on Building Low-Cost Houses in Bursa, 1925*, TCBCA 272.80/3.8.13.

33 *Document on Filader*, 26.06.1924, TCBCA 272.11/18.87.5. According to Zeynep Eres, the village was being built up until the end of 1920s and was used as an example in a cultural geography book for high school scholars. Eres, “Türkiye’de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu,” 127.

34 *Document on Karacaoba and İkizceoba*, 03.12.1924, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/12.59.9.

35 According to a document dated 30 March 1924, Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu analyzed the work of the ministry and criticized the organization of its housing of immigrants. He criticized the settlements and the bad condition of abandoned houses and construction material in new houses. *Document on Arif Hikmet Koyunoğlu, 1924*, TCBCA 30.18.1.1272.11/17.80.11.; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 229–31. He had a sig-

tion Exchange and Housing and later in the Housing Department within the Ministry of Interior. There, during the first years of the republic, he focused on the planning of villages and village houses, and the reconstruction of abandoned buildings.³⁶

During the mid-1920s housing for newcomers in Antalya, Adana, and Mersin – three cities located in southern Anatolia – was built by the government following the same principles of regular village planning practiced in other parts of the country. Documents show that Çirkinoba Village was built in Antalya, and several farms and cultivated areas were transformed into settlements in Adana and Mersin during the second half of 1920s.

According to correspondence dated 12 February 1925, Çirkinoba Village was under construction. However, difficult weather conditions and diseases like influenza and malaria in the district badly affected work in the construction areas. Therefore, the completion of settlement was postponed until April 1925.³⁷ The building methods and materials were not mentioned in the document, but timber cottages with mud-brick fill were probably used as these were the materials and methods used in the other settlements in Adana and Mersin.

The construction of dwellings for the exchanged population in Adana and Mersin started in April 1924.³⁸ Mehmet Emin Bey, the director of the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing in Adana, proposed the Madama farm and surrounding cultivated area to begin the construction, and prepared a scheme for the settlement.³⁹ In September, the council of ministers agreed to accelerate the operations in Adana and to construct timber cottages in the rural areas for housing the newcomers.⁴⁰

nificant impact in forming the early republican conception of rural settlement and the rural house in the 1930s.

- 36 Nurcan İnci Fırat, *Ankara'da Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimarisinden İki Örnek: Etnografya Müzesi ve Eski Türk Ocağı Merkez Binası; (Devlet Resim ve Heykel Müzesi)*, T. C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları Yayınlar Dairesi Başkanlığı Sanat eserleri dizisi, 2188 203, 1. Baskı (Ankara, 1998), p. 145; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 84–86.
- 37 *Document on Çirkinoba*, 1925, TCBCA 30.18.1.1./12.75.13., and Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 42.
- 38 *Document on Building Houses for Immigrants in Adana*, 1924, TCBCA 272.80/3.6.1. See also Eres, "Türkiye'de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu," 116–19.
- 39 *Document on Madama*, 1924, TCBCA 272.80/3.6.14. Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 174.
- 40 *Document on Building Cottages in Adana*, 1924, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/10.42.16.

One month later, it was decided to build cottages in Kozan, Adana, and an agreement was concluded between the constructor Hilmi Bey and the director of Population Exchange and Housing commission in Kozan, Halid Bey. The agreement contained the details of eight cottages that were constructed using timber supports, roof and walls filled with mud and sedge, and including four rooms.⁴¹ Furthermore, Bedros farm in Yumurtalik, Adana was organized for a settlement with 50 dwellings. In November 1924, the director of Population Exchange and Housing commission in Yumurtalik, Hüsnü Bey, and the constructor Riza Bey agreed on constructing the cottages with the same technique.⁴² Within the same correspondence it was also agreed to start building a settlement for 34 cottages in Yuvanaki farm in Mersin. Another document from 13 July 1925 introduced the base map of the settlement, including 40 dwellings and their conditions.⁴³

Housing the newcomers in Izmit province (including Bilecik) was implemented through two government procedures, starting in 1924. For the first, the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing announced that the immigrants would construct the settlements according to their own ability, and additionally the government would build two settlements in the area. These villages would consist of 150–200 dwellings, 50 of which would be built by the end of 1924. The commissions in the region would decide on the area and prepare the documents (such as base maps). Then a committee of an architect (or civil engineer), engineer and agriculturist would visit the site to develop settlement schemes. For the second procedure, villages that had been demolished in the

41 *Document on Building Cottages in Kozan, Adana, 1924*, TCBCA 272.80/3.7.24; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 175–77. According to the planning details, it was mentioned in the agreement that the each cottage had four rooms. This shows that the cottages were built according to the 'low-cost house' type but using local materials and construction methods. Each cottage had four rooms and each room had a door and window. On the corners, around doors and windows, 45 cm-wide timber pillars should be constructed. The circumference of central pillars should be at least 60 cm between vertical pillars; in every 40–50 cm, horizontal timbers should be located and bays between the grids should be filled with knotgrass. Each side of the wall should be plaster with mud. Interior walls should have a double grid and the roof should be covered with sedge and mud.

42 *Documents on Yuvanaki and Yumurtalık, 1924*, TCBCA 272.80/3.8.2.; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 178–81.

43 *Document on Yuvanaki, 1925*, TCBCA 272.80/4.10.11.; Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 216.

war would be assessed for the reconstruction of houses and new infrastructure in these areas. The governors would also take into account sanitation and economic circumstances.⁴⁴

A document dated 29 April 1924 shows that the Ministry of Population Exchange and Housing provided site plans and typological plans for houses in the settlements that the immigrants constructed. Engineer Ismail Bey worked on the plan and decided on the final changes during the implementation. The same document also includes correspondence regarding Mihalic village, where construction was completed by the immigrants. Building of the village was accelerated due to the urgency of settling the people, and architect Edhem Bey was sent to the site to reorganize the construction work.⁴⁵

Construction of new villages in Ankara was put on the state's agenda while Ankara was emerging as the capital city of Turkey. A document dated on 9 May 1928 presented the parliament's decision to construct new settlements for immigrants along the railway lines between Eskişehir and Ankara, equipping the area with public facilities and modern infrastructure. The settlements would be built after an agricultural study of the site to provide the agrarian framework for the settlers. It was planned to build Etimesgut (or Ahi-Mes'ud) village along the Yahşihan–Eskişehir line, and Malıköy and Samutlu villages along the Beypazarı–Ayaş–Polatlı line in the west of Ankara.⁴⁶

According to a document of 30 April 1930, Malıköy was constructed with 29 dwellings designed in accordance with the principles of low-cost housing for newcomers from Bulgaria.⁴⁷ Other records from 3 September 1930 and 8 October 1930 concerned Samutlu village, which was built for immigrants who had not been settled until that year. The village was organized not only for dwellings, but also for infrastructure to support settlers' agricultural activities.⁴⁸

44 Cengizkan, *Mübadele konut ve yerleşimleri*, 172–73; Eres, "Türkiye'de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu," 120.


45 *Ibid.*, pp. 172–73, 184; *Ibid.*

46 *Document on New Villages along the Eskişehir-Ankara Railway Line*, 1928, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/28.29.12.

47 *Document on Malıköy*, 1930, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/02.10.27.11.

48 *Document on Samutlu*, 1930, 30.18.1.1/02.13.5.; *Document on Samutlu*, 1930, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/02.14.64.

Figure 4.2. Village houses and other public buildings in Etimesgut, 1930s.⁴⁹



Regulations of the 1924 Village Law and 1926 Settlement Law were implemented in Etimesgut (Ahi Mes'ud). On 16 and 28 May 1928, it was agreed to adapt one of the farms in the Atatürk Forest Farms (*Atatürk Orman Çiftliği*) for model villages,⁵⁰ and one month later the first phase of the construction of Etimesgut village started.⁵¹ According to documents of 10 and 21 October 1928, the building program included the dwelling area, train station, village hospital, government house, guesthouse, coffee house, bazaar area, boarding school, and coppice. The land around the settlement was provided for agricultural activities for the dwellers. The northern part of the settlement, separated from the village by the railway line, was planned as a housing area for the agricultural technicians who would assist the villagers in agrarian work. Within two months, 50 houses had already been built. Stone and mud bricks were the construction materials. Each house consisted of two rooms, a penthouse for farming equipments, and a corral for animals (**Figures 4.2**).⁵²

49 *Yabancı Gözüyle Cumhuriyet Türkiyesi* (Ankara: Dahiliye Vekaleti, Matbuat Umum Müdürlüğü, 1938).

50 *Document on Etimesgut (Ahi Mes'ud)*, 16.05.1928, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/29.32.1.; *Document on Etimesgut (Ahi Mes'ud)*, 28.05.1928, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/29.35.9.

51 *Document on Etimesgut (Ahi Mes'ud)*, 10.06.1928, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/29.36.18.

52 *Document on Etimesgut (Ahi Mes'ud)*, 10.10.1928, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/30.61.4.; *Document on Etimesgut (Ahi Mes'ud)*, 21.10.1928, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/30.63.9. All agricultural materials

The rural settlements planned during the first years of the republic were mostly constructed as a result of the housing emergency. They were therefore characterized by an agglomeration of dwellings with a simple necessary infrastructure. Nevertheless, Etimesgut was designed in accordance with the modern urbanization building program. Developed simultaneously with the urbanization of Ankara, Etimesgut is key to understanding the patterns and/or distinctness of building actions in the city and countryside during the first years of the republican period.⁵³

During the first years of the republican regime, village construction was central in the larger theme of housing the existing population and the exchanged people coming into the country from the former Ottoman terrains. All the correspondence, contracts, and ministry council decisions during the 1920s present a picture of consent about immediately settling the incoming people. They also demonstrate the lack of economic and organizational frameworks for the projects of the early republican state. In other words, until the early 1930s village planning had been undertaken by the republican regime to solve concrete problems of the country, such as reconstructing the building stock and infrastructure in the cities and towns, housing the population consisting of locals and immigrants, and establishing economic welfare in the country. As a result, the first programs had a pragmatic tone in the regime's efforts, rather than forming an idealized land in rural Turkey.

Building the Republican Villages

A general overview of 1930s Turkey leads us to some crucial points. The first is that the Great Depression in the western world had a robust impact on Turkey's economy, and Turkey needed to consolidate its foreign policy due to the approaching war in Europe. The second concerns the domestic programs of the Turkish state: consolidation of the RPP, hence the Kemalist regime, after 1930 had a great impact on the planning the country in its socio-cultural, economic, and political aspects. The newcomers who arrived after the Treaty

such as tools, stores, and animals were given to the dwellers by the government. *Document on Etimesgut (Ahi Mes'ud)*, 21.10.1928, TCBCA 30.18.1.1/30.62.14.

53 For the comment, see Cengizkan, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kırsal Yerleşim Sorunları: Ahi Mes'ud Numune Köyü," 113–16.

of Lausanne with Bulgaria and the Treaty of Amity with Romania⁵⁴ demanded immediate housing. The existing population, of which the majority were living in rural areas, abandoned properties and demolished villages, were also in need of better living conditions. In addition, with the one-party regime, the village as a community – for rural people and the rural administration – emerged as the nucleus of the RPP's nation-building, Turkification, and consolidation of state power. These fundamental facts determined the principles of architectural planning of the villages during the 1930s.

The most significant influence of the political environment appeared in eastern Anatolia. Starting from the first years of the republic, the eastern population forcefully resisted the Kemalist regime due to ethnic and political discrimination and poverty in the region. In response, when the regime gained the tools to consolidate its power in the 1930s, it also developed a radical authority in the country on its way to “building the nation”.⁵⁵ Relatedly, the or-

54 On 18 October 1925 the Treaty of Amity between Turkey and Bulgaria was concluded. From 1930 to 1939, more than 80.000 Turco-Bulgarians immigrated into the country. On 17 October 1933 the Treaty of Amity between Turkey and Romania was concluded. This treaty also paved the way for the immigration of the Turco-Romanian populace up until the early 1950s. See Yüksel Kaştan, “Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye-Bulgaristan İlişkileri,” *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi* XXIV, no. 72 (2008), <http://www.atam.gov.tr/de rgi/sayi-72/ataturk-donemi-turkiye-bulgaristan-iliskileri>; TBMM, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ile Romanya Arasında Dostluk, İyi Komşuluk ve İşbirliği Antlaşmasının Onaylanmasının Uygun Bulunduğuna Dair Kanun Tasarısı ve Dışişleri Komisyonu Raporu (1/323)* (Ankara: TBMM, 13 January 1992), p. 8 <<https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanaklar/TUTANAK/TBMM/d19/co 32/tbmm19032080ss0157.pdf>>.

55 The first revolt against the new republican government occurred on 13 February 1925 in Diyarbakır, led by Sheikh Mehmet Said on the grounds that the new regime ignored the Kurdish populace and their demands after the legitimization of Turkey in the Lausanne Treaty. Üngör, pp. 124–25. The resistance was forcefully repressed by the state, and the cabinet released a large-scale program to put down resistance in the eastern provinces, hence the Kurdish population, including deportation of the rioters and Kurdish intelligentsia from the region. *Şark Islahat Planı*, the Reformation Plan of the East, was concluded on 25 September 1925 by the cabinet. Before the implementation of the reformation plan, the country separated into general inspectorships the one region that enclosed the Kurdish provinces in the east. The general inspector would work with the experts of the ministries and the military to operate the reformation plan in the east. The regulation included 28 articles in which the Turkification of the region would be discussed and scheduled in various areas, including settling the Turkish people in abandoned properties of Armenians in the Kurdish provinces; assigning the Turkish people in the governmental, administrative and judicial position in the Kur-

ganization of rural Turkey, and hence the construction of villages, reached its second phase, becoming a great instrument of demographic engineering in the country on behalf of the Kemalist government.

Deportation of the Kurdish population from the eastern provinces led to an increase in abandoned property stock, adding abandoned housing from the deportation of Armenians in 1915.⁵⁶ The eastern provinces, such as Diyarbakır, Elazığ, Tunceli and Malatya, became emerging areas for the settlement of Turkish-speaking people, especially from Balkan countries. Accordingly, the demographic formation of the country became the fundamental operation in

dish provinces; and inflicting punishment on people who would speak Kurdish. Mehmet Bayrak, "‘Şark Islahat Planı’ ve TC’nin Kürt Politikası," in *Resmî Tarih Tartışmaları 6: Resmî Tarihte Kürt’ler*, Özgür Üniversite Kitaplığı 76 (Ankara: Maki, 2009), 389–94. This regulation demonstrated that the state sought to resolve problems with the opposition through ethnic conflicts targeting the Kurdish people. This caused another revolt between 1927 and 1930 in the Ararat province. According to Uğur Ümit Üngör, "the Kurdish-nationalist organization ‘Independence’ (*Xoybun*) entrenched itself in the Ararat region and forcefully resisted the Kemalist government with demands of autonomy. Again, the Kemalists responded with violence and a local conflagration grew into a guerrilla war quite similar to the Sheikh Said conflict (in 1925)" *Ibid.*, p. 148). After the suppression of the Ararat revolt, the state consolidated political power again, announcing the single-party government of the RPP followed by legislation and regulations for the reorganization of the Kurdish populace on behalf of the Turkish state. Between 1937 and 1938 the state faced another collective resistance from the Kurds in the Dersim Revolt—a more localized opposition in Tunceli Province. This time Kemalist regime used army forces to suppress the rebellion and demolished the area. Faik Bulut, *Dersim Raporları: İnceleme*, 3. Basım, Evrensel Basım Yayın Kürt Tarihi ve Kültürü Dizisi 281–14 (İstanbul: Evrensel, 2005). For another reading of the revolts during the early republican period: Robert Olson, "The Kurdish Rebellions of Sheikh Said (1925), Mt. Ararat (1930), and Dersim (1937–8): Their Impact on the Development of the Turkish Air Force and on Kurdish and Turkish Nationalism," *Die Welt Des Islams* 40, no. 1 (2000): 67–94, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1571104>.

- 56 Notable publications about the Armenian diaspora include the following: *The Armenian Genocide: The Essential Reference Guide*, ed. by Alan Whitehorn (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, an imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2015), pp. 1–11, 17–19.; Taner Akçam, *The Young Turks’ Crime Against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*, Human Rights and Crimes against Humanity (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012).; Ronald Grigor Suny, Fatma Müge Göçek, and Norman M. Naimark, eds., *A Question of Genocide: Armenians and Turks at the End of the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).; Tacy Atkinson, *The German, the Turk and the Devil Made a Triple Alliance: Harpoot Diaries, 1908–1917*, Armenian Genocide Documentation Series (Princeton, NJ: Comidas Inst, 2000).

domestic politics and dominated building policy in rural Turkey during the 1930s.

Yet, east Anatolia was not the only region where the new population strategy changed the built environment. West Anatolia, east Thrace and some small cities in central Anatolia witnessed the nation-building project through the transfer of people. Establishing new villages, reorganizing existing settlements, and arranging properties for newcomers in towns and cities had been conducted after the population exchange agreements of Lausanne Treaty that brought Muslim people from the Greek hinterlands into the country. Strategies had also been implemented following the 1924 Village Law and the 1926 Settlement Law. However, in the 1930s the state needed new settlement legislation that would emphasize Turkification as a demographic policy. The peace treaties between Bulgaria and Turkey in 1925, and between Romania and Turkey in 1933⁵⁷, also paved the way for the new population strategies. This time, the immigrants would play a crucial role in forming a loyal “Turkish” society that merged with the existing population. Furthermore, the newcomers were mostly villagers and peasants in their home countries, making them suitable subjects for the state’s socio-cultural and economic policies for rural areas.

Parliamentary discussions also explicitly demonstrated the economic, demographic, and ethnic planning aims of settlement policies. In 1934, Interior Minister Şükrü Kaya announced:

“There are approximately two million pure Turks abroad in our near surroundings. It is almost mandatory for them to come to the homeland little by little [...] It is then our obligation to settle them according to the social and economic principles that the science of settlements necessitates [...] A nation’s biggest duty is to annex everybody living within its borders to its own community, to assimilate them. The opposite has been seen with us and has dismembered the homeland.”⁵⁸

In another report, Diyarbakır’s second General Inspector Ahmet Hilmi Ergeneli detailed the Kurdish deportation and the organization of newcomer settlement. He strongly advised that the living conditions of the new settlements in which the immigrants – “our racial brothers” in his words – would be

57 Kaştan, “Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye-Bulgaristan İlişkileri.”

58 “TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, IV. Dönem, 3. Devre (TBMM Journal of Official Report, Period IV, Session 3)” 23 (June 14, 1934): 141, 249. Quoted from: Üngör, p. 149.

settled should be much more developed than their places of origin to comfort them in the country. He suggested building convenient infrastructure and designating economic and social facilities such as “financial rewards and advanced educational opportunities, high-quality housing, children’s playgrounds and sport facilities”. These groups should be housed near the railways so that “strategic areas would be populated by a ‘reliable population’”.⁵⁹

Furthermore, from 5 to 22 December 1936, the Interior Minister Şükrü Kaya brought together the General Inspectors – Abidin Özmen, Kazım Dirik, Tahsin Uzer, and Abdullah Alpdoğan – in Ankara to reevaluate, first, the state’s control mechanisms in the eastern Anatolian cities, the deportation of Kurds and settlement affairs, and second, the modernization program in rural Anatolia. Discussions during this conference appeared as crucial documents showing a picture of Turkey in the political, socio-cultural, economic, and demographic frameworks from a wider point of view. Yet the consolidation of the regime, and the Turkification of the non-Turkish population in particular, emerged at the center of the debate: the committee agreed that “there is a Kurdishness Cause in the East” that urgently required a response. To ease the obstacles in the eastern provinces, they concluded that the officials who would work in the east would be chosen among Turkish people with encouragement from government through a higher salary, housing, and the possibility of promotion. The new rural settlements would be built on the sides of the railways to house Turkish people. Considering the demographic demand of the state, these settlements could serve the increasing number of Turkish-speaking immigrants. Local commissions and the general inspectors of each region would organize the construction of the new settlements. The government would supply the economic and socio-cultural infrastructure through the People’s House, using it as a significant tool to plant Turkishness in “non-Turkish places”.⁶⁰

On the other hand, during the conference other groups such as Pomaks, Cherkes and Jews were also discussed in terms of assimilation: Pomaks and Cherkes, who mostly inhabited the Thrace region, were found “adaptable” into Turkish culture because they spoke a dialect close to the Turkish language. Through culture programs they would be practically adapted to “Turkishness”.

59 Ahmet Hilmi Ergeneli, ‘Ergeneli to İnönü’, 10 November 1934, BCA, 69.457.24. in: Hüseyin Koca, *Yakın Tarihten Günümüze Hükümetlerin Doğu-Güneydoğu Anadolu Politikaları*, Bilimsel Araştırma Dizisi, 04 (Konya: Mikro, 1998), pp. 416–20. Quoted from: Üngör, p. 154.

60 Varlık and Koçak, pp. 16–17.

However, the committee found the Jewish population in the Thrace region a crucial threat because they dominated the local economy in the rural areas, small cities, and towns.⁶¹ The debate on the Jewish people in the Thrace region dated back to the early years of 1930s. When the Thrace region was included in the General Inspectorships, the authority first imposed Turkish dominance by deporting Jews and Bulgarians from provinces in the region such as Kırklareli, Edirne, Çanakkale and Tekirdağ. But the reports mostly concentrated on the Jews, declaring them “unreliable” and condemning their controlling of the trade activities in the cities and towns. In addition to this, nationalist and antisemitic writers⁶² paved the way for the increase of hostility among the local Turks against the Jews. In July 1934, the result was another deportation: Jewish people were expelled from the region and forced to Turkify and/or sent to larger cities such as Istanbul and İzmir.⁶³

Similar to the tactics in the east, the settlement policy in the western provinces would also center on the legitimation of the state and the domination of “Turkishness”. Balkan immigrants would again play a significant role, not only in smoothing out the ethnic characteristics of inhabitants, but also in serving the rural economic program by laboring in agriculture and craftsmanship. The 1934 Settlement Law legislated “building the republican villages” on behalf of population planning and constructing the rural country from top to bottom.

The 1934 Settlement Law

On 14 June 1934, the Kemalist regime implemented a new law that emerged as a critical instrument in the campaign of the RPP to blend the people into one “nation” and to control them in several spheres such as the economy, culture, and social life. As Uğur Ümit Üngör puts it:

“The 1934 Settlement Law read as a typical document of an interwar nation state fortifying its ethnic boundaries through restricting citizenship, expressing a nationalist ideology, and introducing nation formation on an alien

61 Ibid, p. 22.

62 Rifat N. Bali announces here Nihal Atsız (1905–1975) and Cevat Rifat Atilhan (1892–1967).

63 Rifat Bali, *Azınlıklar Türkleştirme Meselesi: Ne İdi? Ne Değildi?*, Tarih Dizisi, 93, 1. Baskı (İstanbul: Libra, 2014), pp. 144–45.; Rifat Bali, *1934 Trakya Olayları*, Libra Tarih Dizisi, 54–43, 11. Baskı (İstanbul: Libra, 2014).

population by force. It captures the essence of demographic engineering: The Kemalists sought to increase the relative size and power of the dominant ethnic group, the Turks, at the expense of ethnic minorities. The latter were expected to decrease determinately, and ultimately evaporate into insignificance or disappear sometime in the future.”⁶⁴

A detailed look at the law and its annexes discloses that the state’s housing agenda, concentrated on rural planning within urbanist concepts, became a nation-building tool and maintained the tone of modernization at the same time. The text of the law, consisting of nine chapters, gradually reveals this objective, describing the settlement regions, registration, and housing of immigrants together with the local people in the settlement regions, the obligations and exemptions of the settlers, and distribution of the agricultural land to the settlers.

The first and second articles introduced the aim of the law. The first article described that revision of the settlement and distribution of the population in Turkey was assigned by the Ministry of the Interior in accordance with the program scheduled by the cabinet, considering the bounds of Turkish culture. The second article detailed the settlement areas that zoned Turkey into three types of territories: territories numbered 1 were places where the concentration of Turkish population was to be located; territories numbered 2 were designated for transporting and housing the population that was intended to “be Turkified”; and territories numbered 3 were areas to be set aside and forbidden from dwelling and settlement due to sanitation, economic, cultural, political, and military circumstances. The Ministry of the Interior suggested the cabinet could amend the zones and territories over time in response to changing needs.⁶⁵

Acceptance of immigrants and refugees became a significant part of the law. The third article of the first chapter presented legal definitions of “immigrants” and “refugees”. To settle in Turkey, only people of Turkish origin (and/or who were “culturally Turkish”⁶⁶) immigrating into the country alone

64 Üngör, p. 153.

65 “İskan Kanunu,” 4003.

66 The text of the 1934 Settlement Law uses the term “culturally Turkish” to refer to people who were traditionally akin to the Turkish language, and easily adopted to the livelihood and customs of Turkey. Here, I interpret the term as a very ambiguous description of Turkishness due to the nature of the concept. As briefly explained in the second chapter, from the beginning of the discourse, the definition of Turkishness retained its

and *en masse*, as well as Turkic nomads, would be accepted according to the instructions of the Ministry of the Interior. Only they were considered “immigrants”. The Ministry would determine which people had Turkish origin and/or were culturally Turkish. “Refugees” were defined by the law as groups who sought temporary asylum in the country due to an emergency situation.⁶⁷

The organization of settlement was determined in the seventh article and stated that immigrants and refugees of Turkish origin would be allowed to settle where they chose. However, immigrants and refugees who requested housing assistance from the state had to settle in a location determined by the state. Likewise, non-Turkish groups had to settle and remain where the Ministry of the Interior and the cabinet decided, even though they would not receive housing assistance.⁶⁸ In other words, the first chapter centered upon a general ordinance and definitions of the groups who would be organized, instead of a spatial formula to house the population.

The second chapter had the title “Mobilization in the Interior, Circumspections of Culture and Administration”. Here, the law detailed the spatial organization according to territorial categorization: the Ministry of the Interior would transport the villagers without arable lands and a source of living as well as people who lived in territories numbered 3 to more suitable areas in terms of the livelihood and sanitation. Additionally, the ministry would decide to relocate the villagers where the settlements were dispersed, and it would organize removing the temporary settlements.⁶⁹

Within the third chapter, the settlement policy was detailed: tribes – *aşirets* – who were not culturally Turkish (referring to the Kurdish groups) would be dispersed and settled in the territories numbered 2; Turkish nomads, who were culturally Turkish, would be transported to favorable areas in terms of the livelihood and sanitation within territories 1 and 3. The Ministry of the Interior would decide to deport non-Turkish nomads. The groups who did not speak Turkish could not establish a community such as a village, neighborhood unit, labor or craft organization. Similarly, the law announced that the

conflicting facets in various aspects. Its grounds changed between religion, race, geography, and language under the state's nationalistic legitimations. But it was always questionable to frame “Turkishness”, as it is controversial to attempt a description of any nation's characteristics.

67 “İskan Kanunu,” 4003.

68 *Ibid.*, pp. 4003–4.

69 *Ibid.*, p. 4004.

tribes and nomads who were not culturally Turkish were certainly not allowed to settle in the territories numbered 1. Here, the non-Turkish locals were separately deported to Turkish villages, towns and city centers and settled with immigrants and refugees of Turkish origin. The territories numbered 2 would be completely designated by the authority under the Turkification aims. The Ministry of the Interior and the cabinet would decide and re-organize the settlements here,⁷⁰ having the power to control these groups on behalf of the authorities.

In addition to national resolution and formalization, the settlement policy also focused on work such as the arrangement of houses or housing plots for families, distribution of shops, ateliers and shared lands for the craftsmen and small traders, and distribution of arable lands, livestock, barn and agricultural equipments for the farmers. The land provided for the settlers would be distributed from expropriated areas and the terrains reserved for public use and forestry in and around the villages, towns, and cities. The government organized settlement works, providing building materials, labor⁷¹ and funding. In the newly built and reconstructed villages, public areas such as schools, mosques, village houses, police stations, bazaars, threshing fields, cemeteries, meadows, water resources and marshes would be reserved. Schools, fountains, waterways and channels, and watering facilities would be primarily constructed and/or repaired by the government.⁷²

Although the Settlement Law (including provision for housing the locals and newcomers and maintaining the land and workplace) was introduced as if the state conducted the entire operation, people received housing and land support through a debiting plan prepared by the government. Particularly in the territories numbered 2 – places where the state intended to Turkify – people were obligated to pay the prices of the estates within 20 years according to a payment schedule that would start after eight years of occupancy.⁷³

During the years after the enactment of the 1934 Settlement Law, the operation was re-arranged with new regulations that consisted of instructions in different scopes of the law. The state sought to fundamentally consolidate the

70 Ibid, pp. 4004–5.

71 The government would use public vehicles, experts and officers in order to operate the Settlement Law. If necessary, the settlers would work on the building sites.

72 “İskan Kanunu,” 4005.

73 Ibid, pp. 4007–8.

obscure articles that might have caused problems in practice. The first regulations, approved from 7 to 11 August 1934 by the Ministry of Interior, comprised instructions for the implementation of the law within the framework of Turkification of the population, as well as details of the land distribution in accordance with the national categorizations of the population.

The fourth article of regulation, 15035/6599, announced that the government had written a declaration of citizenship (*Tabiiyet Beyannamesi*) for people subjected to the 1934 Settlement Law. Turkish newcomers had to sign this declaration and register as “immigrants”. Some groups such as Pomaks, Bosnians, Tatars, and Karapapaks who had already settled in several terrains in East Thrace and Anatolia, and Turkish-speaking Muslim groups such as Lezgis, Chechens, Cherkes, Abkhazians, also had to sign the declaration of citizenship to receive settlement support from the government. Kurds, Arabs, Albanians, non-Turkish Muslims, and non-Turkish Christians and Jews did not sign the declaration of citizenship since they were considered foreigners by the state.⁷⁴ The article highlighted that the state sought to resolve the ambiguousness of descriptions of the ethnic groups and their position within the 1934 Settlement Law, and to sort out the population demographically for the purpose of nationalization in particular areas.

Additionally, the regulation introduced general instructions for land and estate distribution. The state mainly referred to the derelicts that remained following the Armenian, Greek and Kurdish deportations. The immigrants who received support from government would be first housed in these abandoned properties and workplaces such as shops and ateliers, and arable lands. If necessary, the government would provide dwellings, land and/or workplaces to the settlers from the expropriated areas in and around villages, towns, and cities.⁷⁵

Another regulation dated 11 August detailed general terms for the settlement operations for the newcomers: “the settlement operation begins with the acceptance and registration of the immigrant at the border. It ends after the meriting properties and lands are resigned with the documents of each title and given to the settlers; the production equipments and food are supplied.”⁷⁶ Furthermore, the settlement operation of the non-Turkish groups (meaning Kurds) was re-emphasized and elaborated. According to the regulation, these

74 T.C. Sıhhat ve İçtimai Muavenat Vekaleti, İskan Umum Müdürlüğü, *İskan Mevzuatı* (Ankara: Köyöğretmeni Basımevi, 1936), 240.

75 Ibid, p. 241.

76 Ibid, p. 247.

groups could not be settled in the villages and neighborhood units where they shared the same language and ethnicity with the locals,⁷⁷ and they could not entirely form a new village or neighborhood unit. They could only be settled in Turkish villages and neighborhoods where they constituted a maximum of five percent of the whole populace. They would not abut each other as at least ten Turkish families would live in between. These groups would be obligated to speak Turkish, and they should even be encouraged to engage with Turkish people to Turkify their nations.⁷⁸

The regulations for land organization within the 1934 Settlement Law were basically developed from the 1924 Village Law and 1926 Settlement Law, and this time it was detailed in accordance with the new necessities for the newcomers, the locals, and deported people. In so doing, *İskan Toprak Talimatnamesi* (the Settlement Land Regulation), which concerned the land distribution and architectural organization of the new and existing settlements, was drafted from 9 to 11 August 1934.⁷⁹

In the second chapter of the regulation, the planning of new villages and the extension of the existing villages were laid out according to the first regulation with which the Ministry of the Interior set out the national organization of the population. In the 15th article of the second chapter, the method of implementing the new villages and extensions was determined. The ministry would sort out the land in the villages or in appropriate rural areas to settle the newcomers with consideration of the interaction between the settlers and locals. However, the village could still be separated into the quarters for newcomers and residents.⁸⁰

The 20th article provided that in each territory a local governor and/or a committee would be established for the village planning operation. They would agree on suitable areas for new rural settlements in cities, towns, and villages by indicating possible housing schemes, and mapping them in scales of 1/20.000, 1/5000 and 1/1000. Thereafter, construction work would begin, and land would be prepared for distribution.⁸¹

77 This article demonstrated that the Ministry of Interior hesitated to name and legitimate the locals, who collaborated with the state within the frame of new settlement program, as Kurds.

78 T.C. Sihat ve İçtimai Muavenat Vekaleti, İskan Umum Müdürlüğü, *İskan Mevzuatı*, 248–49.

79 *Ibid.*, pp. 259–76.

80 *Ibid.*, p. 264.

81 *Ibid.*, p. 266.

Within the following articles of the regulation, the organization of rural settlement construction was defined. The place of the new settlement would be decided by the local governor himself, or by a committee formed by the governor and consisting of a state doctor, engineer, cadaster technician and settlement officer. They would draw up the scheme of the settlements, including the borders, streets, and houses in accordance with the 1924 Village Law. The experts of local government would draw up the settlement plan showing the streets and houses. The local government would also approve the settlement scheme to start the construction.⁸²

The law also highlighted that the new settlements would be established in the areas accessible to transportation (close to the railways, highways and harbors, or areas where the extension of the transportation network was planned), suitable for agriculture (in the watery and arable areas) and sanitation (in the areas where the land was reclaimed).⁸³ In the new rural settlements at least five decars for each person were to be reserved for a forest.⁸⁴

The construction of the new settlements and the reconstruction of the existing villages started with reserving public areas and facilities. For this, the supply of potable water for the inhabitants and the animals emerged as the primary task. According to the regulation, the new settlements would be built with 100 houses. Each house would be divided in 500m²–1000m² parcels, in proportion to the acreage. Each family would have at least 3000m² of arable land around the villages and towns where they were dwelling. In the villages and towns, the farmers and craftsmen would receive a barn and livery stable for at least three animals if they received housing support from the state.⁸⁵

The Settlement Land Regulation dated 9–11 August 1934 gave instructions for land organization. In this regulation, the state detailed not only the distribution of land, which had been decided and elaborated on by the 1934 Settlement Law, but also the architectural program and construction schedules. In this regulation it was declared that the architectural planning of the new settlements and reconstruction of the existing villages would be coordinated and managed by the local governorates, in contrast to operations following the 1924 Village Law and 1926 Settlement Law. With this method, the settlement could

82 Ibid, p. 267.

83 Ibid., p. 267.

84 Ibid, p. 268.

85 Ibid, pp. 269–71.

be individually directed by local authorities in particular areas where the government wished to control the population.

The Land Regulation of the 1934 Settlement Law made the state's intentions clearer, so that the program emerged as much broader than simply housing people as had been the case with the legislation and agenda of the first years of the republic. The most apparent fact was that this time the land organization, and the architectonic, economic, and socio-cultural determination of the housing act, also served nationalization, in contrast to early statutes like the 1924 Village Law and 1926 Settlement Law. It was crystal clear that within the 1934 Settlement Law the regime organized comprehensive population engineering, reflecting the political climate of mid-1930s in Turkey.⁸⁶

Villages of the 1934 Settlement Law

The 1934 Act paved the way for a settlement policy through which locals, Turkish immigrants and Kurds could be blended within the nationalization program. The application of the law and its regulations took place in the rural areas surrounding larger cities, in small Anatolian towns, in villages from which communities were deported, and in the new rural settlements. In particular these villages, which were built as an outcome of the 1934 Settlement Law, became an important tool for the RPP in forming the nation, modernizing and internally colonizing the people through architecture.

Following the passage of the 1934 Settlement Law, it was declared that 50.000 Turco-Romanian immigrants would be welcome and granted Turkish citizenship by the state. The Housing Department of the Ministry of Interior would guide this operation. At the same time the police departments would be responsible for newcomers' security in the arrival cities and would also guard and control immigrants during their transportation to the settlements. The reports announced that immigrants would arrive in Istanbul as the first receiving location. Here they would be registered by the officers registered and prepared for the journey⁸⁷ to towns and villages where they would be settled.

86 Özge Sezer, 'Modern Köyün İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Kırsalında İskan Politikaları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme', *Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Kültür Envanteri Dergisi*, 0.24 (2021) <<https://doi.org/10.22520/tubaked2021.24.007>>; Veli Yadirgi, *The Political Economy of the Kurds of Turkey: From the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic*, 2017, p. 180.

87 '50.000 Muhacir Gelecek (50.000 Immigrants Will Come)', *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul, 7 October 1934), pp. 1, 4.

General Inspectorates in provinces of Thrace conducted the housing program not only in the region but also in eastern Anatolian provinces. However, at the end of 1934 new neighborhoods in the towns and complete settlements in the villages for the immigrants were still under construction.⁸⁸

Immigration continued in the following years and exacerbated the problems of housing organization in rural areas. In May 1935 it was reported that General Inspectors and local governors were forming a commission for the operation. The Thrace region emerged as a target district for the government. Considerable efforts were made to settle the first groups of newcomers, such as arranging building sites for rural houses and land for agriculture,⁸⁹ with 90.000 liras spent on the preparations.⁹⁰

Besides, to administer the rehabilitation of villages, the İzmir governor Kazım Dirik established a Village Office in the Local Governorate of İzmir (*İzmir Köy Bürosu*) in 1931. When Kazım Dirik became the General Inspector of Thrace in 1935, he established a similar organization for the whole region, the Village Office of Thrace (*Trakya Köy Bürosu*). This was a forerunner to the state's regulation in 1936 founding "the Province Village Offices" in cities where the 1934 Settlement Law was implemented.⁹¹ Now the village offices became the local authority accommodating the newcomers and people deported from eastern Anatolia. Nevertheless, constructing houses for immigrants emerged as the crucial problem for the government to complete the operation immediately.

On 1 May 1935 the government and the People's House called for an architectural competition for village houses in the new rural settlements, particularly in the Thrace region, and promoted Turkish architects to cooperate. The jury consisted of the director of the People's House, a professor and architect from the Fine Arts Academy, and an architect from the Architect's Chamber. The participants proposed two different housing typologies focusing on local build-

88 'Trakya'ya Yerleştirilen Muhacirler (Immigrants Who Are Settled in Thrace)', *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul, 16 November 1934), p. 2.

89 '50.000 Göçmenin Anayurda Nakli, Bu İşlerle Uğraşacak Bir Komisyon Kuruldu (Transporting 50.000 Immigrants into the Homeland, A Commission Has Been Established for the Operation)', *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul, 13 May 1935), p. 2.

90 'Göçmenler İçin Malzeme Alındı (Construction Materials Have Been Bought for the Immigrants)', *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul, 20 May 1935), p. 2.

91 TBMM, *Regulation for 'the Province Village Offices*, 1936. In: Eres, "Türkiye'de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu," 148.

ing techniques and materials. (The villagers and settlers could build the houses themselves), as well as considering budget efficiency, sanitation, functionality, the livelihoods of the dwellers, the climate (the first group would be settled in Thrace region and in the villages around Istanbul, and thus the climate and environment of these districts should be considered in the design), and national issues (the houses should architecturally reflect the “Turkish” style).⁹²

The Village House Competition was a significant event, demonstrating the state’s efforts to develop the housing operation into a standardized project that would be organized by local authorities, and easily carried out by settlers and locals together. Turkish architects also agreed with the concept that the implementation of rural settlements (including constructing brand-new villages and building new quarters around existing villages) should be considered in an architecturally systematic organization. However, they criticized the process in the first years, claiming that the state’s early housing solutions were concluded without any research on the village and the village community. The costs of construction were too high for any villager to be able to build a house by his own means. Architect Abdullah Ziya Kozanoğlu pointed out another dimension of this issue: “The son of the villager would expect that the state would build a house for him as well as it built a house for his father. If not, ... he would become an enemy to the regime.”⁹³ And he continued:

“1. Firstly, the existing village houses and the wishes of the villagers who have been already living in the rural settlements should be studied. Accordingly, new planning for villages and the new typology for village houses should be concluded (It could be accomplished by zoning the country and designing 5–6 typologies). 2. A “modern” sanctuary, which would replace the “mosque”, should be built to bring the villager under the same roof, to transmit the regime’s ideals and the reforms. 3. The new village and village house should be planned in accordance with local techniques and materials [that the villager could easily construct and repair]. 4. They should be as cheap as the villagers could build through their own means. 5. In the party [RPP], a new branch should be established to cope with this assignment. The branch should teach and explain to the villagers [how to build the settlement and the houses]”.⁹⁴


92 ‘Köy Evleri Proje Müsabakası’, *Arkitekt*, 51.3 (1935), 93.

93 Kozanoğlu, “Köy Evleri Proje ve Yapıları İçin Toplu Rapor,” 204.

94 *Ibid.*, p. 204. Author’s translation.

The winner was the architect Abdullah Ziya Kozanoğlu. He introduced two typologies for village houses: type one included two rooms, a small interior storage, a porch in the front, and a semi-open barn at the back. The plan was symmetrical, with the entrance in the center. Type two was located on a larger site and included two rooms, a large hall with an opening to the entrance, a kitchen and a storage room, a porch in the front, and a closed barn which was also accessible from the interior. Kozanoğlu also considered the environmental differences, presenting ideas for flat and sloping land. The common concept for both plans was to use local building materials and techniques. In so doing, he suggested timber construction combined with adobe walls. In both interiors he sought to create a “traditional”, and/hence “national” life in the houses (**Figure 4.3**).⁹⁵

Figure 4.3. Winning project of the Village House Competition for Thrace region, by architect Abdullah Ziya Kozanoğlu.⁹⁶



95 Abdullah Ziya Kozanoğlu, 'Halkevi Trakya Göçmen Evleri Proje Müsabakasında Kazanan Eserin Raporu', *Arkitekt*, 55–56.07–08 (1935), pp. 205–6.

96 Kozanoğlu, "Halkevi Trakya Göçmen Evleri Proje Müsabakasında Kazanan Eserin Raporu," 205.

State architect Behçet Ünsal also participated in the competition with two typologies. The house planned for small families consisted of two rooms and a corral, which was not directly connected to the rooms but attached to the house. It was located on approximately 66m² of floor space. The house planned for larger families was designed according to traditional aspects. The rooms were arranged around an atrium, as well as the “traditional Anatolian village house”. It consisted of two rooms, a kitchen and cellar, two corrals and a barn. The house was located on approximately 286m² of floor space.⁹⁷

The building expenses associated with these proposed projects, however, were too high for the government’s budget. Therefore, the Housing Department of the Ministry of Interior implemented another housing plan, in which the settlers could participate in the construction. The plan was based on a two-room organization, including a small area in the entrance that the settler could use as a cellar, and a corral attached to the house towards the garden. This house cost only 800 liras (**Figure 4.4**).⁹⁸

The construction of village houses was reported in the newspapers. The Housing Department of Ministry of Interior introduced a prototype for rural houses for the incoming Turco-Romanians and planned to complete the project by the end of the year in several rural areas, especially in Thrace. The operation would continue in other regions by bringing not only more Turkish-speaking immigrants from Romania, but also from other Balkan countries into the country.⁹⁹ At the end of the year, within the regulation dated 19 December 1935 (number 3711), the cabinet provided instructions for organizing housing and caring for the immigrants, and sent to the local governorates a procurement list including construction materials (stone, bricks, lime and an assessment of their resources), agricultural equipment and animals, food and animal feed, medicines and medical equipment, and shelters. Another enactment dated 22 June 1936 (number 2/4847) shows that the cabinet budgeted 1,750,000 liras for accommodating Balkan immigrants.¹⁰⁰


97 Behçet Ünsal, “Bir Köy Evi Tipi,” *Arkitekt* 109–110, no. 1–2 (1940): 17.

98 Ünsal, “Bir Köy Evi Tipi.”

99 ‘50.000 Göçmen İçin Trakya’da Hep Bir Tip Evler Yapılıyor (For 50.000 Immigrants Prototype Houses Are Being Constructed in Thrace), *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul, 29 May 1935), p. 2.

100 T.C. Sıhhat ve İçtimai Muavenat Vekaleti, İskan Umum Müdürlüğü, *İskan Mevzuatı*, 159–60.

Figure 4.4. A village house constructed by the Housing Department of the Ministry of Interior.¹⁰¹



In November 1936, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk called attention in parliament to the urgent need to house the Balkan newcomers: “Settling our new-coming citizens who are currently arriving in the homeland, is one of our principal tasks. We are furnishing [the operation] to house the immigrants suitably, and to induce them [in agriculture and other fields of manufacture] readily. The results we have already achieved are reassuring. We will eagerly continue this national matter within the bounds of possibilities.”¹⁰² In 1937 in the *Belediye Dergisi* (*Journal of Municipalities*) the state announced the intent to complete 18,114 village houses in the rural areas of several cities in Anatolia and Thrace within four years.¹⁰³ In addition to the list published in this journal, village houses in the new settlements were constructed in Sincan Village in Ankara and in Harbato and Özmen villages in Diyarbakır.¹⁰⁴

After the 1934 Settlement Law, the largest number of newcomers and deported people were settled in Tekirdağ province in Thrace. According to the report of the *Journal of Municipalities*, from 1934 to 1937 the government constructed 6.727 village houses for the new dwellers. The new settlement in Muratlı emerged as a crucial example of the project to establish rural life in the

101 Behçet Ünsal, “Sincan Köyü Planı,” *Arkitekt* 109–110, no. 1–2 (1940): 16.

102 Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *1 İkinci Teşrin 1936’da Atatürk’ün Kamutay’daki Nutku*, T.C. Trakya Umumi Müfettişliği Köy Bürosu, 40 (İstanbul: Halk Basımevi, 1937), p. 8. Author’s translation.

103 ‘Göçmen Evleri ve Köyleri’, *Belediyeler Dergisi*, 29.12 (1937), 53–55.

104 Eres, “Türkiye’de Planlı Kırsal Yerleşmelerin Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Planlı Kırsal Mimarisinin Korunması Sorunu,” 155.

countryside consistent with the new economic, demographic, and cultural ambitions of the Turkish state.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Muratlı was a small rural settlement accessible by rail. Up until the first years of the republic, the population of the town increased, and it became a convenient area to settle the first wave of newcomers. Between 1925 and 1933, 56 dwellings were constructed for 107 immigrants from Bulgaria, Romania, and Yugoslavia. After the 1934 Settlement Law, the area was planned to house the largest “new rural settlement” in the Thrace region, building 700 village houses for the dwellers. Between 1935 and 1939, 656 rural houses were constructed and 23.670 decares of land were provided for the settlers. The site was planned in a grid scheme, but during the implementation of the project some aspects were changed. The houses, constructed of timber and adobe bricks, were placed on 1000 m² plots. Although they followed the same typology as the other implementations of the Housing Department of Ministry of Interior, they had a symmetrical arrangement (**Figure 4.5**).¹⁰⁵

Figure 4.5. *Muratlı Village, Tekirdag, Thrace region, 1935.*¹⁰⁶




Aspect général d'un village d'immigrés en Thrace. Gesamtansicht eines Einwandererdorfes in Thrazien. General view of a village of immigrants in Thrace

105 Ibid, pp. 240–44.; Eres, ‘Muratlı: Bir Cumhuriyet Köyü’.

106 ‘L’immigration En Turquie,’ *La Turquie Kemaliste* 23, no. Janvier (1938): 15.

Figure 4.6. *Sincan Village, Ankara, by architect Behçet Ünsal in 1937.*¹⁰⁷



Later, Sincan Village in Ankara was planned by the state architect Behçet Ünsal in 1937 for Turco-Romanian immigrants. This village emerged as another exemplar plan for new rural settlements following the 1934 Settlement Law. Sincan was situated in western Ankara and neighboring Etimesgut village, which had been constructed starting from the late 1920s as one of the first exemplar village projects of the republican state. According to Behçet Ünsal's plan, the new settlement was located on the hillside behind the railway station. A 25-metre-wide road from the railway station was the main access to the village. Agricultural fields and gardens were on the outskirts of the settlement. The main road led to the public core of the village, which included the guesthouse, nursery and its annexes, washhouse, and school. The end of this area was designated for the power plant, village library, coffee house, bazaar and mosque, and the central organization of public facilities was extended by

107 Ünsal, "Sincan Köyü Planı," 15.

a public park. The top of the hill was arranged to provide water resources for the dwellers and agricultural activities in the village (**Figure 4.6**).

The new settlements in Diyarbakır were built to contribute to the demographic transformation of the region. According to the General Inspector of Diyarbakır Abidin Özmen,¹⁰⁸ the province and its surroundings would be developed in accordance with the decisions of a commission consisting of “experts such as artisans, administrators, settlement bureaucrats, judges, doctors, engineers, architects and scientist bureaucrats”, aiming to build “three to five Turkish villages of 100 houses every year at a cost of 600 lira”. Özmen also declared that “this way our progressive nation can assimilate the backward nation and establish economic dominance in a Turkish center”.¹⁰⁹

The implementation of the 1934 Settlement Law fundamentally had two significant aims for the rural sphere in Turkey. First, settling the incomers would drive the demographic program forward, the objective of which was to conform the whole population to a predominant Turkishness. Thus, either the incomers would be settled in completely restrainable places along the railways and highways, hence in the accessible areas for the state, or they would be settled together with the locals and the deported population to smooth potential conflicts in the countryside. Likewise, the journal *La Turquie Kemaliste* announced that up until 1938, almost 80,000 Turco-Bulgarians and Turco-Romanians, and 10,000 Turco-Yugoslavians, were accommodated by the state, not only in separated settlements but also together with locals. Besides, “350 families from eastern Anatolia” were settled together with Balkan immigrants in the village houses and new rural settlements built in Thrace provinces.¹¹⁰ The report reveals the demographic ambitions of the settlement operation: Balkan immigrants were instrumentalized in “Turkifying” and easing the strength of the “culturally non-Turkish” population in Turkey.

The second aspiration of the 1934 Settlement Law concerned the economic program of 1930s Turkey. Balkan immigrants were again favored by the economic program grounded in agriculture and agriculture-based industry. A report in the daily newspaper *Cumhuriyet* of 29 May 1935 briefly presented this

108 The Inspectorate also included some other provinces in eastern Anatolia such as Elazığ, Urfa, Bitlis, Van, Hakkari, Mardin and Agri.

109 Koca, pp. 495–97; in: Üngör, p. 162.

110 “L’Immigration En Turquie,” 16. Ümit Uğur Üngör introduces the statistics report of Turkey Prime Ministry: “According to official sources, the total number of Kurds deported to the west in the 1930s was 25,381 people in 5074 households.” Üngör, p. 162.

ideal: 10.000 Turco-Bulgarian immigrants were expected in the county by the end of 1935. The tobacco farmers among these incomers would be settled in places where they could labor in the field and participate in agrarian production.¹¹¹ Moreover, around the new settlements and dwellings, the state expropriated agricultural land for farmer and artisan inhabitants. It provided tools and equipment as well as animals and breeds from the state's farms. *La Turquie Kemaliste* announced the goal to establish 85 additional agricultural credit cooperatives by the end of 1939.¹¹² Once again, the new rural settlements, and the new quarters built as the extensions of existing villages, provided an emerging space that developed into an architectonic language, spoken in the countryside.

111 '50.000 Göçmen İçin Trakya'da Hep Bir Tip Evler Yaptırılıyor (For 50.000 Immigrants Prototype Houses Are Being Constructed in Thrace)'.
 112 "L'Immigration En Turquie," 17.

