VILLAGE CLOSE ENOUGH:

A STUDY OF THE CHANGING CHARACTER OF RURAL SPACE IN TURKEY

ELİF HATİCE TAŞYÜREK

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2022

VILLAGE CLOSE ENOUGH:

A STUDY OF THE CHANGING CHARACTER OF RURAL SPACE IN TURKEY

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

Elif Hatice Taşyürek

Boğaziçi University

2022

Village Close Enough:

A Study of the Changing Character of Rural Space in Turkey

The thesis of Elif Hatice Taşyürek

has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Ceren Özselçuk _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Zafer Yenal _____

Assoc. Prof. Sezai Ozan Zeybek _____
(External Member)

September 2022

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Elif Hatice Taşyürek certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature…….....
Date …….....

ABSTRACT

Village Close Enough:

A Study of the Changing Character of Rural Space in Turkey

This thesis aims to investigate movements occurring at a close distance between rural and urban areas and the changing character of the rural space in Turkey. Within the scope of the ethnographic field research I conducted in three villages of Çubuk District of Ankara, I interviewed people who migrated from the village to the city with various motivations and have continued to commute between the village and the city in changing routines and manners, people who returned to their village permanently and people who never left their village. Focusing on participants' narratives, I examine forms of movements between the village and the city, the effects of these forms on the relationship between the rural and the urban, and suggest that movements between the village and other places have become a constituent of the rural space in Turkey. Based on the participants' experience of the village, I argue that the village as a place contains conflicting aspects. I discuss the intricacy of memory, landscape, and work as the dimensions of the spatial reorganization of the rural space and argue that the balance between work and non-work has shifted to the extent that the village has become a space to enjoy, among other things. Lastly, through the material and the verbal culture of the village and conflict-ridden commensal relations, I discuss how the idea of familial and communal attachments are dissolving is tied with how the village is remembered and its future is feared.

ÖZET

Yeterince Yakın Olan Köy:
Türkiye'de Kırsal Alanın Değişen Karakteri Üzerine Bir Çalışma

Bu tez, kırsal ve kentsel alanlar arasında yakın mesafede meydana gelen hareketleri ve Türkiye'de kırsal mekânın değişen karakterini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ankara'nın Çubuk İlçesi'ne bağlı üç köyde yaptığım etnografik saha araştırması kapsamında, köyden kente çeşitli motivasyonlarla göç etmiş ve köy ile kent arasında değişen rutin ve şekillerde gidip gelmeyi sürdüren, kentte sürdürdüğü yaşamın ardından köyüne temelli dönüş yapmış ve köyünden hiç ayrılmamış kişilerle görüşmeler gerçekleştirdim. Katılımcıların anlatılarına odaklanarak, köy ile kent arası hareket formlarını ve bu formların kır-kent arasındaki ilişkiye etkilerini inceliyor ve köy ile diğer yerler arasındaki hareketlerin Türkiye'de kırsal mekânın bir kurucu ögesi haline geldiğini öne sürüyorum. Katılımcıların köyle ilgili deneyimlerine dayanarak, köyün bir mekân olarak birbiriyle çatışan veçheleri olduğunu ileri sürüyorum. Hafızanın, peyzajın ve işin karmaşık ilişkisini kırsal mekânın yeniden düzenlenmesinin boyutları olarak tartışıyor ve iş ile iş-olmayan (*non-work*) arasındaki dengenin, kırsal mekânı keyfi sürülen bir mekâna dönüştüren ölçüde değiştiğini tartışıyorum. Son olarak, köyün materyal ve sözel kültürü ve çatışmalı ortakçılık ilişkiler aracılığı ile aile ve topluluk bağlarının çözülmekte olduğu fikrinin köyün geçmişinin nasıl hatırlandığı ve geleceğinden nasıl korkulduğu ile bağlantılı olduğunu tartışıyorum.

ACKOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to start by expressing my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Ceren Özselçuk for her support, patience, and effort to understand my never-clear thoughts. I am also grateful to Zafer Yenal for his encouragement and invaluable advices, and Sezai Ozan Zeybek for his diligence and valuable contributions in such a short period of time. I would also like to express my gratitude to Meltem Ahıska, Nükhet Sirman, Güler Okman Fişek, Esra Mungan and Edward Mitchell for that they have been a true source of inspiration.

I would also like to express my gratitude to several friends. I am grateful to Mehmet for being my "honorary advisor," to Rüzgar for her consistent belief in me, to İpek, Şükran and Özlem for their enduring companionship in this difficult time as always, to Akif for being one of the best and most caring study partners, to Damla, Mayıs and İlke for their compassionate and insightful friendship during our time in the Sociology Department, to my housemates Sevgi and Lila for their loving attitude and understanding, and lastly to Şebnem, Barış, Ayşegül, Gökçe, Alkım, Duygu, Gizem and Kadir for their support.

I would like to thank Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu (TÜBİTAK) for the financial support I received during my graduate study. I am also grateful to Alper for vouching for me so that I could receive this financial support.

I would like to thank my family, for each of them has supported me in the unique ways they can find, but particularly my sister Emel, for being the pioneer I have been following since the very first day. I know our minds tend to go to similar dark places, but we'll eventually find an in-between. I believe in you.

Last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to all the participants who opened their doors to me and shared their stories with me. Listening to their stories and their trust in me about what I would do with their stories enabled me to go beyond existing categories in my mind concerning the village, the city, home, *memleket* and *gurbet.* Also, by participating in my thesis research, they supported me to have a different relationship with my own village and *memleket*. For that, I will be forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Brief literature on rural space in Turkey 5

1.2 Transformation of agriculture, the transformation of the rural space 9

1.3 Field and Method 16

CHAPTER 2: FROM AND TOWARDS THE VILLAGE: MIGRATION, MOBILITY AND MOVEMENTS IN THE RURAL SPACE 24

2.1 A conceptual discussion on place, movements, and mobility 26

2.2 Migration, movement, mobility 29

2.3 "There was more flow to Ankara back then." 34

2.4 "Here is a mixed system; the village, Çubuk, Ankara." 37

2.5 Gurbet 44

CHAPTER 3: DIMENSIONS OF SPATIAL REORGANIZATION: MEMORY, LANDSCAPE AND WORK 50

3.1 "Site of picnics" and "deprivation zone" 52

3.2 Memories of the village 58

3.3. Work, non-work 67

CHAPTER 4: HOUSES AND KEYS AS MATERIAL CULTURE: KINSHIP AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS IN THE VILLAGE 74

4.1 Çatalkazık yere batmaz 76

4.2 Ortakçılık 79

4.3 The village and the state 87

4.4 Houses in the village, ruins in the village 91

4.5 Kinship, community, and the village 95

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION 108
APPENDIX A: LIST OF INTERVIEWS 114
APPENDIX B: APPROVAL OF ETHICS COMMITTEE 115
APPENDIX C: LONG TRANSLATED QUOTES 116
REFERENCES 139

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"There in the far away is a village. That village is our village. Even though we do not go there, even though we do not see it, that village is our village"[1] were the verses of the song my classmates and I used to sing in our primary school in the middle of Ankara. Each of us was from various socioeconomic backgrounds, none of us was from the same village, and most of us had a village of our own in various districts of Ankara and various cities of Turkey. For us, the village was a place to go to in weekends, semester breaks, summers, and holidays or sometimes just for a day. There was an incompatibility between the song's verses and our experience. The village where we all belong could only be so far away that it does not exist yet resides in a collective imaginary, whereas for many, the village is just close enough.

Despite a narrative that introduces the village as a far-away place that is remembered with nostalgia and that has not been to or seen, the practice or the habit of going to the village is familiar as the concept of being from a village or belonging to a village is. In a way, despite a narrative depicting the village as a far-away place, for some, the village is just close enough to see and go. Inspired by those who are in proximity to their village and their experiences, this thesis leans on such as movements occurring at such close distance, the mobility between rural and urban areas, and the return movement to the village. It also focuses on the ways in which people engage with their villages as places to inhabit, settle, or (ir)regularly move to and from and regard as home or foreign lands, and on the complex relationship

[1] Translated from: "Orada bir köy var uzakta, o köy bizim köyümüzdür, gitmesek de görmesek de, o köy bizim köyümüzdür." Verses were adopted from a poem written in 1927 by Ahmet Kutsi Tecer.

between memory, landscape, and work. It further dwells on the material culture and demonstrates the ways in which people relate to one another within familial and communal attachments.

While dealing with these different yet connected objects of analysis, this thesis aims to present an approach to the analysis of the changing character of the rural space in Turkey and demonstrate diverse experiences of subjects engaged in villages in different ways and the ways in which places and movements are constitutive of their subjectivities. In that matter, the research is based on the ethnographic fieldwork conducted in villages of Çubuk District in Ankara, the capital city of Turkey. These are Yeşilkent, Karaçam and Yıldırım Elören villages, which are lined up on the same road, Yıldırım Elören being the farthest from the district center with 43 km and the city center with 77 km. The main reason behind choosing these villages is that they are close enough for those who are attached to them and observe how the village (and the city) is experienced, remembered and constructed when it is in proximity. Therefore, including movements and mobility in the essentials of what a village is, this research grasps the changing character of the rural space in Turkey from inside, through leaning on narratives and memories of its participants and the landscape, verbal, and material culture of the village.

There is a detailed literature in Turkey focusing on the village and the rural space from different dimensions. Especially in recent years, studies on the rural migration, rural gentrification, and ecological degeneration in the rural areas have been increasing. Although one prominent theme in this thesis is movements to the rural areas and the village, the thesis diverges from those, because it works through the attachments which people have with their own village and focuses on villages where people move to and from and return to as their own. In this way, it imagines

the rural space, not only by means of mobility, but also with people's meaning and affect worlds. Therefore, it evaluates the reorganization of the rural space with experiences and memories too. Following such an approach, everything from the words and phrases used by the participants to the keys of the houses in the village is taken as the constituent elements of the rural space. Based on these, this thesis deals with how the village and the rural are constructed both in the literature and in participants' narratives, and argues that the village, like every other place, is heterogeneous and consists of different, and sometimes conflicting, aspects. When looked at the literature, regional differences in how the rural space has changed also stands out as ecocide operationalized through extractivist environment policies and mega projects, forced displacement of masses based on ethnic, religious, and political identities, and rural gentrification become constituents of the character of rural space in Turkey. Therefore, the importance of this research is that it shows the conditions that ensures the ability to return to and dwell in the village as home. As a result, these villages and others which they can embody, can be located at the complex network of political, economic and social history of the rural space in Turkey, and how the rural space is reorganized through this history can be observable.

For such aims and with this approach, in this introduction chapter I provide the necessary literature review on rural space in Turkey, then detail how the transformation of agriculture has influenced the transformation of rural space and depict rural space's current state. After that, in the field and method section, I describe the field, the profile of participants and the process of the ethnographic fieldwork, and how the ethnographic fieldwork as the method, the field itself, and the object of this research are articulated.

In the second chapter, I look at the movements from and towards the village. After a short discussion on routines and motivations of these movements, I lay out how movement, mobility, migration, and place have been conceptualized and discussed until now. I manifest that movement is included in the existence of places and places are heterogeneous and changing existences and critically engage with the literature on migration and mobility. I assert how forms of mobility and movements are differentiated, and how these differentiated patterns are linked to how the village as a place is perceived and experienced. As the movements from and towards three villages in the research occur in proximity, I show how these villages surpass their physical boundaries and depict a complex system of the village, the district, and the city. Finally, I reflect on *gurbet* [foreign land] and people who are not familiar with *gurbet, gurbetsizler* [those who have not lived in foreign lands], in the context of the movement that occurs at a close distance between the village and the city, and how having no experience of *gurbet* and living in close distance to the village influence persons.

In the third chapter, I focus on the spatial reorganization of the rural space through participants' memories of the village and landscape, and their experience of the change. I assert that, as a result of the transformation of the rural space, the village has become a place that has conflicting aspects, which are visible in participants' experiences of the village as "site of picnics" and "deprivation zone." After that, I concentrate on the entanglement of memory, landscape, and work. I argue that effects of deagrarianization and intensification of husbandry and return movement of retired people to the village are observable not only in people's memories, but also physical changes in the landscape of villages such as fences put around houses and lands or forested lands that were used to be planted fields. Lastly,

I show how the relationship between work and non-work are experienced in the village.

In the last chapter, following where house keys are mentioned in participants' narratives, I concentrate on the material culture in the village. Through contemplating on the symbolic and affective dimensions of the material culture, and phrases such as *çatalkazık* and *ortakçılık* that are often used in relation to the property, various modalities of exchange, sharing and/or ownership among members of families emerge. Moreover, the conflict-ridden commensal relationalities, the tension between private space of individuals and that of families, and public space of larger families and the village are deliberated. Following that, the role of the state in the village as a figure that does not recognize conflicted relations in the village is discussed in terms of the spatial reorganization. Then returning to the material culture of the village, the relation between care work on the house that is an object of commensal relationalities and ruination is established. Lastly, I put forward that the idea that communal and familial attachments have been dissolving is connected with how the village's past is remembered and how its future is feared.

1.1 Brief literature on rural space in Turkey

In the early 1980s, several significant anticipations emerged concerning the state of villages in Turkey. Keyder (1983) anticipated that the transformation of the village would occur on the level of the entire village; the village in its entirety would either adopt petty commodity production or every household in the village would migrate out. Akşit (1993) argued that transformation happening at the whole village community level was not likely because small commodity producers had been highly differentiated within and between villagers, and rural Turkey had left the tightly

organized village community behind. Therefore, he also pointed to the possibility of the village turning into “a deserted ghost village” in case outmigration continues (Akşit, 1993, p. 174).

These anticipations on the possibility of, if it is not far-fetched to call this way, the extinction of the village are interesting because they manifest a change in the great importance assigned to villages since the establishment of the Turkish state. According to Güzelsu (1983), the territory of the new Turkish state was established through thirty-five thousand villages. It was due to the settling of almost all of Anatolia’s semi-nomadic peoples and tribal groups, imposed migrations of masses, and the foundation of a highly centralized and hierarchical though the weak political system, which initiated an agricultural transformation in the early years of the Turkish state. In this system, the village was given the position of being the primary legal unit of rural settlements by the state for administrative purposes, as was described in the Village Act in 1924, which was one of the first legislations that passed under the Turkish state after the fall of Ottoman Empire. Given all these, Öztürk et al. concluded that “[i]n the predominantly agrarian socio-economy, with three-quarters of the population living in the countryside and rural settlement units as the primary representation of individual and communal identity, space was politically (re)constructed at the village level” (Öztürk et al., 2013, p.373).

Without departing from the concept of the peasant, the village finds itself in ideological approaches and discourses of those years. Asım Karaömerlioğlu (1998) observed the emergence of a widespread peasantist rhetoric in the period from these early years of the Republic until Village Institutes’ establishment in 1940 and abolishment in 1954 and drew attention to the concurrence of this emergence with other countries such as Germany and France. However, the case of Turkey differs

from those in that "[a]lthough many peasantist ideologues in the world expressed contempt for industrialization, in Turkey, it was urbanization that formed the most significant characteristic of peasantism" (Karaömerlioğlu, 1998, p. 52). According to Karaömerlioğlu, peasantists in Turkey argued that industries could be established in the countryside without leading to the exploitation of villages by cities and migration to urban areas, which was especially important because peasantists considered village life to be superior to urban life in many respects. "Villages were the places where the pure culture of the nation was preserved" and "conservatism of the peasants was the 'social insurance' against the moral and ethical deterioration of the cities" (Karaömerlioğlu, 1998, p. 52; Köymen, 1934, p. 30). Zeybek (2011) observed that there emerged a conflict in the ways how intellectuals of the early Turkish Republic perceived rural areas. On the one hand, rural areas bore the nation's "state of nature" or being un-"contaminated" by foreign influence (Yakın, 2007, p. 182; Aykut, 2007, p. 75). On the other, they meant age-old traditions and customs, backwardness, boredom, and apathy due to their resistance to change. Therein, for intellectuals of the time, rural areas appeared as an object of the desire to preserve and change.

Although peasantism and the Turkish intelligentsia's relationship with the village can be evaluated on the level of discourse and ideology today, they contribute to ways to think about the historicity and prominence of the division between rural and urban in Turkey. It was argued that the division between rural and urban was the only legitimate division in the eyes of the state until a few decades ago (Sirman, 2001). Differentiations that class, ethnicity, religion, or gender caused were deemed non-existent. Instead, people were categorized regarding whether they settled in urban or rural areas. Sirman (2001) also argued that reflections of such entrenched

division could be observed in how the village and rural space are studied in social sciences, especially regarding their role in modernization, developmentalism, and the transformation of agriculture.

Most of these studies concern the effects of agricultural transformation and can be traced back to the 1940s. Sociologists such as Niyazi Berkes (1942), Behice Boran (1945), and İbrahim Yasa (1969) investigated changes in village communities after capitalist relations were introduced to agriculture from the 1940s onwards. They all highlighted the village community as the social unit and the households as the economic units, which operated very much in the traditional mode that maintained a subsistence economy. Between 1950 and 1960, villages became an object of knowledge in the discourse of modernization and development. With Daniel Lerner (1958) leading, the assumption that development would follow the adoption of the modern mindset in villages was accepted mainly without much questioning.

In the 1960s, debates about how agriculture was integrated into capitalist production relations sparked in politics and social science. An intense debate between Korkut Boratav and Muzaffer Erdost concerning the predominance of petty commodity production in Turkish agriculture, named the agrarian question, continued in the 1970s (Seddon & Margulies, 1984). In the 1970s, the modernization paradigm was replaced with capital (Sirman, 2001), and agricultural transformation was evaluated concerning the rationale of capital, to which Birtek and Keyder (1975) responded with the state's regulatory role in rural areas' integration to capitalist production. Sirman argued that from the 1980s onwards, the attention of social sciences literature shifted to urban areas and migration under the influence of poststructuralist paradigms (2001). Tekeli also comes to a similar conclusion in his

assessment that “no comprehensive study typifying transformations that have taken place in villages after 1980” (Tekeli, 2008, p. 53).

1.2 Transformation of agriculture, the transformation of the rural space

Keyder’s previously mentioned anticipation of the village’s future came around the same time when Sirman and Tekeli argued that the focus of the social sciences had shifted from rural areas. Keyder framed how petty commodity production developed in Turkey under the impact of state economic policy in the 1960s and the 1970s in his various works (1983, 1993). In that, part of small peasants would be able to transform themselves into small farmers by using family labor, whereas the majority would either strive to hold the land by producing cheaper commodities despite the constraints of infertile land and low capitalization; or agricultural activity would cease to exist, and rural-urban migration over the long term would lead to the depopulation in villages. Through the end of the 1980s, this was undoubtedly the case; a critical portion of rural areas of coastal regions, central Anatolia, and Thrace revolved into capital-intensive family farming (Sirman, 1996). Due to the leverage of irrigation facilities, the coastal areas started to specialize in industrial crops and greenhouse production. Central Anatolia, in particular, focused on wheat, other cereals, and sugar beets. Meanwhile, the rest of the rural areas witnessed outmigration to urban areas in large numbers. For the first time, the urban population exceeded the rural population in Turkey towards the end of the 1980s (Sağlam, 2006).

Aydın (2010) also concentrated on the state as an actor which had tightened the tie between rural areas and agriculture, underlining that this was the case until the start of neoliberal globalization in the 1980s. That continuing growth in agriculture

occurred during the national developmentalist era or the nationalist project between the 1930s and late 1970s under the protection of subsidies and price support systems. A relatively large number of rural activities were put into subsistence, while market-oriented production was well established in the petty-commodity-producing households of predominantly coastal areas. The state secured acceptable stability for farmers producing agricultural commodities via subsidies and price support systems as they slowly took up new technologies and crops. Keyder and Yenal (2011) noted that "[d]espite transformation in the countryside with increasing mechanization, higher productivity and massive migration to the cities, the rural society centered on the village community remained relatively stable when land transactions were rare, and employment opportunity in the countryside was scant" (p. 82).

However, along with globalization beginning in the 1980s, deregulation has disrupted this stability by generating "a comparatively unmediated impact of world markets on inputs and output" (Keyder & Yenal, 2011, p. 82). They concluded that where state policies do not provide a safety net against market risks and prices and demand patterns vary erratically, small producers, farmers in general, similar to other workers under neoliberal globalization, feel vulnerable and arrive at conditions where it acceleratingly becomes harder to manage the uncertainty and insecurity of commodity production and trade. Nevertheless, others evaluated the effects of agricultural transformation on the societal levels from the perspective of rural communities' integration. Stirling (1993) considered economic growth and migration from rural to urban areas to be elements enabling the unification of the new nation because people were forced to adopt the reforms gradually. Likewise, Hann (1990) maintained that a national society had been actualized since the 1950s, and "rural society can now identify positively with the state" (p. 163).

People in rural areas have also become consumers due to strategies of enlarging the interior market during “neoliberal globalization has swept away the accustomed networks of information, production and marketing in the Turkish countryside” (Keyder & Yenal, 2011, p. 82). It is observed that consumption patterns changed radically; durable consumer goods such as fridges and LPG cylinders, packaged and ready-to-eat foods arrived in rural areas (Keyder&Yenal, 2004). By the end of the 1980s, almost all villages got electricity and phone lines; televisions, satellite dishes, and cellphones followed them (Öztürk et al., 2013). By the turn of the millennium, the internet reached rural houses, and websites for agricultural producers in rural areas started to be set. Changes at the level of consumption were made accessible due to enlarging transportation networks and increasing frequency of minibus lines between villages and city centers. Akşit (1993) also underlined that villages in Ankara that were his research site were integrated into the city center through national education, communication, and transportation systems. The interpretation that what makes villages less attractive in comparison to cities has been slowly losing its impact to push people out of the village can be accompanied by that cities have been losing their impact to pull because of increasingly challenging economic conditions.

However, villages in Turkey have not experienced the changes summarized above evenly. While some villages acquired new or diversified economic activities along with a differentiated demographic profile, some gradually lost the young population and the ground to sustain existing economic activities and acquire new ones. In the type of village Keyder (1983) and Akşit (1993) described as lively and thriving, diversified small commodity production was the dominant mode of production, and households earned income through activities ranging from several

agricultural products and livestock to trade and seasonal labor. Such villages were changing so that there was no population loss. Öztürk et al. (2014) observed a similar situation in smallholdings and small-to-medium-size family enterprises. They explained their survival through families' capacity to maintain their small, independent holdings against the new agro-financial realities by acquiring subsistence strategies such as working larger plots, taking on debt, planting higher value deriving products (Aydın, 2010), and by income transfers from remittances, pensions, and paid employment.

Meanwhile, in Anatolia's interior and Eastern regions, some villages could not integrate into the national economy and lost their economic power. The population of these villages was eradicated rapidly, and mostly the elderly continued to reside in those villages. In only 2007-2010, the percentage of the elderly population in rural areas increased to 15% from 12.7% (TSI, 2010). Although mid-Anatolian villages may be told to have already lost population as much as they could until the present and have no population left to lose anymore; a mid-Anatolian village was observed to have now an increasing population even though it was recorded to rapidly lose population in another study 20 years ago (Keyder&Yenal, 2004). Such an unanticipated increase was attributed to previously emigrated villagers' return after retirement; their limited incomes would provide them more welfare in the villages compared to cities and would not deprive them of modernity's facilities such as TV, telephone, and transportation.

Inadequacy of village schools (Ekinci, 2018), problems concerning care-taking, and inadequate infrastructure for elderly and disabled people have been put forward many times (Canatan, 2008; Öztürk, 2015; EYHGM, 2019). It can be further argued that rural space is impoverished because more than 20% of rural residents in

Turkey, approximately five million people at the time, are below the official poverty line (Gürsoy & Dodurka, 2016). In the same study, in that 20%, approximately nine out of ten people asserted that they could not access health services because they could not afford them. Researchers explain the situation by pointing to rural employment, insurance structure, and geographical disadvantage. Reckoning among people who return to the village because they cannot manage balances in the city, people who could not leave the village in the first place, and the reduced need for human labor due to mechanized and industrialized production, Öztürk (2012) argued that villages have become "homes for the elderly, asylums for the weak and centers of unemployment" (p. 39).

Nonetheless, Öztürk, Jongerden, and Hilton (2014) also noted that, along with the commodification of labor and land in rural areas under neo-liberalization and globalization of agriculture, there have also emerged support networks interconnecting rural and urban areas. The extension of settlement patterns of kinship and community attachments across socio-geographical space have connected the rural to the urban and produced new social forms (Öztürk et al., 2014). In their view, kinship and community relations -as "social commons…reorganized labor and residence through migration"- have continued to support the village through "rural-directed movements," and diversified incomes such as remittances have assisted smallholding farming and the elderly in the village or enabled to maintain family properties. Such "solidarity-network-based-common" as they called, has kept a "locus of resilience" and "the struggle of autonomy" alive against the market, capitalist entrepreneurs, and agrobusiness companies. The development of this network is not identified with contexts of the village and the agriculture but with

those resources that are on the move together with people and created by the current neoliberal impetus. Therefore, even if these support networks operate

> in the context of the village deteriorating from a hinterland of support to a shelter for the weak, the aged, and infirm unable or unwilling to compete in the urban labor market...they inject reverse movements of people and other material and immaterial resources from the city that help to sustain small-scale agriculture and rural life, including the (relative) maintenance of non-commodified practices and human relations (Öztürk et al., 2014, p. 364).

As said before, rural space in Turkey has not undertaken the transformation and changes in the same way and to an equal degree, and a regional differentiation may be observed therein. In broad terms, on the one hand, villages on the Aegean coasts are subject to rural gentrification accompanied by different flows of counterurbanization, and rural areas on the Black Sea are against dangers brought upon by hydroelectric power plantations. On the other hand, the seasonal migration of agricultural laborers from the southeast mainly to the northeastern coast for tea and hazelnut harvest and the Mediterranean coast for citrus and cotton harvest should be connected to the actions of the Turkish military between 1990-2000, which in part compelled urbanization as a result of emptying and destroying over 3000 villages as a response to the Kurdish insurgency in the southeast (Jongerden, 2007).

In parallel to the transformation rural space (and urban space) has undertaken, administrative positions in rural areas have changed. A drastic change was introduced in 2012, namely Metropolitan Law No. 6360, aiming to resolve problems created by former laws concerning scale, capacity, urban and rural infrastructures, settlement, and structuring in local administrations in Turkey (Savaş-Yavuzçehre, 2016). Interestingly, both perceptions of rural areas, either as highly integrated into the capitalist economy, thus they do not lack what urban areas have, or as significantly depopulated and lacking adequate support and infrastructure were used to justify the enactment of the law. More practical, economical, and qualified local

services were to be provided by the metropolitan municipalities and central government due to the abolishment of local administrations in thirty metropolitan cities, resulting in extensive changes in Turkey's metropolitan municipality system (Ceyhan & Tekkanat, 2018). Therefore, sixteen-thousand-and-five hundred-forty-four villages in Turkey have lost their legal entity status, and sixteen-thousand-and-eighty-two villages in thirty metropolitan cities have been given the status of neighborhood and engulfed in cities (Genç, 2014).

Intriguingly, aiming to provide more efficient services to rural areas, Metropolitan Law No. 6360 officially eradicated the rural population (Özçağlar, 2016). The change in the metropolitan municipality law has been interpreted in relation to the current government's tendency toward centralization (İzci & Turan, 2013). Kılıç and İpek (2022) argued that the democratic representation power of the village has decreased, the service costs have increased as areas where metropolitan municipalities are responsible have expanded, and the financial liabilities of life in the city have reflected on the village life too, and the agricultural production has been negatively affected. Therefore, the need to restructure the administrative positions of neighborhoods in metropolitan cities emerged. In 2021, Metropolitan Law No. 7254 paved the way for a new administrative status, rural neighborhoods, to be given to villages that had been converted into neighborhoods. Thus, it is aimed to grant some financial privileges to places that maintain their rural character and resolve the existing problems. Nevertheless, with its various shortcomings, Metropolitan Law No. 7254 does not seem to resolve many problems caused by Law No. 6360.

1.3 Field and method

This research is based on the ethnographic fieldwork that I conducted between June 2021 and September 2021 in Yeşilkent, Karaçam, and Yıldırım Elören villages in Çubuk District of Ankara, where I made three round trips and stayed for about two weeks each time in my grandparents' house. Since I aimed to grasp the changing character of the rural space from the inside while experiencing and witnessing it myself, the ethnographic fieldwork as the method was the best option to observe, understand and convey the complex reflections of the change on the village and the network of relations in the village. It also opened up a space for me to dwelling on my personal relationship with the villages where I worked as a part of the research.

The fieldwork included observations and in-depth interviews with participants who resided and were in the village at the time, although they did not permanently reside there. The interview questions were to expand on participants' relationship with the city and the village, work, family, the community; their patterns of movements and mobility, and experience of migration; their experience of the changing village and changing relations. After transcribing all interviews, I merged my fieldnotes with data retrieved from these interviews. Then I started to divide them into different levels of categories, from broad themes in the beginning to specified subcategories and lower levels of subcategories. From the work of analysis on the lower levels of categorizing, there emerged the major themes, which became themes of the chapters in the thesis. During the analysis, I concentrated on participants' narratives, experiences, meaning and affect worlds with the aim of observing reflections of the transformation of the rural space first on ordinary people. From there, how the character of rural space has changed became apparent.

I interviewed 23 people in a total of 19 interviews,[2] all of these occurred in participants' houses or gardens in the village. 14 of these participants were in Karaçam, six in Yıldırım Elören, and three in Yeşilkent villages. Due to an outbreak of Coronavirus in Yeşilkent Village at the time, I could not get the chance to talk to more people there. The age of participants ranged from 43 to 78, mainly falling between 60 and 70 years old. Among them are 11 women and 12 men; all participants are married or widowed with children. Among these 23 people, I interviewed nine couples. To listen to each participant's account, I tried to ask and meet each participant separately. If I met a male participant first and his wife through him, I asked his wife whether she wanted to talk another time. Five women accepted this offer, whereas the other four were unwilling to talk alone, or I could not go back to arrange a new meeting with them. Therefore, participants attended as a couple in four interviews.

22 out of 23 participants were village-born; seven were women and left the village where they were born and grew up when they got married and moved in with their husbands in their village, district, or city. 15 of them left the village for varying reasons, in varying ways, at varying ages and years. Four of these 15 returned to the village after living in the city for varying periods and permanently settled in the village. Other 11 have kept their close link with the village, have visited as much as possible, and/or usually, after retirement, have started to spend spring and summer in their family house or the house they built for themselves. Currently, six of 23 participants permanently reside in the village and make their living out of livestock and/or agriculture. At the same time, the rest are mobile between the village and

[2] Throughout the thesis, participants are referred to by the names that I assigned. The list of interviews in Appendix A provides interview numbers in chronicle order, names, ages, birthplace, hometown, official residence, and occupational status of participants. The researcher is referred to with her initial E where it is necessary to quote.

other places and have different routines concerning where to live based on work, season, weather and et cetera. Except for four people who have settled in the village, everyone has another house in a different district, the city center of Ankara, or a different city (only one participant). Moreover, except for six people engaged in agriculture and livestock in the village, only two are actively employed (they are also retired), 11 out of 23 participants are retired, and seven are housewives. Regardless of where they are officially settled or how much of the year they spend in the village, some of them often said they could not leave the village behind, which emerges as a pattern.

How I met participants and that I was familiar with the field may have an effect that some women did not want to talk to me alone, or some rejected being interviewed in the first place. I was familiar with the field and could meet participants through my parents, my kinship ties, and because I am from one of these three villages, Karaçam. In most cases, my father was my informant who introduced me to people in Karaçam and other villages. A good portion of the participants I interviewed is my relatives from different distances or people I know because I have visited these villages and stayed in Karaçam many times since childhood. However, I needed my parents and my kinship ties' to open a space for people to trust me enough to participate in my research. My father willingly took up this task; sometimes, he was more enthusiastic than I was, while my mother preferred to take a role in the background. It was rare that women became willing immediately to participate when I explained the research and asked them to participate. Most of the time, they insisted that they would not know anything about my questions and that I would better talk to their husband or other people. After I explained that there is not much to know and that it is all about their life, story, and experience, they agreed and

were surprised when the interview was over because it was as if we were chatting ordinarily.

On other occasions, I first acquainted myself with their husbands and then with them because my father was acquainted with men in the village rather than women. For some participants, a spouse's, a relative's, or a fellow villager's request to participate in my research was not to be rejected. Accepting to be interviewed was the decent thing to do within familial and communal relationships, and rules of hospitality. On the other rare occasions, it was simply helping a student, whom they know from her childhood, or they know her family, to finish her thesis. Given that four women rejected being interviewed, I can say that it was harder to reach out to women and more challenging for them to open up to tell their stories. In interviews with couples, I sometimes needed to ask the same question directly to women, and it was challenging to manage the dynamic to prevent husbands from intervening in their wives' answers. At the same time, the reverse had never been a problem. It was even more difficult to keep listening to the husband talking simultaneously with his wife. When I could not, there was a risk of losing men's attention at the expense of women's stories, which was, in the end, that I was eager to take a risk.

I initially aimed for another village called Kışlacık to be a part of my fieldwork, not Yıldırım Elören. Nevertheless, my distant relative who lives there rejected talking to me and helping me find other participants there. Other than him, no other man rejected participating in my research. While interviewing male participants, I sometimes thought that my existence as a person or a researcher and my questions did not make a difference, that they would tell whatever they wanted to tell anyone regardless of the questions. However, others were curious about questions or waited for me to open a topic because they seemed not to want to talk

unnecessarily or too much. Furthermore, a few also asked me questions to hear how an educated person may explain something they find odd or what she may suggest for something they think unresolvable about the village. However, most of the male participants were enthusiastic, talkative, and confident about themselves and what they knew about the village and everything in general. In contrast, female participants seemed to prefer to be to the point or hesitant to make a claim.

These differences and others that I have not mentioned between my experiences with male and female participants in the field resemble what I experienced with my parents as my informants. My father was possessive of my work; on a few occasions, when he was present during the interviews and in the entire process, he intervened a lot, while my mother kept her distance from my work because she thought that she would not understand and could not help me. However, I insisted that her contribution and insights would be as valuable as my father's. She shared her stories and knowledge about the village only when I asked and told me to go with my father because he knew better how to help, and she would do the work of the house where we stayed while I was away with my father. While my father and I were away producing knowledge about the village, she did all the work of an old and crumbling two-stored village house, planted its garden, and grew greens.

When it comes to gardening or the work of the village, my father was also very insistent on what he knew because he had studied at a teacher training school in the 1970s that used to be a village institute and had learned everything about gardening and agriculture from books, from his teachers, by reading and practicing. Nevertheless, my mother lived in the village until she married my father and left the village, and she was doing many things that my father did 'properly' more spontaneously and with less effort. Like my mother, many women I met in these

villages did not acknowledge and belittle the quality and quantity of their work. Men usually had a detailed narrative of how they spent or used to spend a regular day and the work they did in the village. In contrast, many women I interviewed had very few words to define their work, such as one of them saying, "My work in the village was to cook at home, and then we would make *bazlama*. That is our work. We were churning."[3]

What I call the field for academic work is an essential part of my and my family's lives. Karaçam Village was where my parents were born, and my grandparents and a good portion of my larger family have lived a part of their lives. I am connected to other villages, Yeşilkent and Yıldırım Elören, similarly, through kinship ties because my two aunts are married in Yeşilkent Village, and my grandfather from my father's side had come to Karaçam from Yıldırım Elören Village. Beyond these close links, there should be a long history of the kinship network established among and between these villages and others, not only in this region but also in all regions, because villages are connected not only through the road and landscape but also through kinship relations. Moreover, these relations have extended from villages to cities as people move out and from cities to villages back as people move between villages and cities, shaping the context of my engagement with Karaçam Village.

I was not born and/or raised in these villages. I was born in Germany and raised in the city center of Ankara, but I have somehow included the village Karaçam in the concept and feeling of home as the response to where I am from. Therefore, knowing anything about the village to any degree has come through kinship relations that extend from Karaçam as far as my family's house in the city center, through my

[3] Translated from: "Ben köy işlerinde ev içinde yemek, ondan sonra bazlama yapardık genellikle. Bizlerin işi öyle. Yayık çalkardık." (Interview 5)

grandparents' and relatives' houses and gardens, through their labor on the land, in the livestock, in the village. Since childhood, I have frequently participated in the movement to and from the village, between houses of my relatives scattered around Ankara and other villages. In that, mobility is a crucial aspect of life, which in return and some cases, helped me share people's experiences and feelings and make sense of what I hear and observe.

At first, the field appeared as immobile because, in assumption, villages are places rooted in their geographical locations. However, people being mobile with different routines based on work schedule or seasons rendered mobility a crucial aspect of both the field and the village in general. Therefore, the practice in the field had to be dynamic and mobile comprising of movements and travels between Istanbul and Ankara, Ankara and villages, from one village to the other and back to Istanbul at last, to be written on paper. I planned to accompany people on the road to and from the village Karaçam and also continue the research in other places they live, mostly in their houses in the district center of Çubuk and other districts of Ankara, to observe routines of mobility better and understand how mobility and place are intertwined with one another. This effort was inspired by Marcus' deconstructing ethnography as a centrally localized methodology and promise to follow "people, things, ideas, metaphors and biographies" around trying to comprehend increasingly mobile world to a greater degree (Marcus, 1995, p. 98). As this effort could form a multi-sited ethnography, it could also lead to a "mobile

ethnography,"[4], which is the merge of ethnography's known methods with "new mobilities paradigm" (Sheller & Urry, 2006). Nevertheless, given the circumstances of the pandemic, traveling together with participants was not a good option.

In such a situation, my biography and family history became an even more critical tool for the research. However, such close personal relationships within the field could also be a limitation for the integrity of the knowledge production process. Therefore, it was necessary yet overwhelming to acknowledge and unravel my emplacement as an individual in and a part of this specific research context. At the same time, I strived to "investigate the emplacement of the people who participate in the ethnographic research" (Pink, 2009, p. 25). With this acknowledgment and working through my biography, I strived to "learn to occupy or imagine places or ways of perceiving and being that are similar, parallel to or indeed interrelated with and contingent on those engaged in by research participants" (Pink, 2009, p. 34).

[4] Andre Novoa defines mobile ethnography as "a translation of traditional participant observation onto contexts of mobility. It means that the ethnographer is not only expected to observe what is happening, but also to experience, feel and grasp the textures, smells, comforts and discomforts, pleasures and displeasures of a moving life. It means following people around and engaging with their worldviews. It means focusing on mobility" (Novoa, 2015, p. 99). Büscher et al. draw attention to mobile methods, "inquiries on the move – such as the shadowing, stalking, walk-alongs, ride-alongs, participatory interventions and biographies we describe – enable questions about sensory experience, embodiment, emplacement, about what changes and what stays the same, and about the configuration and reconfiguration of assemblies of objects, spaces, people, ideas and information" (Büscher, et al. 2011, p.13)

CHAPTER 2

FROM AND TOWARDS THE VILLAGE:

MIGRATION, MOBILITY AND MOVEMENTS IN THE RURAL SPACE

> Now I get out of here at 3 or 4 on Wednesday. I go right to Kışlacık. In Kışlacık, I look for butter and yogurt; I have buckets; I fill my buckets and weigh them. I pay for it. Then I go to my sister-in-law's house. I get the same butter and yogurt from there. If she has cheese, I take her cheese. I pass from there too. I go down village by village. After that, we continue. I come home at around 8-8:30, at 9:30 in the evening. I load my goods in the morning. I go to the market. We open the market stall at 6:30 on Sunday. After that, customers come. We have something to sell; we have something to buy. Time passes by, mingling with them until 8:30 in the evening. Again, I go to Ankara, Keçiören side, for the Friday market. Saray, Pursaklar, Bağlum, Ufuktepe, Kuşçağız. Besides, I buy milk from [neighborhoods] below, three hundred and fifty liters a week. One person's milk, our friend from Hajj. I distribute it. On the way back in the evening, right to either Karaçam or Çubuk. It depends on the bride [his wife] status in the house. (Interview 8) (See Appendix C, 1)

This is the weekly routine of Taha, a sixty-seven-year-old man born in Karaçam Village. He left the village and moved out to Çubuk District when he was three years old because his father got a job as a construction worker in the Çubuk Dam construction. He was trained as a furniture maker, but after returning from the military service, he started to work as a municipal police officer in the district. After retiring in 2001 and not working for two years, his pension started not to be enough. Therefore, he and his wife decided to go into the business of buying dairy products from farmers in villages and selling them in markets in Çubuk and other districts of Ankara. After the partition of inherited lands from the grandfather among him and his relatives, they built a house in 2010 on land on the outskirts of the village, which used to be cultivated in the past. I met them at this house on a Monday afternoon, so at the time they had returned from the district that weekend and were to hit the road

again in two days. On days like these, when they are at home in the village, they keep busy gardening and improving their house. Sometimes their children and grandchildren come to visit them.

This type of back-and-forth movement between the village and the city and/or district is common in Karaçam and other villages, Yeşilkent and Yıldırım Elören, that were part of the field of this research. Such movement occurs with different subjects, relationships, reasons, understandings, affects, and routines. Those who have to work during the week come on weekends and public holidays, while the retirees come around March when the weather starts to warm up and stay until the winter months. Those engaged with gardening adjust themselves according to grafting and irrigation, and those with beekeeping have to check hives every weekend from April to August once in 20 or 25 days in other months. Sometimes house in the village requires care, so it is also necessary to open and ventilate the house from time to time, put rat medicine where necessary and repair the ruining parts. And sometimes it is just a day-long trip for a picnic and sees longed landscape or to carry stored supplies to the city and necessary ones to the village.

The close distance between the village and other places renders back-and-forth movement more accessible.[5] For example, when a curfew was imposed during the pandemic, Murat from Karaçam Village came to the village right before the curfew started at 9 o'clock. His wife used to prepare everything he would need until he came from work, and he used to come directly to the village every Friday. Ahmet

[5] Three villages are lined up on the same road, Yıldırım Elören being the farthest from the district center with 37 km and the city center with 80 km. From Karaçam Village, the city center is 75 km, and the district center is 39 km. From Yeşilkent Village, the city center is 69 km, and the district center is 28 km. It is essential that more and more people have cars too, because this they are not bound to public transportation. A bus line between the city center and the district center takes 160 minutes. Between the district center and villages of that part of the district, someone from Uluağaç Village operates a private *dolmuş* line on Thursdays. If someone wants to go to Çubuk or Ankara from the village, they need to call to be picked up at the village entrance.

explains the easiness as "[E]ighty kilometers between that house and this house…It is not very far…[People] go on a picnic to Beynam forests…Gölbaşı is at least sixty-seventy kilometers away. [They] will also stay for two-three hours, then come back. But it's not like that here."[6]

Based on these unique or different experiences of participants, this chapter will focus on movements occurring at a close distance between the village and the city and the living conditions and experiences these movements form. The chapter will first discuss how to conceptualize movements, mobility, and place to establish how objects of the research are taken. It will then detail the history, patterns and routines of these movements, and mobility between the village and the city in Turkey. It will explain different forms of mobility, and how movements occurring at a close distance in these villages and in the region are differentiated from them. It will put forward that these differentiated movements are connected with the current situation of the village, the relationship between the village and the city, and are constructive of the complex relation between the village, the district, and the city. It will lastly contemplate on *gurbet* (foreign land), *gurbetsizler* (those who have not experienced living in foreign lands), and how being *gurbetsiz* and personal traits of *gurbetsizler* can be related to movements occurring at a close distance between the village and the city.

2.1 A conceptual discussion on place, movements, and mobility

In order to explain social processes that construct villages, it is also necessary to go through assumptions about them, since assumptions in part construct places, too. For

[6] Translated from: "Seksen kilometre o evle bu evin arası… E çok bir uzak değil… Şimdi Beynam ormanlarına pikniğe gidiyor… Gölbaşı en aşağı yukarı vardır altmış yetmiş kilometre. E bir de iki saat üç saat kalacak. Tekrar gelecek. Ama bura öyle değil." (Interview 3)

sure, villages, like other places, have not undergone changes and transformations in the same way since development occurs unevenly. However, in the current state, where "the extent of commuting between urban and rural areas has increased dramatically," there emerge "zones of transition around large urban centers where urban and rural functions are mixed together" (Champion & Hugo, 2004, p. 11). Therefore, focusing on the movement to and from villages may lead to understanding a transitional zone. However, the idea of a transitional zone between urban and rural may still depend on an ontological assumption, in which "by involving the notion of 'in-between,' it seeks to understand how two polar opposites can be brought together," however, there should rather be efforts "to comprehend how the locus of place is a *unity* containing within itself different aspects" (Merrifield, 1993, p. 519).

Effects of assuming that rural and urban are ontologically two polar opposites, and there can be a transitional space in-between can also be observed elsewhere. Some studies of urban development and migration predicted increasing urban growth in developing countries since the 1970s (Kelley & Williamson, 1984). Many argued that the urban population would grow steadily and rapidly in the last quarter of the twentieth century due to the privilege and priority given to cities and urbanization in economic development policies (Lipton, 1976; Bairoch, 1988). By the late 1990s, others argued that the urban population had grown slowly over the past few decades in developing countries, and previous estimates of rapid population growth turned out to be exaggerated (Becker & Morrison, 1999). According to Brokerhoff (1999), the main factors behind this were the relatively slow development of the urban industry, the aging population, and migration policies in developing countries, mainly due to the global economic transformation.

Keyder and Yenal (2004) argued that in these works of both Brockerhoff and others (Becker & Morrison, 1999; Satterwaite, 1996), changes in inspiration and expectations of people in rural areas due to diversification in employment and globalization in rural areas were not essential enough to lead to the failure of the predicted urban growth. However, Keyder and Yenal (2004) argued that migration slowed down in the 1980s and the 1990s not only because the effects of the pulling factors of urban areas decreased but also, maybe primarily, because the gap between urban and rural narrowed as the village became more livable. While the failure to arrive at the predicted pace of urban growth in developing countries was evaluated taking urban on the focus and without deconstructing and problematizing the dichotomy of the urban and the rural and the city and the village, Keyder and Yenal focused on the rural when they emphasized on the decreased effects of the pushing factors of villages.

Such a dichotomic understanding of rural and urban constitutes the rural as "an outdated concept, residualized and perhaps totally transcended by the spatial hegemony of urbanized capitalism …but the rural is much more alive, mobile and versatile, manifesting itself to varying degrees in any time-space as representation, practice, and experience" (Halfacree, 2004, p. 285; p. 302). Therefore, the village as one pole of the dichotomy cannot be defined through the negation of the city as the other pole and with regard to the absence and presence of its particularities. In a Lefebvrian resolution, the village and the city can be thought to be operating "as aspects of unity…interrelated parts of a whole… [in which] dynamism is immanent to reality" (Merrifield, 1993, p. 517). If it is possible to see the rural and the urban in such a dialectic relationship, movements from and to the village may become aspects of the village, and therefore, they become aspects of the place, too.

In the dialectic relationship, another ontological assumption of the dichotomy of sedentary settlement and singular residence trickles away because as migration is a "space-time phenomenon" (King, 2012, p. 136), settlement and movement are connected. Hence "the very idea of home place becomes plural," or there become "multiple roots in different places" as *heterolocalism* indicates (Halfacree, 2012, p. 217). Moreover, "living structures" are introduced to mark a "sense of space/place as defined in relation to time/movement, with structures as the arrangements/patterns of spatiotemporal locations and 'living' as the human dynamics of this, the changing (re)construction and more or less flexible employment of these in people's lives" (Öztürk et al., 2013, p. 372). Such a view may lead to transcending the binary of the rural and the urban, on the one hand and, on the other hand, it opens a space for a consideration in which place is understood as the "internally heterogeneous, dialectical and dynamic configurations of relative 'permanences' within the overall spatio-temporal dynamics of the socio-ecological process," rather than "mere position or location within a map of space-time constituted within some social process or an entity or 'permanence' occurring within and transformative of the construction of space-time" (Harvey, 1996, p. 294).

2.2 Migration, movement, mobility

Esma is the only city-born participant from a village of Çankırı, Ankara's neighboring city in the northeast, but her parents migrated to Ankara before she was born. She met Karaçam Village when she married her husband, Uğur. Before they both retired, they did not visit the village very often. After Uğur retired too, they wanted a house in the village. They asked Esma's parents to give them a piece of land enough to build a house in their village in Çankırı, but her parents declined to

provide. Therefore, although she did not want to be in Karaçam at first, she found herself dealing with a house in Karaçam. With her husband, they spend springs and summers in the village and winters in the city, but wherever they are primarily based, they are mobile in-between. When I asked whether she is contented with commuting frequently and living in two different houses and places, she said:

> If not, time does not pass. This way is better to spend time. I went to Çubuk yesterday...I tell my husband not to stay here constantly…go and return. Sometimes I am with my father, and he stays here…he does not leave at least for a week or two…Let him be here for a month; there is no way he will go down. That is the way he loves life. (Interview 14) (See Appendix C, 2)

For Esma, the movement between the village and the city facilitates passing time as if being mobile in-between places renders a place more enjoyable. Likewise, Faik describes how he moved back and forth in-between before he settled back in the village "I used to come to the village when I was bored," but for his permanently settling back in the village he says that "[f]or now, we watch over Karaçam village."[7] In that, for some, motivation for the movement to the village, whether constantly or in a way to end in settlement, emanates from belonging to the village. People who left the village in diverse ways and for different reasons describe the mobility they have continued in different forms for years as *not actually leaving the village*. "I did not leave the village. I still come and go to the village. What else is there?"[8] says Murat very simply and Ömer is more articulate with regard to their long history of mobility:

> we have never left the village. In 15-20 days, whether on foot or another way, we were constantly coming and going, visiting. So I never left the village. I worked for 30 years, but I still have not left. In the summer, I would have a month off, 20 or 30 days, and we would stay in the village all the time. I even traveled among cattle. (Interview 19) (See Appendix C, 3)

[7] Translated from: "Ben bunaldığım zaman köye geliyordum…Şimdilik Karaçam'ı bekleriz köyü" (Interview 6)
[8] Translated from "Köyü bırakmadım. Halihazırda da daha köye gelip gidiyorum. Başka neler var ki?" (Interview 7)

Among all participants, the first to leave the village is Celal from Yıldırım Elören Village. He left the village with his family in 1950 when he was only one year old. According to him, his father was the first person to return to the village after retiring from working in the city. It takes until the early 1990s for other village-born participants to leave their villages and move to the city. Based on dates participants reported during interviews, outmigration from the village in the region appears as a continuous phenomenon, and their history of migration and mobility is intertwined with migration and mobility patterns in Turkey.

With increasing industrialization and urbanization from the 1960s onwards, many people started to move to cities, particularly Istanbul. Throughout the mid-1970s, ten percent of the national population was registered as migrants (İçduygu, 2009). From 1975 until 2000, three and a half million people migrated from rural to urban areas. Nevertheless, this accounted for only one-fifth of the migration in the country in that period. Moreover, in the same period, more than half of this movement was between urban areas. Almost three million people were also migrating from urban to rural areas (TSI, 2000). This means that the rural population grew up until the 1980s, but its growth was slower than the urban population. Towards the end of the 1980s, the urban population exceeded the rural population for the first time (Zeybek, 2011). The rural population decreased even more sharply until reaching 35 percent in 2000. Although the pace slowed down until it reached 23 percent in 2012, under the effects of changes in the Turkish Statistical Institute's official measurements for the rural population and the implementation of a

municipality law,[9] the rural population has decreased to 7.7 percent as of 2018 (Öztürk, 2013; TSI, 2018).

It can be observed that the population in the rural geography of Turkey has decreased vitally throughout the last 50 years, while the urban population has exceeded the rural population at various paces. Öztürk et al. (2017) refer to two conventional assumptions, the first of which is that the growth of the urban population in a few prominent cities appears to be due to migration from provincial towns and smaller cities rather than rural areas, and the second of which is that migration from urban to rural areas, counter migration, had already begun taking place from the 1970s onwards.

For the first one, the underlying logic is that people migrate from the countryside to cities because agriculture requires less and less labor and job opportunities are on the rise in the city, "where the increased surplus value produced in the urban-oriented secondary and tertiary sectors also translates into higher wages/salaries," and "urban-to-urban migration may be explained similarly, only with families uprooting and people moving from small, agrarian-oriented towns to cities, and (especially) from these provincial towns and cities to the metropolitan conurbations" (Öztürk et al., 2017, p. 3; Öztürk et al., 2013, p. 374). Intending to highlight diversity, Öztürk et al. suggest the name *urban-based urban directed flow* as an improvement to the basic rural-to-urban migration model of economic development because within what is typically known as urban migration there is also the movement that has started from urban rather than rural areas.

[9] Due to the implementation of Municipal Law No. 6360 on the Establishment of Fourteen Metropolitan Municipalities and Twenty-Seven Districts and Amendments at Certain Law and Decree Laws from the 12th of November 2012 onwards, the administrative statuses of 16,082 villages in 14 metropolitan cities have been changed into the neighborhood, and they have become part of respective city populations in official terms. Over a night, the rural population of these cities decreased to 0 percent, and Turkey's urban population increased to 92,1 percent from 77 percent (Özçağlar, 2016).

The second assumption concerning high numbers of people migrating to villages and the case that it has developed such extensively in Turkey before the emergence of a mass middle class is worthy of greater attention since it may have acquired a different character than *counterurbanization*, which is conventionally known as "a bourgeois phenomenon related to rural idyll" (Öztürk et al., 2013, p. 374). At the same time, others argue that "metanarratives of population change…based on lifestyle-led voluntary movements of middle-class groups to rural areas" should be reassessed critically (Milbourne, 2007, p. 382; Halfacree, 2012).

Revisiting these two conventional assumptions regarding population and migration is vital to reconsider the meaning of mobility from and towards the village because terms such as urban migration is not adequate to depict the diverse nature of the movement between rural and urban areas. Movements between places and geographies are complex phenomena. Categorizing them according to points of departure and arrival and "the spatial hegemony of urbanized capitalism" deprive us of seeing the diverse ways in which these movements can take place, the kinds of places they can produce, ways in which the character of the rural space, and the urban space, has been changing and how they can be constitutive of subjectivities. As in the cases of Karaçam, Yeşilkent, and Yıldırım Elören villages, movements that started in these villages in some ways fit into the category of urban migration since, in the end, people migrated from their villages to urban areas at different distances. However, the back-and-forth movement people have continued throughout their lives, their return movement to settle back in the village, and the changing character of the rural space under the effects of these movements are adequately represented by the category of urban migration. To better represent these movements towards and

from the village and the changing character of the rural space, it will be convenient to begin with participants' narratives on how and why the movement started.

2.3 "There was more flow to Ankara back then."

> Children of neighbors and friends are leaving. There was a flow from here. A migration started. When it did, now you are a student, there were 100 students at the school, 80 of them have gone somewhere. You think, as the 20 left behind in the village, these 80 are gone, why are we staying? And we went and worked. (Interview 13) (See Appendix C, 4)

> We left because of the conditions in the village... there was more flow to Ankara back then. Such cattle as now did not exist; there were no opportunities... At that time, you could not sell fifty sheep and fifteen black cattle and buy a tractor. Now selling ten calves is enough to buy a tractor. You know, we went because of those conditions then. Everyone in the village went. There was not many left. That is why we went that it would be better. (Interview 7) (See Appendix C, 5)

Like many participants I interviewed and others in these villages, Erhan and Murat left their villages to work at the organized industrial zone known as *Siteler* in Ankara through the late 1980s. When telling their stories about why and how they left the village, they refer to the outmigration from their villages as a flow (*akım*). It highlights the intensity and prevalence of outmigration from their villages, as if it was something in which they got carried away, in a way that staying in the village could not be an option. Ömer from Yeşilkent Village explains the choicelessness faced at the time as follows:

> What would we do if we stayed in the village? We could not do anything. I saw that there was nothing. I had two more brothers and a sister behind me. You see, there is nothing here. In the morning you go to the mountains with a donkey. You bring ample firewood. You burn it down in one day. Nothing made any sense. That is why I got a job. I worked there. (Interview 19) (See Appendix C, 6)

Faik from Karaçam Village draws attention to the same issue: there were not many options in the village, but adopts a different angle. When he returned to the village from the military service, he first decided to build a house for his future larger family

and even dug out its foundation. However, later, he says: "If I stay in this village, I'll get married, and there's no woman in the village and no one marrying their daughter to me. I said it's better to leave this village."[10] So he left the village, leaving behind his mother and the pit with stones removed.

Calling outmigration from the village as flow may also mean that its current or stream can sometimes take different turns, as it can be seen that migration from urban areas to rural areas had already begun from the 1970s onwards while urban population was increasing in different paces. Whereas small families or individuals within large families were leaving the village one by one over time, the movement back to the village had already begun. Two participants from Yıldırım Elören Village returned to the village after they had worked a few years in *Siteler*. Erhan had to return because his elderly parents could not care of the fields and livestock. He, later on, had other opportunities to move out from the village when his commander in the military wanted to recruit him as a shooter, but his mother resisted. He eventually wholly took over the family's business and house. On the other hand, Ali had to return to the village because when his father died, he was somehow the only one among married brothers to return and take care of their mother, younger single brothers, and business. However, their wives did not want to settle permanently. Suzan, Ali's wife, said, "this village was established like that,"[11] I asked what she meant. She answered:

> I wasn't married to stay here. I was going to Ankara when my husband was discharged from the military. My in-laws died. When they both died, there were four boys left to marry; we got stuck with cattle. Then they [other brothers] helped from Ankara. We got it from here. We got them married. (Interview 16) (See Appendix C, 7)

[10] Translated from: "Bu köyde dursam, evleneceğiz, karı yok. Ondan sonra, kız veren yok…en iyisi mi dedim burayı ben terk edeyim bu köyü." (Interview 6)
[11] Translated from: "Bu köy öyle kurulmuş" (Interview 6)

It appears that the village was established by those who could not leave. Suzan said she used to cry until a few years ago because she wanted to move to Ankara for the reason that "[i]t was much work. Village life is tough. No sitting back until the evening." Then she added, "[n]ow I've given up hope, I won't be able to leave the village… If I go, I can't stay there now. How will you stay there? You'll be inside four walls there. We make our living, thank God. We're comfortable."[12] All she cares about now is whether her children in the city will worry financially. Animal husbandry and farming are the only things they know how to do; Ali thought he had no chance of finding a job in the city after a certain age, so he wanted to stay despite his wife's desire to leave. Like Suzan, Berna wanted to move to Ankara, thinking that a job with insurance would save her children. But her husband, Erhan, didn't, for the same reason as Ali; Berna said, "No pension, no insurance… no other job other than animal husbandry. Where can you go from now on? What job can you do?"[13]

Thus, the rural work, animal husbandry and agriculture, as what they learned when they grew up and knew how to do best, seems to be the thing that prevents them from leaving the village and moving out to Ankara, binding them to where they are, to the village, given that the rural work is bounded to rural areas. In the end, while Erhan and Ali assumed the responsibility to take over and care for the household and settled back in the village with their own families against their wives' wishes, the rest of their larger families was able to be more mobile because when someone from the family lives in the village, there is always a place to stay in. Theregfore, *flow* to Ankara and back to the village, migration from and to the village,

[12] Translated from: "Önceden de iş çoktu işte. Köy hayatı zor. Akşama kadar oturak yok durak yok. Böyleydi... Şimdi gali umudu kestim ya, köyden gidemeyeceğim gayri… Gitsem şimdi orada ben duramam. Nasıl duracaksın orada? Dört duvar arasına gireceksin orada. Geçimizi sağlarız Allah'ıma bin şükür. Rahat." (Interview 16)

[13] Translated from: "Emeklisi yok, sigortası yok…hayvancılıktan başka bir iş de yok. Bu saatten sonra nereye gidebilirsin, ne iş yapabilirsin?" (Interview 15)

and mobility between the village and other places may occur and have occurred simultaneously with various motivations and arrangements.

2.4 "Here is a mixed system; the village, Çubuk, Ankara."

> All smart people here went to Ankara at that time. The older people stayed. Then older people took their hands off work... those who finished primary school used to go to *Siteler*, which was the job source. There is no one left here...the older people have stayed. What will happen when they die? Now retirees are coming. Does anyone with a job come here now? They will not. What will they do here? What will they earn? (Interview 5) (See Appendix C, 8)

These words of Feza refer not only to Karaçam, where she started to live in springs and summer after her husband İsmet retired, but also to Kuzuören, her hometown village nearby. They reveal how migration from the village is constitutive in the way that the village has been changed. As a result of a series of flows to Ankara and other places, the village has become a place where most older people live; younger people visit regularly or irregularly, and people who migrate before return after they retire. According to Celal from Yıldırım Elören Village and his observations on people's mobility patterns, people who live in Ankara want to come to the village more than people who live in Çubuk District. People who live in the village make money out of livestock farming and whose many close relatives live in Çubuk, therefore, find coming to the village quite easy due to the closer distance in-between. He then adds, "here is a mixed system; the village, Çubuk, Ankara… there are no young people in this village."[14] A similar situation is observable in the other two villages too. For example, Taha from Karaçam Village compares himself to his son and says, "I am 66 years old. My child will not be able to come and settle down here from now on. He

[14] Translated from: "Burası köy, Çubuk, Ankara karışık bir sistem…bu köyde hiç genç yok." (Interview 11)

just turned 46. Will he come now? Not possible. If he comes, he will come here for a picnic."[15] Ahmet from Karaçam Village elaborates on this with similar reasoning:

> what will our young people do in the village? They have to leave for work. Their parents die. Inevitably, the population decreased in the village. There is not such a population decrease in Ankara…If I count my cousins right now, they may be not less than 25-30. Where are all they? In Pursaklar, Çubuk, Ankara. What would happen if they stayed in the village now? The population would be 150-200. But since there is not any area of work, you will either retire or do an activity here. That is how the return will happen. Otherwise, there is no return to the village. For example, after we die…one of our children will come here only when s/he retires. Otherwise, they come and go daily. (Interview 3) (See Appendix C, 9)

In these examples, we understand that the rural work not only prevents people who make a living out of it from leaving the village and moving to Ankara, but it also obstructs return to the village. Ahmet's reasoning is widely shared among participants. It makes sense to many that people of the working age do not settle in the village due to the limited means of making a living in the village. However, since increasingly more people start to live in rural areas, regardless of their initial relationship with rural areas, for various reasons, it can be argued that the return of the village coincides with the return to the village. Because for increasingly more people, rural areas have replaced urban areas as places to settle and dwell in. Therefore, when assessed all together, all the differentiated movements to rural areas can manifest the return of the village, to the center of attention.

Why retirees do not settle in the village is beyond the grasp of some. For example, Rıza from Karaçam Village, who settled in the village and started livestock farming after he retired, says:

> Our village is good for a retiree. Otherwise, there is no such thing as staying in the village and making a living here. I am against that young people live and make a living here. The retirees should come back...If they do not work, they should return to their village. If 10 people return to this village from

[15] Translated from: "Şahsen ben 66 yaşındayım. Benim çocuğum buraya gelip de yuva kuracak hali yok bundan sonra. O da girmiş 46 yaşına. E şimdi gelecek mi? Mümkün değil. Anca gelirse buraya piknik yapmaya gelir." (Interview 8)

> Ankara, Ankara will be less crowded. If 50 people return to the other village, Ankara will be even less crowded; that is, there will be a return to the village altogether. (Interview 9) (See Appendix C, 10)

Rıza goes on to name people from his generation one by one and expresses his anger towards them because they have not returned to the village as he did after he retired. Behind his desire for his fellow retiree villagers to return to the village, there lie the problems he lives with the shepherd in the village. In each of these three villages, people who are engaged in livestock farming either hire a shepherd together for all herds or take turns themselves according to the number of their cattle to watch over the herds put out to grass. The shepherd at that time was hired by an outsider who rented a vacant barn in the village. Because Rıza and the outsider were the only people engaged in livestock farming in the village, Rıza's cattle used to join the outsider's much larger herd. However, the shepherd did not pay much attention to Rıza's cattle because the outsider was the actual employer. That is why Rıza wishes that his fellow retiree villagers return to the village, start livestock farming, and then together, they can hire a shepherd *just for the village.*

The general understanding is that the return to the village happens only when people who migrated to the city migrate back to the village. However, Celal calls his village *a mixed system* of Ankara, Çubuk, and the village itself, where the village is comprised of not only people who live inside the geographical boundaries of the village but also all people who move between the village and other places outside of geographical boundaries, some participants conceive the return to the village to be a more *mixed,* diversified movement. Ömer from Yeşilkent Village says, "the return to the villages is gradually starting. There are many people who build houses. One or two people build a house in the village every year," and his wife Ayten adds, "four or

three houses have been built this year." [16] I asked whether they are also retired and returning like them. They said, "there are those who have returned, those who stay in the summer, those who stay until the summer. Some retired and settled and live here. There are also ones who sometimes come and leave like us."[17] While talking about the return, they also mentioned those who have returned and converted their old house in the village into a barn while still living in the city, Ayten said that they "hired the shepherd, they are there, the barn is here, they get the cattle taken care of."[18] Feza from Karaçam Village similarly emphasizes those who come for summer and that many people from both the village and outside of the region want to buy land in the village. Therefore, according to their observations, the return to the village may also indicate the return of the village.

Both the return to the village or the return of the village can be thought with concepts that may lead to reinterpreting the mobility between the village and other places and the changing character of rural space in Turkey. For example, Escribano (2006) argues that urban-to-rural migration cannot be explained as an isolated concept and should be evaluated as the end product of social and economic restructuring processes that have been ongoing in rural and urban areas, in accordance with social changes and technological improvements that make communication and travel easier compared to the experience of previous generations (Okumuş, 2018; Halfacree & Boyle, 1993; Woods, 2005). Furthermore, urban-to-rural migration is also connected to counterurbanization, suburbanization, and rural gentrification (Uysal & Sakarya, 2018).

[16] Translated from: "Köylere dönüş başlıyor azar azar. Bayağı ev yapanlar var. Bizim köye her sene bir tane iki tane ev yapan var…Dört tane üç tane ev yapan oldu bu sene." (Interview 19)
[17] Translated from: "Dönenler var, yazın oturanlar var. Yaza kadar da oturanlar var. Emekli olup da buraya yerleşip de burada oturanlar var. Ama bizim gibi bazen gidip dönenler de var. (Interview 19)
[18] Translated from: "Köyden gitti, adamlar tekrar geldi, evlerinin yerine ahır yaptı. Çobanı tuttu, kendi orada, ahır burada. Malı baktırıyor." (Interview 19)

According to Philips (2010), counterurbanization leans on changes in population and migration statistics as a result of the movement from urban areas to rural areas, whereas rural gentrification accentuates the displacement of locals and its dimension of class differences. In Sutherland's study (2012), rural gentrification can be described as a counterurbanization merged with social upgrading of the locale, landscape change, and the displacement of low-income residents. However, counterurbanization is "more complex than the 'purified' dominant understanding" (Halfacree, 2012, p. 210). Mitchell (2004), for example, identifies three subcategories of counterurbanization to render the term more sufficient to apprehend the phenomenon's complexity. Building on the literature that makes similar categorizations, she suggests "ex-urbanization" for ex-urban residents who retain their ties to the city through their daily commute to work, "displaced-urbanization" for households that move to rural areas looking for employment and/or living with lower cost, "anti-urbanization" for migration dependent upon lifestyle choices (Mitchell, 2004, p. 23-24).

Öztürk et al. (2013) include counterurbanization in rural-directed movements. It is an attempt to account for the variety of motivations, processes, and styles of people migrating to the countryside in the case of Turkey. These movements merge with "living structures" which are "spaces that people in Turkey are creating as their geo-social realities, or the socio-spatial products of their movement" (Öztürk et al., 2013, p. 372). Their framework divides rural-directed movements into three subcategories: counterurban movement, rural return movement and transrural movement. Counterurban movement is close to the typical counterurbanization, yet the emphasis is on mobility because the focus has shifted from the urban toward the rural environment. It consists of one-step migration and the following mobility with

the development of commuter-belt areas in rural Turkey, which includes quickly growing housing projects that are not in accord with preexisting rural settlements and form suburban villages which are mainly located on the peripheries of conurbations in a way to exemplify uneven national development.

Counterurban movements also include the return of urban retirees to the countryside, where the inflow of city wealth and culture may occur in rural areas. However, garden farming is still highly dominant since pensions may not serve as a living wage. Such settlement begins with weekend and holiday mobilities, and it is completed with a long-term migration and can be considered an extended, indeterminate counterurban movement. It appears as a life-long process for individuals and families, which usually also has a geo-seasonal side to it, in that, people may live in the city in winter and the village in summer. This makes the second home a place for summer, known as *yazlık* in Turkish. Furthermore, a similar counterurban movement between a suburban and summer village may also occur. With their different emerging aspects, these movements produce the living structure of "rural-urbanite dual place residence" and retirement/summer and commuter villages.[19]

The second rural-directed movement is the rural return movement, which is the return to the native rural settlement. Although it can be conceived as a counterurban movement, it is specified for people who move to their village, for example, as they retire and when children's education is completed, which is one of the primary reasons for them to move to the city in the beginning. These, similar to counterurban movements, incline to involve recurrent family travels to the village on

[19] These villages are in the typology suggested by Öztürk and his colleagues (2014). The rest are Agricultural villages, semi-seasonal semi-agricultural villages, semi-agricultural villages, suburban villages, ex-agro-industrial villages, emptied villages, and moribund villages.

weekends, holidays, and in summers for the unemployed. Advanced transportation paved the way for such often and recurring travel, and affordable air travel (Sheller & Urry, 2006; King, 2012; Öztürk et al., 2013). The third and last of rural-directed movements is transrural movement, through which people who migrated from rural areas to Europe, especially to Germany, return to their native village or summer/retirement villages for holidays or permanently.

Concepts, frameworks, and classifications mentioned above can be valuable tools to represent better and provide a framework to analyze the movements between the village and other places. As Öztürk et al. diversify movements between villages and other places, they reveal those movements' differentiating characters, which matters because they are productive for living structures and places. In these, Öztürk et al. put forward a new village typology in accord with the characteristics of movements from and towards the village and some other parameters. They focus on villages both in their established forms and in the new forms that they are taking. For example, by means of which, counterurban movements have produced rural-urbanite dual place residence and retirement/summer and commuter villages. Rural-directed movements seem diverse enough to contain movements from and towards the village. On the one hand, in the cases of Karaçam, Yıldırım Elören, and Yeşilkent villages, the flow from the village to Ankara and succeeding back-and-forth and return movements can best be discussed under the category of rural return movements due to its emphasis on the rural areas where people left in the past but now in different forms they return to. On the other, the emphasis so far put on one's village, hometown, and familiar places will shift to *gurbet* and foreign lands, which often found a niche in the participants' narratives.

2.5 Gurbet

In the interview, Taha said that his grandfather "migrated to Çubuk three times, came back to Karaçam three times."[20] as if pointing out an inability to do otherwise, that is, the inability to live in other places and eventually return to the village. For now, Taha is himself mobile between Karaçam and Çubuk because he sells dairy products at the market in Çubuk. However, he said, "if we can do it, we'll quit the market and live permanently in Karaçam or go under the great pine."[21] Not understanding what he meant, I asked where the big pine was. His wife Oya explained, "it is the inevitable end for all of us."[22] It slowly became clear that the metaphor "under the great pine" originated from the huge pine tree in the village cemetery, on which a small signboard writes, "This tree has been left to nature for biodiversity and ecological balance."[23] If the attribution of a state of inability to live in other places holds correct, Taha's words bring out that whether one can live in other places, the place where they will be dead is the village, which takes its name from black pine trees around.

However, before the eventual return to the village, many people prefer to live at a close distance from the village, mainly in Çubuk and Ankara. When questioned about why they have not gone to further places, Feza said:

> We prefer it to be closer because we have not seen distant places. We used to think of such places as *gurbet* before. We think that places we live in should be close…since we are born and raised here, it feels comfortable to us. We did not open up and give many in *gurbet* before. When we went away like that, it is like we got lost. We think so. However, why not travel and see beautiful places? (Interview 5) (See Appendix C, 11)

[20] Translated from: "Üç kere Çubuk'a göç etmiş. Üç kere Karaçam'a geri gelmiş." (Interview 8)
[21] Translated from: "Yapebilirsek pazarı da bırakacağız, temelli Karaçam'da duracağız ya da koca çamın dibine gireceğiz." (Interview 8)
[22] Translated from: "O kaçınılmaz hepimizin sonu." (Interview 8)
[23] Translated from: "Bu ağaç biyolojik çeşitlilik ve ekolojik denge için doğaya bırakılmıştır."

That the place plays a central role in people's lives is not a far-fetched deduction. However, these words refer to a state of the need to stay in close proximity to the village because of the feeling of being lost in distant places, in *gurbet.* Some even think that being close enough to the village to be able to return at any time has a profound effect on what kind of people they are. Murat said:

> Since our village is close to the city, we have not become men [*adam olmak*]. I wish our village were far away so we could not return…The man coming from the east is now buying [property in] Ankara and Istanbul. They came but could not return. I mean that it is hard for them to return. But now I am leaving in an hour, and I am at home in 50 minutes. I am going home until dinner is ready at home, and the tea is brewed. (Interview 7) (See Appendix C, 12)

As the rural work prevents people who are engaged in it from leaving the village, being close to the village, in Murat's rationale, prevents people from *adam olmak.* People, who Murat takes as a point of reference, have become so wealthy that they can buy plenty amount of property in Istanbul and Ankara, because they have come from the east and places that are harder to return to. While talking about what could happen when someone leaves the village, Arif similarly connects being in *gurbet* with better management of the economy:

> you could have gone to different cities. You would have seen the traditions and customs of different cities. Your children could be different. You could be something better. You could have studied. You could have had a particular career. Your economy could have been a little better. You do not have much of an economy inside [the village], but when you go out, you see more of the economy because you are on your own at *gurbet;* there are not many to help. You are necessarily trying. You try to see further. So, you are braver. (Interview 10) (See Appendix C, 13)

Therefore, being alone without help or solidarity at *gurbet* renders people more courageous since they have to be so. Nevertheless, Arif thinks that this is a quality that people from his village do not have, and in a way, it is to refer to a state of inability as Taha accounts, "…they hadn't seen, hadn't left. He went to Çubuk in the morning. He could not wait until the evening. He came to his wife, came to the

village or he came to his house. He didn't say I would go" and he described that "man of our hometown, that region, is a man who does not know *gurbet*," and characterized them as *"gurbetsiz adam."*[24] Therefore, it can be said that *gurbet* gives more knowledge and experience if a person dares. To make this point, Erhan began by adapting a frequently asked question, whether the one who travels or the one who reads knows more, into a concise story:

> [t]hey asked the wise person [*alim*] whether the one who travels or the one staying at the bottom of his/her log[25] [*kütüğünün dibinde duran*] know more. The wise person said that the one who travels knows. If you join the society, at the wedding or funeral, you will know if you visit places. The man who grows up here in the house sees nothing. He cannot look out the door. His point of view is always inside the house and does not see outside. You travel the world; your perspective becomes very wide… A person will travel. S/he will appreciate everything s/he owns, be a guest, and know how to be hosted. S/he will know how to pay homage to the guest. (Interview 13) (See Appendix C, 14)

It can be said that, according to Erhan and the wise man, going out of the village and seeing other places will lead to adopting proper manners and a much broader perspective, which work across all different kinds of places. Esma corroborates this affiliation, arguing that people in the village always encounter people within the same culture because they do not go out of the village and see other places. She adds, "A cultured person does not harm…A person should improve herself. If s/he stays inside four walls, don't do any activity, what will happen?"[26] Ömer tells what will happen when a person does not stay inside the four walls and goes out of the village:

> There were civil engineers, mechanical engineers, and architects where I worked. If I hadn't seen them, maybe I wouldn't be like this. I wouldn't be this knowledgeable, or I wouldn't be such an *efendi*. They would come in the

[24] Translated from: "Görmemişler gitmemişler, gitmiş sabah Çubuk'a gitmiş. Akşamı zor bulmuş. Hanımın yanına, köye gelmiş. Veyahut da evine damına gelmiş. Gideyim yani dememiş ya…. Bizim adam, bizim memleketin, o tarafın adamı, gurbeti bilmeyen adam. Gurbetsiz adam."

[25] A connection between the village, hometown, and trees (the big pine) or material made of trees (the log, *kütük*, also means the register books which show family records) interestingly suggests that, as if roots are not only of trees but also of people too.

[26] Translated from: "…kültürlü insandan adama zarar gelmez…Kendini geliştirmesi lazım. Kendini geliştirmezse, dört duvar arasında otururşa, hiçbir yere çıkmazsa, bir şey yapmazsa, bir faaliyeti olmazsa, ne olacak?"

> morning and say good morning. We didn't understand at first. We've got a little steady by looking at them, living among them. (Interview 19) (See Appendix C, 15)

Participants express that life at and experience of *gurbet* contributes a lot to a person: courage, knowledge, manners, culture, and for sure better understanding and management of economics. For *gurbetsizler*, inexperience at *gurbet* arises from the inability to become distant to the village, where those who were able to leave in the past eventually return. However, the experience at *gurbet* is also interlaced with feelings of loss, belonging, getting lost, and longing. "I long for these mountains, lands where I step," says Nur. According to Feza, being born and raised in the village is the reason for the longing, especially for older people. In the interview, she remembered my grandmother, whose very few words in her last days were "oh my home, oh my village," and she said:

> She [my grandmother] used to say, "protect the village, take care of the village"...she loved the village. No matter how comfortable she is in Ankara…it is not her homeland. Here is your grandmother's homeland. She had to sit on that balcony and watch the landscape. Because she spent her childhood here, she spent years here. (Interview 5) (See Appendix C, 16)

Therefore, there surges a tension between *the gurbet* and the village, or *memleket* (hometown), as it is often put forth opposite to *gurbet*, which is a tension that echoes in other tensions, or dichotomies, such as the one between the urban and the rural. Furthermore, it plays a vital role in movements and mobility between the city and villages in the cases of the three villages aforementioned here because movements and mobility in between do not happen towards any village or any part of rural area in Turkey, but instead happen towards the village where people are from, where they were born and raised, to which they are somehow affectively attached.

For this reason, the relationship between *gurbetsiz* people and those who can live at other places with their *memleket* diverges from other migration, mobility, and

movements from and towards rural areas. For example, Calvario and Otero (2015) define what they call "back-to-the-landers" or "neorurals" as following:

> people with no agrarian background migrate from the city to the countryside to adopt a radically new agrarian or artisan lifestyle…Their motivations are linked to the search for a simpler, self-sufficient, autonomous (free from wage labor and market), close-to-nature, and ecological way of life…Back-to-the-land is now new in Western history. Since the advent of capitalism, the "countryside" has played a role of critique to rationalist abstraction, commodification of land and labor, modern state and politics, individual alienation, and the dissolution of social bonds. (p.143-145)

There are also similar movements discussed under different concepts such as counterurbanization and antiurbanization, as the flows from the village to Ankara and succeeding back-and-forth and return movements in the cases of Karaçam, Yıldırım Elören, and Yeşilkent villages can be.

However, in this case, the main difference is that people put their land at the core of their movement, which often does not occur as a politically critical performance but as it is in the course of life. *Back-to-their-own-landers* can be a term coined for this specific type of movement, in addition to Öztürk et al.'s "rural return movements," to carry the effects of affective bonds through which people are attached to their village. It can also mark the historical process of transforming villages and rural spaces. The fact that people with rural backgrounds can return to their village but experience it differently than they did in the past, they can have a second house in the village regardless of their background, and most of them do not engage in any rural economic activity may exemplify regional differences in the development of capitalism. A participant said that in the region, "[t]he lands are always unproductive…There is the manure of the livestock and rain that Allah gives from above, that's it…Farmers here are unlike those in Polatlı, Konya Plain,

Çukurova…*Saldım çayıra mevlam kayıra hesabı.*"[27] Therefore, because the rural area of the region has not had much to be commodified due to the *intrinsic*[28] unproductivity together with the absence of any conflict with the state, the existence of a village to be visited and returned to may have been ensured. For the villages on the focus of the research and the region containing them, being able to be *gurbetsiz* and in close distance to the village and being unable to detach oneself from the village or live in multiple places and dwelling in multiple houses may have emanated from the unique intersection of the political, social, and economic dimensions of Turkey's history.

[27] Translated from: "Hep topraklar verimsiz…Hayvan gübresini verir, Allah'ta yukarıdan ne kadar yağmur verirse o kadar…Bir Polatlı gibi bir Konya Ovası gibi Çukurova gibi, suyu hortumu bağlayıp, gübreyi arkasından verip, günlük suyunu verip, ilacını verip, arkasından gezen bir çiftçi yok burada. Saldım çayıra mevlam kayıra hesabı." (Interview 17)

[28] Italics emphasize participants' consideration that unproductivity is intrinsic in the region.

CHAPTER 3

DIMENSIONS OF SPATIAL REORGANIZATION: MEMORY, LANDSCAPE AND WORK

The previous chapter focused on movements occurring at a close distance, their effect on the relationship between the village and the city, and the emergence of a mixed system between the village, the district, and the city. This chapter will dive into how the village as a place is perceived and experienced by participants and how the village is associated with and contains conflicting aspects under the influence of these movements. It has been noted before that the rural, taken as one pole of the long established-dichotomy, cannot be characterized as a negation of the urban as the other pole or by the lack or presence of its particularities since the rural is a "much more alive, mobile and versatile, manifesting itself to varying degrees in any time-space as representation, practice and experience." Thus, there are distinguishing qualities of the rural and the urban that are not necessarily intrinsic but appreciated through the relationships participants have with the rural and the urban.

Accordingly, this chapter focuses on those distinguishing qualities of the rural such as the weather, nature, and the spaciousness of the village. In them, there emerge seemingly contradictory aspects of the village as a "site of picnics" and "deprivation zone," which explain movements between the village and the city, motivation to live in multiple places, *rural-urbanite dual place residence* as others named it, and the experience of the village. It has to be noted that the village's capacity to contain conflicting aspects should be analyzed with transformations that the rural space in Turkey has undertaken and summarized in the preceding chapters.

Therefore, in the rest of this chapter, the dimensions of the spatial reorganization of the village and how it is experienced will be further detailed through the intricacy of memory, landscape, and work which took a turn during the process of deagrarianization of the rural space.

The idea of a life belonging to a place, "village life" and "city life," was often brought up in interviews and daily conversations. Both appear as something that one cannot be easily detached from. "Because I went to Ankara late, after the military service, I cannot forget the village life," says Murat, whereas İsmet says, "I have spent 55-56 years of my life in the city; we cannot forget it, we should not leave the city life...One should not be detached from that life."[29] Participants also say that the gap between the two lives concerning living conditions has gradually closed, which made it easier for people to become accustomed to living in two separate houses in two different places. A participant in Yeşilkent Village says that his house is fully equipped with all appliances just as his house in the city is; they do not bring back what they take to the village, and they only take what they will eat daily according to the season,[30] and another in Karaçam Village said:

> …here remains here. There remains there. We don't carry much. We bring the food. We bring whatever is missing, needed… if you can harvest something from the garden, you take it. We take water with us and distribute it to anyone who wants it[31] (Interview 5) (See Appendix C, 17)

[29] Translated from: "Ben Ankara'ya geç gittim askerden sonra gittim. Köy hayatını ben unutamıyorum ben. Hayatımın 55-56 senesi şehirde geçti, bunları unutamayız yani, şehir hayatını da terk etmemek lazım…O hayattan da kopmamak lazım.".

[30] Interpreted from: "…yani her şey mevcut yani, şehir evi gibi yani buzdolabı, çamaşır makinesi, bulaşık makinesi fırınını ocağı her şey tam tam teşekküllüdür. Biz götürdüğümüzü oradan getirmeyiz. Oradan da buraya pek kalan, orada kalır yani…sadece bir götürürsen burada çayın şekerin bile hepsi var. Sadece ne götürüyorsun? Günlük yani yiyeceğim. Yeşilliğin bilmem neyin, domatesi, salatayı, mevsimine göre götürdüğün şey olur." (Interview 10)

[31] It is a widespread practice to fill five or ten-liter water bottles from springs in the village or the springs famous in the region for the delicious taste of their water and take them to the city. For many, it began in 2008 when it was heard that arsenic was mixed in Ankara's water supply. https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/ankara-suyunda-arsenik-polemigi-9164594

Esma said that she and her husband decided not to build a big house at first and that a place to stay would be enough when they came on weekends; therefore, they did not buy the kind of appliances they had in their house in the city or bought those in small size. However, shortly after, these were not enough. N.Ö says: "We understood that the taste [of the village] here is good. It's better than Ankara. We said we should stay while we're here. We said we should plant a garden while we're here."[32] Next part will delineate what "the taste" and the village life refer to and describe how the village is experienced as a place.

3.1 "Site of picnics" and "deprivation zone"

For Faik, it is impossible to estimate a price for Karaçam Village; it is "a small city, those who live in Karaçam cannot live anywhere else."[33] What makes Karaçam priceless for him is its weather. The air is cleaner, and the exhaust gas in the city is not breathed in the village. Although the winters are harsh and warming up with stoves is not convenient, the summers are cooler in the village than in the city, making life convenient for especially the elderly. Some think that if they can manage the exterior sheathing and insulation of their houses and install heating technologies, they can spend the winter in the village and settle down permanently.

The good weather and clean air are accompanied by the spacious and green environment in comparison to the "dust, ash, fuss, traffic"[34] of the city, which, according to the participants, heal them in various ways. The sleep in the village is shorter than in the city, making them "tough as nails."[35] Esin, whose husband Ahmet

[32] Translated from: "Baktık buranın tadı iyiymiş. Ankara'dan daha iyi. Gelmişken de kalalım dedik. Kalmışken de bahçe ekelim dedik." (Interview 14)
[33] Translated from: "Buraya değer biçilmez kızım. Burası Karaçam, küçük şehir. Karaçam'da yaşayan başka yerde yaşayamaz." (Interview 6)
[34] Translated from: "toz, kül, gürültü patırtı, trafik" (Interview 3)
[35] Translated from: "çivi gibi olursun, bu hava başka hava." (Interview 11)

struggled with cancer two times in a row, said her husband feels better when he comes to Karaçam Village. Ahmet used to love his job, but he now suffers from noise-induced hearing impairment due to the conditions in his working environment in the city. He said that "[e]ven if they say that gold is flowing down from here [the neighborhood where he lives in the city], I have no desire to have it anymore."[36] The city causes headaches and trouble sleeping. Uğur said that Ankara "has rotten" him because:

> You have no place to go in Ankara... I used to go from home to work, from work to home. But after retirement, people get depressed. In other words, if one doesn't find a job, if one does not make an effort, s/he gets depressed. I got depressed. And I got sick… When I am in Ankara, I suffer from breathing problems. I take pills. But when I come here, I have no complaints concerning breathing. It ends. I throw away the pills, I do not take them. I breathe very easily. But when I go there, I have a hard time breathing...These are the benefits of the village. (Interview 2) (See Appendix C, 18)

Participants expressed that they do not feel depressed, bored, or overwhelmed in the village, which, for some, is directly associated with the village because it does not intrinsically bare these feelings. For example, Ömer said, "there is no boredom in the village!"[37] whereas Faik said, "Why should I get bored here? There is a great place here. Does the man get bored in Karaçam? Take a cane in your hand, stroll around the cemetery, here and there. Where will you go in Çubuk?"[38] İsmet's words can be accepted as a response to the question, "Here you become more independent, freer. You go wherever you want. You take a walk, wander. You will find a walking track there [the city] and then you will walk. But here, go out now, walk around."[39]

---

[36] Translated from: "eğer şuradan aşağıya altın akıyor desinler. Gözüm yok artık." (Interview 3)
[37] Translated from: "Köyde sıkıntı yok." (Interview 19)
[38] Translated from: "Burada niye sıkılayım ki buranın bir maşallahı var yani. Burada adam sıkılır mı Karaçam'da? Eline al değneği, gez de gel mezarlığı şurayı burayı.Çubuk'ta nereye gideceksin?" (Interview 6)
[39] Translated from: "Burada daha bağımsız oluyorsun. Daha serbest oluyorsun. İstediğin yere gidiyorsun. Yürüyüşünü yapıyorsun. Geziyorsun, dolaşıyorsun. Orada ama bir yürüyüş parkuru bulacaksın öyle yürüyüş yapacaksın, ama burada çık şimdi yürü, dolaş gel." (Interview 1)

Also, the village being a much less crowded place, it is much easier to walk and wander and safer since all or many people to encounter are familiar faces.

Moreover, that the environment and the place are spacious in the village renders the life in the city more spacious because all the excess materials in the houses in the city and seasonal supplies are stored in the houses in the village, and activities such as washing carpets that cannot be done in the city are done in the village. Esin incisively asked, "How would we fit in there without this place?"[40] Furthermore, the production of the supplies also happens in the village; pickles, pepper pastes, and dried foods are made in the village— as many say that the water tastes different; therefore, the end product tastes different and better than in the city.

"After they [his children] left, we had nothing else to do. The nature here is stunning...that's why it's better to live here… All green, nothing to be obsessed about, no city, no stress, no exhaust smell"[41] said İsmet in order to explain why he wanted to be the mukhtar of Karaçam Village and spend most of the year there. Many people, such as İsmet, do not spend time wandering in the mountains. Depending on the season, they engage in mushroom picking, gardening, and beekeeping activities. These, along with the village life, are described with the potential to rehabilitate and heal, as the village isolates people from the city and the activities they are engaged in keeping them busy. A retired special operations policeman Celal told how he enjoys his time in the village after a past of working in hot regions:

> The water is good, and the weather is good here [Yıldırım Elören Village]. You wander around the mountains. I have tomato and pepper branches here…I came here after the prayer at 6 am...The weather is clean; I have nothing to do with anyone...The city is hot...And I always worked in hot

[40] Translated from: "Oraya nasıl sığacaktık burası olmasa?" (Interview 4)
[41] Translated from: "Artık bizim ayağımıza dolanan yok, çoluk çocuk ayrıldı. Onlar da gittikten sonra tabii boşa çıktık. Tabiatı buranın çok güzel bir faktör..onun için burada yaşamak daha güzel. Her taraf yeşil, takıntı yok, şehir, stres, egzoz kokusu yok." (Interview 1)

> regions in the East. This place makes me feel good. We're here; we're spending time here. (Interview 11) (See Appendix C, 19)

In that, for Celal and others, the village emerges as an isolated place concerning its physical distance from the city; it also emerges as a place for seclusion from people and all the things the city may contain in terms of sociality. However, the seclusion here does not refer to a complete withdrawal from people, worldly affairs, and wealth in a religious or spiritual sense. Instead, it refers to a state of enjoyment bound to the place because what the place can offer is enjoyed to the utmost. For example, in the interview with Esin, she mentioned a conversation with her grandchildren. When her grandchildren complained that they were bored, Esin responded that "it's nice, you're going to picnics. Look, we're staying put in the same place," upon which her grandchildren responded, "You're always at the site of picnics anyway!"[42]

A picnic is ordinarily "an occasion when a packed meal is eaten outdoors, especially during an outing to the countryside."[43] However, for those who live in and visit the countryside in their personal and differentiating routines, instead of an occasion during an excursion, the life in the village may resemble a continuous state of a picnic where the time after retirement is leisure, and the work is no more an obligation. On the one hand, an aspect of the place emerges, where the village is to be enjoyed and engaged. On the other hand, the extent to which the village is enjoyed is limited because while physical distance makes isolation and seclusion possible, it also put restraints on access to what can be desired, making subsistence easier. Celal said that

> Here, I don't deal with people, watch TV, news, listen to those guys at all...and it's easy to make a living here... You eat whatever you find. If the market comes or you go to Çubuk, you will get it. Not so in Ankara. Go to the market, you see meat, you want meat, you see honey, you want honey...

[42] Translated from: "… diyorum ki ne güzel, pikniklere gidiyorsunuz. Bak biz aynı yerde duruyoruz. Oradan diyorlar ki siz zaten hep pikniklerin yerindesiniz ya" (Interview 4)
[43] Retrieved from https://www.lexico.com/definition/picnic

> My expenses are low here…you can see and buy everything in the city, you may or may not be able to afford it…When you are not, you become aggrieved. But not so here. The market comes several times a week. What I call market is a car. They sell bread, tomatoes, peppers, everything in the markets. There is a refrigerator in it; they sell meat and ice cream. (Interview 11) (See Appendix C, 20)

"Here is deprivation zone,"[44] Esma refers to being deprived of the potential to buy what is wanted whenever it is wanted, in short, to consume without limit. The presence of such potential in the city is one thing that renders the city desirable for her:

> If you want ice cream here, you can't have it. If you want to go to Çubuk and get it, it will melt until you come back…In Ankara, I have to take my wallet and go out immediately…I would definitely go out and buy something. Here you save money. You are lucky in that way. You can't spend. Only when the market comes… You can't spend much here even if you need it, at least since you can't go out and buy anything…I went down to Çubuk yesterday. I was passing by the stove sellers. A barbecue. Don't I have a barbecue? I have. But this one felt different. I said I'll buy that barbecue and go…I said to my husband, let's eat out. I am used to such things. When my husband and I get our salaries, we will definitely have a meal out. I'll take the grandchildren out...Isn't the city life to be liked? We grew up there. We're used to it. If a person stays here permanently, s/he will crack and die. (Interview 14) (See Appendix C, 21)

Thus, the village manifests another aspect. Alongside being a "picnic site," it emerges as a "deprivation zone," where "[y]ou cannot find what your heart desires here…but you manage with its weather and water."[45] For some participants, walking around markets in the city keeps them busy, just as walking around the mountains in the village keeps people busy. Recall the question that Faik asked, "[w]here will you go in Çubuk?" Feza's question is the opposite: "our time is full there [the city], but where will you go here?"[46] Celal's words may explain how the time is packed in the city: "There are markets there [the city], I go to buy something. There are 8-10

[44] Translated from: "Burası mahrumiyet bölgesi." (Interview 14)
[45] Translated from: "Her gönlünün çektiğini bulamazsın burada…ama idare ediyorsun işte havasıyla suyuyla idare ediyorsun." (İnci, Interview 9)
[46] Translated from: "orada zamanımız daha dolu geçiyor ama burada nereye gideceksin?" (Interview 5)

markets, I go, I walk around. I decide after wandering where to buy…This is how we spend our time."[47]

That the village has these two contradictory aspects of being a "site of picnics" and "deprivation zone," along with its other aspects, intensifies the movement from and to the village. On the one hand, these can be thought in line with concepts such as push and pull factors, in which the "site of picnics" would be a pull to the village and the "deprivation zone" a push out of the village. On the other, the emphasis is on the place and its potential to contain such colliding aspects in a dynamic way, which amplifies the dynamic of movement between the village and the city, rather than a specific feature that is intrinsically attributed and used to define the place. Moreover, the emphasis is also on enjoying and consuming the place since both the "site of picnics" and "deprivation zone" mark whether and how the place allows for enjoyment and consumption.

The emphasis on enjoyment and consumption can be considered together with the rural space's transformation into a consumption area and its integration into capitalist development. As an effect of this transformation, the current state of villages in Turkey demonstrates diversity, for which some, such as Öztürk et al., suggested a new typology. The distinctiveness of this case reveals itself in that these villages in question have become places consumed and enjoyed, with the mediation of mobility, while mobility is itself also enjoyed. However, as said earlier, the rural space has not gone through this transformation equally, and the way it has gone through exhibits both "uneven development" and regional differences. In other words, being able to move between the village and the city, returning to the village,

[47] Translated from: "Orada marketler var, bir şey almak için gidiyorum. 8-10 tane market var gidiyorum dolaşıyorum dolaşıyorum. Nereden alacağımı dolaştıktan sonra karar veriyorum…Ne alacaksam alıyorum geliyorum. Vakti böyle geçiriyoruz." (Interview 11)

having a house to return to, having a house and village that you can enjoy when you return, is not equally possible and easy for everyone. For the three villages that this research focused and for those for whom it is possible and easy enough to move to and return to the village, the dimensions of the transformation reveal themselves in memories of the village, how the landscape of the village has changed and the relationship between work and non-work.

3.2 Memories of the village

In her inspiring work, Frances Pine (1994) argues that in the village Gorale in Poland memory and kinship are interwoven so intricately that disentanglement is impossible; they are in accordance entangled with the place concerned with the space. She further says:

> It is land- the named fields, pastures, and forests of the village and the slopes and peaks of the mountains beyond- which holds memory in this region. And it is through these memories of place, as well as through complex systems of work and exchange, and rituals of the house that are rooted in place, that people make and remake kinship (Pine, 1994, p. 107).

Similarly, in the three villages of this research too, work and landscape are incorporated into the intricate entanglement of place, kinship, and memory.

Keyder and Yenal (2004) argue that there is an implicit assumption concerning agriculture and rurality that the population in rural areas are the producers of agricultural products, and each rural household is engaged in the production of a specific product. Peasants' income is primarily dependent on the price of agricultural input and products. They further argue that the rural population living only on agricultural production has been in decline, and a growing portion of the rural population is experiencing different conditions similar to the urban population in terms of income generating activities' diversity and complexity.

That agriculture is no longer the essential income source of livelihood for rural residents, and non-agricultural income is increasingly important for rural households is a crucial indicator of the rapid change in the social and economic structure of the rural areas, beginning in the early 1980s and with the end of the national developmentalist era and the agriculture-food sector opening up to global markets. In the new rural space, livelihood is provided through new strategies such as product diversification and contract farming (Keyder & Yenal, 2011) or income transfers from remittances, pensions, and non-farm employment (Öztürk et al., 2013). In other words, what has been observed is "the decomposition of (notionally) 'pure' classes of agrarian labor" (Bernstein, 2004, p. 201) and de-agrarianization, which is "a long-term process of occupational adjustment, income-earning orientation, social identification and spatial relocation of rural dwellers away from strictly agricultural-based modes of livelihood" (Bryceson, 2002, p. 726).

Karaçam, Yıldırım Elören and Yeşilkent villages are interwoven with varying memories and knowledge concerning the process of deagrarianization, income differentiation, and spatial relocation of the rural dwellers. For some participants, maintaining agricultural work in the village is one of the defining features of the village. In her memories, Nur recalls that

> It was a lovely village. When no one stayed here, my good God, sometimes it didn't snow; there was no water. Those barrens of ours, these places were like heaven, my dear, you see the pattern of this carpet, this Karaçam was full of flowers like the pattern of this carpet. Those gardens were so beautiful with the fruits of God that you and I grew. This was the most beautiful of the surrounding villages, more beautiful than Kuzuören, Evci. It is in a secluded place, exposed to the sun, and there are few people. The fields they planted, the grass, the sickles, not a single grass or sickle was brought in from outside, no hay either. Whatever was here was enough. What everyone was getting was enough. (Interview 18) (See Appendix C, 22)

However, Faik, a retired watchman who left the village due to limited means of living in his youth, has other recollections of self-sufficiency and productivity:

> Agriculture is over. Here it was already hard to get two halves and three halves [yarım, a type of denomination used for various crops] from one half. Two to one, three to one, there was no yield here in Karaçam. Even though there was, the land was not giving enough compared to your labor. They were pulling straw with five to ten oxcarts; you were picking up ten halves of crops; you could hardly get 15 halves of crops. That's why it was not giving enough for your labor, so now everyone, young people, left the village for work. Each has a pension for her/himself. S/he has insurance. What will a man do here? If he plants, he doesn't get enough anyway. Now, most of them do cattle husbandry. (Interview 6) (See Appendix C, 23)

Faik seems correct that most rural dwellers in the region make a living out of livestock, yet indeed with the contributions of pensions, credits, and financial support from family. Nevertheless, the situation is more complicated than it seems. The livestock in the region is based on cattle—sheep and goats have not been preferable because they require more watch work by shepherds who are hard to keep and more human power to milk. However, family members cannot do more; this work is either done for milk, cheese, yogurt, and butter for sale or for the festival of sacrifice. Livestock husbandry and the methods of producing these products are also quite diverse; some people, especially elders, continue with traditional methods, while the younger ones use electric vehicles and try to enlarge their barns. However, one of the most apparent differences is that the agricultural activities to sustain husbandry have become increasingly inadequate. It is impossible to sustain it without additional hay and feed. Yıldırım Elören Village is one of the villages where cattle husbandry is the most intense in scale in the region, and a participant engaged in cattle husbandry explained the situation as follows:

> There are about thirty-five forty [cattle], together with their calves. Here we make use of their meat, butter, and yogurt. At the same time, we are doing agricultural labor [rençperlik] not to sell but to feed them. We can only provide for their feed. It may not be enough this year so that we can buy it [their feed] this year…A year ago, when I took care of animals and thought about hay and feed, I sold cattle that was thirty-eight thousand liras worth for the festival of sacrifice, paid sixteen thousand two hundred lira for feeds, and eighteen thousand for hay. It was head-to-head. *Rençper* [agricultural laborer] does not count his/her labor. (Interview 13) (See Appendix C, 24)

When I could not understand the last sentence, Erhan explained in more detail: "We have such a saying…if you quantify your work, it'll mean that you are making a loss from the work you do. If you don't, you're going head-to-head. Neither profit nor loss."[48] Then he told me a short story to further detail how this approach to work, that can be explained as self-exploitation, is justified:

> There was someone in Ayrılan, the man had a goat. Fifty years ago, he used to buy and sell butter in the market or to his acquaintances. Someone asked how the business was, his profit and loss. He said, "if I do not count my own butter, there is neither profit nor loss." The man sold his own butter too and compensated for the loss. (Interview 13) (See Appendix C, 25)

Rençper is generally referred to as a laborer who works in vineyards, gardens, fields, and lands. It varies from region to region whether *a rençper* owns the land where s/he works, and there are even debates about who was called a *rençper* and who was called a farmer in earlier times. However, in the villages of this research, people who work on their own land or on their families' land are called *rençper* beside farmers and peasants in the region. It can be seen how much this work weighs in the stories and narratives participants told. It is referred to as work that does not give anything in return, which only sustains but does not add anything more. Moreover, maintaining this work with limited means, its physicality, and its hardship gave rise to the desire for some people to leave the village. For example, Ömer, who became an officer at the Ministry of Public Works and Housing after he left his village and returned after his retirement, had recollections of his engagements with agricultural labor, such as:

> I could not do much about the village work, I could not understand how this *rençperlik* works. We didn't have much property. You used to need a tractor or ox. We owned neither tractor nor oxen. You would need to ask from strangers in the village for their oxen. You used to harness the ox. That's

[48] Translated from: "Rençper emeğini saymaz. Bizde böyle bir deyim vardır…Yani emeğini sayarsan yaptığın işten zarar ediyorsun demektir. Saymazsan kafa kafaya çıkıyorsun demektir. Ne kar ne zarar." (Interview 13)

> why, not much was going to happen with the work done with the help from strangers. Thank goodness there came out such an occupation opportunity in the city. We went to Ankara, that's it. (Interview 19) (See Appendix C, 26)

Although conditions got much better compared to the days of Ömer's youth, the conditions of this work has not gotten brighter. Ali's brother in Yıldırım Elören Village said that "[c]attle husbandry is excellent, people will do it…but after ten years, this *rençperlik*, cattle husbandry will diminish here, there is no one coming from behind. The state will help…if someone applies…but there is no one to do it."[49] Where there is no one forthcoming to pick up the profession, those currently engaged in this work do their best for their children to have a life outside the village and in the city. Some of them continue agriculture and husbandry because they buy houses in the city for their children through the income that they earn from husbandry.

In these three villages of the region, in the process of deagrarianization, where agricultural labor is increasingly reduced, cattle husbandry has become the primary income source, and movements to the village and from the village have accelerated, the landscape of village has changed. One crucial indicator of this change is fences, the enclosure of houses and gardens. The intensification of outmigration from the village and the lands getting emptier due to decreased crop cultivation and productivity meant that the places once fields and property have turned into pasture. Thus, habits and work patterns in the village have changed. A couple from Yeşilkent Village, Ömer and Ayten, told the tension that rises in the village concerning the fences and changing habits and patterns of work:

> Ayten: They leave their cattle to the property…I enclose some places; I make a beautiful garden. Their cattle cannot enter and pasture. That's why they are not willing.
> E: Well, isn't there enough grass when the gardens are enclosed?

[49] Translated from: "Malcılık çok iyi, yaparlar da ne dedi on sene sonra burada bu rençperliği malcılığı çok aza iner, geriden gelen yok, devlet de yardımcı olur yani devlet a olsun veya b olsun fark etmez, dışarılara şeye eğer gerçekten müracaat edilip de şey yapsa devlet yardımcı olur ama adam yok onu yapmaya." (Interview 17)

> Ömer: There is a lot of grass. In the past, there were 3000 sheep and goats in our village. There would be 300-400 cattle…there would also be oxen. There would be water buffalos separately.
> Ayten: Their calves would be separate.
> Ömer: They used to herd separately. It was enough for those. There are no more than 100 cattle now. Believe me, after this month; they will come out to these gardens, to the apples. Then we will not be able to protect these apple trees; they will herd the cattle to the gardens right away...In the past, they would not put animals in the gardens before the 11th or 12th month.
> E: Why so?
> Ömer: They eat trees
> E: Don't they take them far?
> Ömer: They take them far away, but it doesn't matter. It's easier here. There was no one to claim these places until now. They don't like when you own your property. Most of them think that we disturb their comfort. We hear so…It doesn't work for them. Now those who return enclose their gardens with wire. Their cattle can't enter…
> E: That didn't use to happen before, right? Enclosing your garden and your house?
> Ömer: There used to be nothing like that. There were fields everywhere...They used to herd the sheep through a place this small [showing a small gap with his hands]… not to damage the field. But now leave the cattle from here, it is empty until there. There are not so many who plant crops. (Interview 19) (See Appendix C, 27)

Before the return to the village accelerated and wire fences around old and new houses and properties started to be put up, unused and unoccupied lands became available to be grazed due to the accelerating outmigration from the village. Since when not enclosed, almost all lands are used as pasture, it is not necessary to herd cattle much farther to graze. In Ömer's and Ayten's claims, since grazing became more difficult as more land is reclaimed and enclosed in and close to the village, there sometimes rises tension between those who work in livestock farming and others.

However, such tension or similar ones are not newly emerged. Many participants said that fields that were not to be cultivated by owners used to be left intentionally as pastures in addition to the known and used pastures. Although grazing in a planted field or garden has never been welcomed, as pastures at a distance were depleted, grazing in the fields that had passed the planting season in

late autumn was allowed. The enclosure following the return to the village in its diverse forms is a new development for the village. Wire fences around may be interpreted as the demonstration of an increasingly individualizing village community where each person and/or family have visible boundaries around their property to separate the property and, therefore, themselves from the village, given that participants referred to the village as "vacation spot" in addition to "site of picnics," where they don't have to, don't need to and don't want to engage with anyone else and just enjoy the village on their own.

How the agrarian past of the village finds its way through in participants' narratives surpasses the often-heard statement that everywhere used to be planted fields and now is green grass, or that such a green landscape attracts people to the village. Because in memories of the village's landscape and contemplations on the changing landscape, there surfaces how interwoven the landscape, the agrarian work and memory are with one another. When Ali from Yıldırım Elören Village and my father[50] were talking about the types of pasture plants, their enthusiasm was almost tangible:

> Zafer: I went down to the land of the mill in Karaçam, and it was challenging to go down. You know the crimson clover [*kırmızı üçgül otu*], right? It was like this [height, putting his hand up to half of his height]
> Ali: Yes, it is like that.
> Zafer: All green…there is a place below Aydoğan, on the other side of the cemetery, Çamurcuk; I was walking around; I had a hard time walking because I swear that there is such grass that it is all green
> Ali: Everywhere is like that, brother; there is too much pasture grass this year. (Interview 17) (See Appendix C, 28)

In my observation, the enthusiasm did not rise from the aesthetic beauty of a landscape full of crimson clovers. Then they explained that the crimson clover is more nutritious than other pasture plants. For livestock, it is perfect to be made into

[50] He will be referred as Zafer.

hay in winters and to use for grazing in the springs and summer, which made it clear to me that they were enthusiastic because livestock would be fed very well. Such an affective response must be related to their engagement with agrarian work and the agrarian past of the village. Ali's excitement is more understandable since he is currently engaged in livestock farming in Yıldırım Elören Village. However, Zafer is only an observer, a retired teacher who left the village young. For him, memories of the past when those were cultivated fields and his prior work in those fields may have evoked such an affective response because what followed that enthusiastic tone was a sadness pertaining to the days when the village was crowded, and they used to harvest those fields together in solidarity.

The effects of the agrarian past are also observable when people talk about the forestation in their village and in the region. As some portion of the fields have turned into pastures, some portion has turned into young forests and groves. Some thought that the increase in the amount of forest area in Turkey in official records is due to this transformation— agricultural lands that were previously allocated from forests have turned into forests spontaneously because migration from the village to the city since the 1970s has reduced the pressure on the forests in rural areas (Atmış et al., 2022).

Types of trees common in the region seem to play an important role. Pinus brutia (*kızılçam*), pinus sylvestris (*sarıçam*), and pinus nigra (which gives the village Karaçam its name) are the three pine strains common in the region. As it was explained to me in villages, they spread through their cones, which are called young shoot (*genç sürgün*). They are not known for an invasive root system, but they go as far as there is water. However, they change the acidity of their environment; therefore, other types of trees are not easy to find in pine forests and groves. A

couple from Karaçam Village told that some of the current forested lands used to be fields, which the husband remembers from his childhood and the wife from her earlier years as a bride in the village:

> Taha: I know that they used to plant there…There was not a single tree there.
> Oya: It was a bone-dry field
> E: So how did it become forested?
> Oya: By not taking care, not coming, and going
> Taha: as those things, pinecones roll…
> Oya: Yes. Well, that side of the road, when I came as a bride, the field was planted there, it was harvested.
> E: The inner side of the village, the back of our house, is now in the forest. Was that place always the forest?
> Oya: There was almost nothing but bush as a grove.
> Taha: I mean, there was no pine, but it used to be called grove
> (Interview 8) (See Appendix C, 29)

Deagrarianization and outmigration from the village have transformed the landscape of the village, in ways that are incorporated into the intricate entanglement of place, kinship, and memory. Places that are called forests, groves, or pastures have not emerged out of anywhere, yet during the change that the rural space has gone through, places with specific names and qualities have adopted new qualities and acquired new names. Planted fields of the past are now young forests, still bearing memories of families' arduous work there and invoking an aesthetic pleasure.

However, the change in the landscape, in itself and as an effect of the "tangible force of historical passage," also evoke an affective space, of nostalgia for what is lost (Serematakis, 1993, p. 23). For example, the mill of Karaçam Village and the fields surrounding it are now waist-deep grass, old trees that no longer bear fruit, half-destroyed walls with its waterways blocked, and a broken millstone. A walking trip there with my parents took them back to the childhood memories of those days when they tried to do more out of less, but everything was somehow better, according to them. In tears, my mother described her surrounding as

"orphan."[51] For her, cultivating the land is to take care of and own the land; meanwhile, those who cultivate the land, in that sense, function as parents who raise the 'wild' nature to be cultured—feeling of desolateness and abandonment echo with how unsettling it can be not to recognize what used to be familiar and known. With what was familiar and known, while there were others to hold onto to watch your losses, a community of familiar faces, there was no fear, yet now young forests are also known for the beasts they contain. Nur told the fear rising from the fact that the landscape is not plain fields anymore but impenetrable forest:

> It's not like it used to be here either. There is bear, there is beast. What can I tell you, there is wild boar. Out of fear of it. Cattle used to lie and wander outside. There was no fear, there was no such forest back then. Now if there is a calf lost, everyone goes crazy. (Interview 18) (See Appendix C, 30)

3.3. Work, non-work

I have so far tried to establish that the change in the landscape is intertwined with deagrarianization, which is, with its all effects, a crucial dimension of the changing character of the rural space in Turkey because it is historically connected with migration and all types of movements from and to the rural areas. The fact that agriculture is a diminishing component of the rural area and that living in the village is financially supported by other resources brings us to an interesting point in terms of the relationship between space and work, which is that the village has distinctively become a space to enjoy among other things. To begin with, retirement is a crucial concept to approach the issue.

Along with deagrarianization and as people who work and spend most of the week and the year in the city flee to the village on weekends and holidays and as retirees return to the village, the village has become a place where work is left behind

[51] Translated from: "Her yer öksüz" (During a walking trip to the old mill of Karaçam Village)

in the city. Therefore, in contemplations of the changing character of rural space, especially where retired individuals and retired families live, it should be addressed that rural space is connected with enjoyment and leisure while urban space is connected with exhaustion, boredom, depression, and work, although work and non-work have been highly intertwined with one another.

"What is the job of the retiree? The retiree runs away to the village, s/he gets bored in the towns. Villages are a blessing for retirees."[52] says Faik in Karaçam Village. Another person who makes a living from livestock farming in the same village said that he is against young people living in the village and making their living there. However, he cannot understand why retired people do not return to their village and add: "Come back, retirees!"[53] The couple at Yeşilkent Village, Ömer and Ayten who returned to the village claimed that they had never left the village completely. Once in fifteen or twenty days, whether on foot or any other way, they kept visiting with their children. Upon that, when I asked how it felt visiting the village for holidays, Ömer laughed and disagreed with me:

> Ömer: We are not coming for a holiday, Elif.
> E: You come to work here
> Ömer: We come to work at our father's. We were coming to our father to do his work.
> Ayten: Have we ever had a holiday?
> E: While working in the ministry, you came here to work.
> Ömer: We go on leave, collect his [his father's] cherry, we harvest crops he plants, we make his bunches, we put his hay. Only then do we leave. However, we still used to come and visit on weekends when we took leave. We never really left. (Interview 19) (See Appendix C, 31)

[52] Translated from: "…emeklinin işi ne? Emekli köye kaçıyor işte, kasabalarda bunalıyor. Köyler emekliler için bir nimet." (Interview 6)
[53] Translated from: "Emekli olarak köyümüz iyi. Yoksa bu köy öyle hani ben köyde durayım da karın doyuruyorum veyahut da ben burada geçimimi sağlayayım diye öyle bir durum yok. Ben ona karşıyım bak. Gençler burada dursun da geçimini sağlasın diye ben ona karşıyım. Emekliler dönsün ya. Dönsün emekli ya." (Interview 9)

Now that they are retired and have made a return that is almost permanent since they continue their life with two houses, one in the city and one in the village, I asked them how they spent their time in the village, for example, whether they were bored at all. Ömer responded, "There is no boredom in the village. No. If we go to Çubuk, we get bored on a summer day," and Ayten added, "My head hurts now when I leave. I get a headache for two days there."[54] Bodily responses to life in urban areas are not uncommon. When I asked the same question, Uğur, who is a retired officer who returned to his village Karaçam and built a house there, said:

> I am getting sick in Ankara. Why am I getting sick? Because I get depressed there. I don't have a job. I'm getting depressed. I also get sick when I'm depressed. But when I come here from there, I feel very alive here, I mean, I become vigorous here, from its air, its water, things like that, I mean, here in the village. (Interview 2) (See Appendix C, 32)

Then I asked him what he does from the moment he wakes up until he sleeps, how he spends an ordinary day. He answered:

> I wake up in the morning and spend time working in the garden. I go to the forests, I walk, I wander. I'm looking for mushrooms, I'm looking for this, that and so on. Sometimes I do gardening. I mean, even walking in the forest relaxes me. The wheezing of that pine relaxes me. Know what I mean? ... Here in Ankara, I suffer from respiratory distress. I'm using pills. But when I come here, I have no complaints about this breathing. It ends. I throw the pill; I do not use it. I breathe very easily. But when I go there, I have a hard time breathing. You know what I mean? That's the way things are in the village. Such are the benefits. In terms of human health, the air of the village is beneficial. (Interview 2) (See Appendix C, 33)

The couple Taha and Oya from Karaçam Village shared Uğur's views; they mentioned that they rest only if they come to the village and never rest in the city. After the husband retired, because they had economic difficulties, they went into business to gather milk, butter, and yogurt from the producers in surrounding villages and to sell them in the market in Çubuk District. They began picking up products

[54] Translated from: "Ömer: Köyde sıkıntı yok. Yok. Çubuk'a gidersek bunalıyoruz biz yaz gününde. Oya: Benim başım ağrıyor şimdi gidince. İki gün başım ağrıyor orada." (Interview 19)

from each village on Wednesday afternoon, arrived at their house in Çubuk in the evening, sold those at the market on Thursday, and returned to the village on Friday or Saturday. Oya said, "When it is hot there in the summer, it inevitably weighs one down. Also, since I'm sick, I can't put up with children's noise."[55] When I commented that they liked the quietness of the place, I learned that they would never leave the village if they did not have a business in the market. Taha added, "if I have an opportunity, and I make a good and reasonable living, I will never return to Çubuk and turn towards its qibla."[56]

For those who have spent some time during the pandemic in their houses in the city, being unable to leave even the house added to their attraction to life in the village. Most of my participants started to spend even more time in the village after the pandemic began. One of them, Ahmet from Karaçam, detailed the difference between experiencing the village and the city quite nicely when I asked whether he ever gets bored in the village:

> No, I don't get bored here... It happens in the city. I went last year, for example, in the cold, and because of the pandemic, I couldn't come back because of these bans. I can't go out there. Our house over there is on the eighth floor. For example, its balcony is bigger than the balcony here. I have a thirty-two square meter balcony. One with an Ankara view. In Şentepe, you know that side. Ostim, Demet, Batıkent, Eryaman...So you see two-thirds of Ankara. So it is. My house is also lovely, a hundred and sixty square meters house. The balcony has an open front. There is nothing more. But now she says to me that you are sitting on the balcony, what else do you want. You can sit on the balcony for many hours and relax, but the sun is shining. But it's not like that here. It's such a blessing to be sitting here. I'm sitting on the balcony. I put my feet on the corner of the balcony. I take my tea with me. So for me, this doesn't have a price anymore. (Interview 3) (See Appendix C, 34)

[55] Translated from: "Yazın orada da sıcak olunca ister istemez adamı bunaltıyor. Bir de benim kendim rahatsızım ya, bebeleri sesinden kafa götürmüyor." (Interview 8)
[56] Translated from: "Yani imkanım olsun güzel geçimimi yapayım aklım sarsın, çubuk'a dönüp de kıblesine doğru dönmem." (Interview 8)

Seeing how one can enjoy being in a place and how much pleasure and satisfaction he feels while in the village, I asked, "so you are enjoying it, right?" Then he said:

> Of course. I'm sitting here now. For example, I drink evening tea. I'm looking over there at work I have done. Even though I am so tired, I get up and work again. I mean, I already loved the village. I used to love the village before. I came here; I used to go to the mountains and smell herbs and thyme. I loved the village like this. God blessed us, so we came. I mean, I dreamed of such a house like this. I wished I had a house, even if it were not big, even if it were small and had a tree in front. I told her, "let us put a table under the tree; you will die here. Yesterday, while drinking tea, I told her I dreamed of sitting down like this and doing things; I love nature so much that I don't feel like harming it. I don't know; I do not mean to harm any bugs or trees; I love them. … now that I am in the village, for example, I go to prayer. And after that, I'm here [back in the house]. I don't have a wish for a friend to come by because I'm bored. (Interview 3) (See Appendix C, 35)

That the village and non-work are connected in experiences of the village does not indicate the absence of work. Erhan from Yıldırım Elören Village says that "There's work here every day if you're going to do it, you go to the garden, you dig up apples, you clean your trees, you take care of your cherries…if you're going to work if you have the determination to work."[57] Interestingly, many participants stated that they become more eager to work in the village and more productive as they work even though they get exhausted. Therefore, the village is a place where the work never ends if one endeavors, and a place that brings about more endeavors in return, which brings out the result that almost nothing is ultimately completed in the village: houses are never completed, and conflicts due to division of property are never resolved. A common conception that time passes slowly in the village may be due to this un-ending of things and un-beginning of the new. However, that does not mean that the village is a still and not-changing as it was in the travel notes and novels of Republican intellectuals (Yakın 2007, Zeybek 2015). Because as can be

[57] Translated from: "Burada iş olur. Eğer yapacaksan her gün iş olur, bahçeye gidersin, elmaların dibini kazarsın, ağaçlarını temizlersin, vişnene bakarsın…eğer iş yapacaksan, iş yapmak için içinden azim geliyorsa" (Interview 13)

seen in all scales and dimensions, the village changes; for example, many items are used for another function after their essential use is over, and fields transform into forests after they are abandoned.

Those who are determined to work and enjoy working in the village say that time is not enough for everything they want to do in a day. Most of them are bound by seasonal cycles. If you want to pick rosehips as Arif from Yeşilkent does, it takes 15 to 20 days to pick, sort out its thorns, and boil. In those days that you spend among rosehip bushes in the outskirts of the village; there is no time left for anything else. Arif says he does not get bored and adds, "I can find things to do for myself."[58] Another person who complains about time is the mukhtar of Karaçam Village, İsmet. After he said that he is never bored because he does not have enough time in the village, I asked him what a regular day looks like. His response was:

> I get up at about eight. Thanks to my wife, she prepares the breakfast. We have our breakfast at half past eight, half past nine. What do I do right after that? We pray. After that, I go right to my bees. With my bees, these two months, I will go at least at nine in the morning and leave at five in the evening. It's *oğul* season. I spend time with the bees and take care of them. For example, now you have come, I have come from the care of bees since nine. I immediately prayed. I'll go back to the bees right now. I'm there until five. There is a wedding today. I'll leave it at four but it will be in my mind. Why? It's *oğul* season...I have to take care of them. Its lath, its wax; which bee is doing its duty? Which bee is not doing its duty? You have to follow them like a child. (Interview 1) (See Appendix C, 36)

Then I asked him if he recognized all the bees one by one. He answered:

> Of course, I know more or less. My father used to do it for a long time, but now our care is very different from his...If I was not close to beehives, he used to ask me to help him with bees. He's your father; you have to do what he says... he passed away in 2007, and because there was a system left him, we had to take care of it. Now I'm keeping myself busy with them. For example, there are tree branches. I continue them. I dig their bottoms. I give them medicine. No spare time. Always busy. You'll find something to do for yourself. If you're free here, you won't be able to spend time. I can't. But if

[58] Translated from: "Yok vakit bulamıyorum. Vakit yetişmiyor. Yani vakit yetişmiyor yani. Zaten bugün gidiyorsun kuşburnuna gidiyorsun akşama anca geliyorsun. Gelip de yani fazla toplayamıyorsun. Uzağa gidiyorsun böyle şey. Arabanla gidiyorsun geliyorsun…Burada da pek sıkılmam. Kendime göre iş bulabiliyorum." (Interview 10)

> the man is not strong anymore, I respect then. Thankfully, I'm strong enough now. I can catch up with anything. (Interview 1) (See Appendix C, 37)

Rosehips to pick, a table in front of a tree in the garden, wheezing of the pine, tree branches, beehives to take care of, and more are several ways to fill in time and enjoy the village with everything it contains. However, who enjoys the village is still contested. The story I have told so far is mainly of male retirees. For their wives, farmers, and agricultural laborers in the village, the story varies widely and gets complicated, and it should be incorporated into this section. The village, and all other places, need not manifest just one of its multiple aspects such as "site of picnics" and "zone of deprivation," since the place is heterogeneous and dynamic. However, it is valuable to reveal diversely experienced and invisible aspects of the village to capture the changing character of rural space in Turkey.

CHAPTER 4

HOUSES AND KEYS AS MATERIAL CULTURE: KINSHIP AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS IN THE VILLAGE

In her inspiring work on Greece's modernization process, Serematakis takes the symbolic and affective dimensions of material culture as "passageways into those experiential fragments, deferred emotions and lost objects that were not part of public culture of Greek Modernization, yet were integral to the tangible force of its historical passage" (Serematakis, 1993, p.23). In a similar vein, I will claim that symbolic and affective dimensions of material culture in the village, namely houses and their keys, can be "those passageways into experiential fragments, deferred emotions, and lost objects" which are essential to "the tangible force of the historical passage" that the village is through, especially concerning property, kinship, and community relations. Quite significantly, keys open not only houses, but also symbolic and affective dimensions connected to houses. Therefore, in the following where participants mentioned keys in their narratives, symbolic and affective dimensions connected to houses will be unpacked through keys. Expanding on those first encounters in some interviews where the key is only uttered as an ordinary object of participants' narratives, I will unpack entangled property, kinship, and community relations in the village. For that purpose, each mention of keys in the quotes below is emphasized.

> I said don't you dare. I said, look, *if we give them the house key, I won't come here again.* Oh, it is okay to let them come and go while I'm there [in the village]. *But I said while I'm not there, don't give the key for them to stay* because my sisters-in-law are not like others. They are not the kind of people who help me. Never. Oh, sure, they play kissy face with me. (Esma, Interview 14) (See Appendix C, 38) [emphasis added]

> My in-laws had houses. Mine [her husband] pulled down our house so we would not return to the village. *We used to ask for the key from my in-laws. We'd always come to the house of whoever gave us the key.* We used to spend all of our time there with what we would eat and what we would drink. We cook, eat, drink and sleep in that house. When we got up early, we'd go to the stream banks. We'd do whatever we were going to do on the banks of the stream; we'd sit there until the evening, have our picnic, and walk around under branches. Then we'd go back to Gölbaşı …We had been coming and going for some time. *This one* [her son] *got tired of asking for keys. He said he would not ask for a key again and would build a house*…Just the two of us [she and her son] arrived at my in-laws' house. *We asked my brother-in-law for a key.* His wife was not willing, but I said that we would build a house, then she was willing happily. Hah, she thought we would build a house, and her house would be saved from us. (Nur, Interview 18) (See Appendix C, 39) [emphasis added]

> Of course, by law, each person's child has the right. But only one of them can live there, not each of them. It is a two-room old house. For which parts of there do you have the right now? You have the right for its every part. They didn't build anything new on it. You have the right at its ground, but what can you say to them just because you have the right there? You can't tell them to leave because s/he has as much right as you do. But if it had been a very large place, you would build something in the corner. It is different that way. Why? Because you built it there...*If that place had been in common use for a long time, it would be okay if everyone had a key.* Then you let them know when you'll come and how long you'll stay. You know, there are these houses for summer, like that. (Ahmet, Interview 3) (See Appendix C, 40) [emphasis added]

> I will not give this house [on the highland of the village]. I didn't even have that much space before; we built this one with my husband…Every one of them [in her husband's family] can claim it because my father-in-law supposedly built this house. But I don't accept such a claim; I have four children. But daughters [of her father-in-law] and all of them can take the house in the village. *They all have the keys; I can't tell them not to take it*…it's their father's house with a title deed. But this house doesn't have a title deed; they can't take this house. (Berna, Interview 15) (See Appendix C, 41) [emphasis added]

In these four quotations from participants' narratives where I encountered the key, the object is ordinarily associated with specific actions: giving, asking for, and having, respectively, all of which may come to mean various modalities of exchange, sharing and/or ownership among members of families. On the one hand, who asks for and who owns keys to family houses or houses on the family estate may render

keys as symbols marking conditions of *ortakçılık*[59] as it is referred to colloquially. On the other hand, feelings arising around asking for and giving a key may indicate conflicts among family members and the desire to have the key to a house privately, which can render keys objects of desire. In the key as an object of desire, one can observe that tensions between the common and the private or sharing and owning among family members accompany the changing characteristics of the village: the image of a vibrant village and its community with large households remembered nostalgically disappears into families' efforts to enclose and create a place of their own. The houses in the villages witness this transition, *the tangible force of historical passage* as one might say; the care given to these "experienced" houses sustains the family, memories of the family, and the idea of the village. Because, as it will be mentioned below, houses that are not maintained will be ruined.

4.1 Çatalkazık yere batmaz

In Yıldırım Elören Village, Ali and his brother Remzi told how they bought the land which they recently built a house. The land belonged to a family who moved out from the village and demolished their house on the land to take its timber with them. When heirs of the land put up the land for sale, Ali and his two brothers bought the land without hesitation and built a three-decker apartment building, each deck for one brother's family. When asked why they preferred to buy the land and build a house together, Ali said they wanted to be together. However, Remzi was more straightforward, "The truth is that there is no space… Finding this was a miracle. I

[59] *Ortakçılık* can be interpreted in English in two ways, one of which is *sharecropping* and the other of which is *commensalism.* Both will be further detailed below.

wish everyone had their own land so they would build separately, but there is no land."[60]

The reason it was a miracle is that title deeds in the village have multiple heirs; usually because so many heirs are scattered around the city of Ankara or the entire country, it is not easy to gather them all and ask for their consent to sell anything or transfer to title deed into one's own name. Therefore, many gave up trying to take their share of the title deeds officially from the older generations or to find and persuade all the shareholders and take the whole. Arif wearily told:

> I wanted to give someone the price per meter for them [shareholders] and money and collect all the shares...One side in Esenboğa, the other in Istanbul, the other where I don't know...They left the village in the past... Now I can't find them. I gave up because I couldn't find them. My life is not enough anyway. Now I don't know who will look after me, maybe my grandson or someone else… (Arif, Interview 10) (See Appendix C, 42)

İsmet gave a name to this situation, "for example, that field has ten heirs. For example, this is of a neighbor, if you look at it, it belongs to at least twenty people. That's why these lands are not sold here. No buyers. Many want. So, it's *çatalkazık.*"[61][62]

Çatalkazık means a stake with a fork-shaped tip and is often used in the proverb *"çatalkazık yere batmaz,"* which directly translates as that a stake with a fork-shaped tip will not be driven into the ground, in that such a stake will not secure anything well. The proverb colloquially means that a matter where multiple persons have a say will end in a deadlock, which is, in a way, a point of view disdaining or refraining from conflict and its resolution. The word *çatalkazık* describes the

[60] Translated from: "Yer yok yok. İşin doğrusu…Burayı bulmak mucizeydi. Yani herkesin yeri ayrı olsa da herkes yapılsa daha, ama yer yok." (Interview 17)
[61] Translated from: "Şura mesela adamın tarlası on tane mirasçı. Mesela şura bir komşunun mesela yokla en azından yirmi kişinindir. İşte bunun için buralar satılmıyor. Alan yok. İsteyen çok. Çatalkazıktır yani." (Interview 1)
[62] To be clear, his saying that there are no buyers but many who want meant that those who want to buy land cannot become buyers because there is no seller.

situation of the land and property market in the village concisely and clearly. Lands and houses to be divided into multiple shares remain in deadlock because it is usually thought that there cannot be a consensus among family members due to either that some members do not come into agreement or some members of the family are not accessible even through their proxies. Ali and his brother Remzi nonetheless explain why family members stay distant and/or do not come to terms regarding sharing land and property. Remzi says:

> If this region were like Saray [an area in Çubuk where land value is relatively very high], Ali would get his share, I will get it, your father will get it, and your uncle will get it too… Nobody demands it because it is worthless… If land in Aydoğan, Karaçam, or our village is worth money, everyone will get their shares... There are two or three invaluable fields, the mukhtar's, ours, and Yunus Ağa's. They are close to the village. I mean, if there was only one title deed, you could do anything, you could build a barn, you could build a house... you could put it to good use...it's invaluable, but what will pass on to me from my mother, both here and in Aydoğan? If it were Altınova, five-six hundred billion, one trillion dollars is paid for one acre. (Remzi, Interview 17) (See Appendix C, 43)

Such a line of reasoning explicitly connects the value of land in the village with individuals' unwillingness or lack of motivation to gather family members and/or resolve conflicts. Remzi speculates that if it were to retrieve more significant profit, each member of families would get their share, regardless of the fact that the land in the question are inherited from the father's or mother's family.

The last step of this speculation matters greatly. Because, to my question whether they would build a house if they took on suitable land in their mother's village, they responses with an absolute no because their village is their father's village, Yıldırım Elören, and their mother's village, Yıldırım Aydoğan is only where they visit relatives a few times in a year. Since lands in that village are not valuable, they are not interested in their mother's share and allow their uncles and children to use her share in any way they want. They estimated that all the lands of their village,

Yıldırım Elören, would be worth three to five million Turkish Liras if they were to be sold. However, the market value is not an actual point of reference in these villages because, as Ali and Remzi say, "for the people living here, the place of the house is precious."[63]

4.2 Ortakçılık

The situation where title deeds inherited from older generations cannot be taken on officially or sold out outside of the family has contributed to those diverse modalities of exchange, sharing and/or ownership among members of families, some of which can be gathered under the name of ortakçılık. Just as çatalkazık, ortakçılık is a term often used in the village, which indicates that land and/or property are in common use among family members and kindreds in various routines and arrangements. For participants in the three villages of this research, usually the houses of parents and grandparents and the houses that were built on lands descended to multiple people are the ones in common use among family members and kindreds. As Ali and Remzi said above, the place of the house is precious in the village since both houses and lands scarce relatively to the intensity of desire to have them.

Ortakçılık can be interpreted in two ways in English. The first is *sharecropping*, "in which a tenant applies his labor to another's land in return for a share of the crop" (Reid, 1975, p. 426). Reid detailed circumstances in which sharecropped production historically took place as following

> (1) it coexisted with rental and owner cultivation; (2) landowners and laborers chose among alternative tenures; (3) contracts were common in all tenures; (4) landowners took active steps (monitoring, fines or bonuses, and arbitration) to ensure that contracts were fulfilled so that all contracts were costly to negotiate and enforce; (5) the terms of all contracts varied over time; (6) as did the prevalence of tenures. (Reid, 1975, p. 429)

[63] Translated from: "burada yaşayan insan için ev yeri kıymetli." (Interview 17)

For the case of Turkey, Keyder pointed to the tension between small peasantry and sharecropping, where the absence of wage labor indicated that "concentration – the increase in the scale of production - required sharecropping tenants, whose status as sharecroppers was not necessarily permanent" (1983, p. 130). Furthermore, Keyder elucidated two observations in connection to sharecropping, the first of which is "that there are perfectly plausible data indicating the growth of sharecropping practices during certain periods in Anatolian history; and equally plausible data indicating the reverse tendency in the same geographical areas but during different periods" and the second of which is "that traditional sharecropping has totally disappeared during the period since 1950, and small peasant ownership seems to have been successfully entrenched" (Keyder, 1983, p. 130). For sure, how the mentioned tension between small peasantry and sharecropping, and the process of entrenchment of small peasant ownership unfolded in three villages is beyond the scope of this research.

The term *ortakçılık* does not refer to sharecropped cultivation. However, it has possibly similar characteristics, such as the contracts among family members and the state of precarity among family members concerning how they share and live in the house. Going back to the beginning of the chapter, house keys, with effects arising and circulating them, are objects that lead to actions taking place within these contracts, representing various modalities of exchange, sharing, and/or ownership among members of families.

At the beginning of the chapter, there were the words of Esma, who required her husband not to give the house keys to their relatives because she witnessed others' bad experiences. For example, a woman next door, the wife of one of her husband's uncles, never comes to the village because the other three partners with whom she shares the house do not clean enough and do not replace the products they

use. As Esma quoted from her saying, "*ortakçılık* is not good," she also complained about that uncle who did not let them use his electricity when they first built the house. In addition to material conditions such as keeping the pantry full and cleaning that bother Esma and her sister-in-law, the non-existence of privacy is also a concern. For instance, Suna says,

> mostly my husband was staying when my sister-in-law was here [her husband's sister]. I couldn't come much because I was babysitting for my grandchildren. I came and realized that my sister-in-law's son and daughter-in-law also came… It doesn't work with other men in the same house. Celal continued to stay, but I left... sleeping arrangement is not comfortable, you sleep without a headscarf, you are not dressed well. (Suna, Interview 12) (See Appendix C, 44)

Suna's need for privacy and the feeling of discomfort in the house she shares with others reveals another dimension of *ortakçılık* that is beyond inheritance and property disputes and marks the relation between family life and the house, where there are interventions into the boundaries of private space and "their transitional points – the thresholds, windows, doors, entrances and exits, walls, and façades" which are used to "transact, allow, bar or control access to" private space (Attfield, 2000, p. 178).

In his study of the social production of space, Henri Lefebvre noted that "Private space is distinct from, but always connected with, public space. In the best circumstances, the outside space of the community is dominated, while the indoor space of family life is appropriated" (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 166). However, this appropriation is not conducted by "an immobile group, be it a family, a village or a town," which indicates a potential for change and transition. The transition enables the investigation of how seemingly permanent social structures such as the family, which is historically equated with the house, can deal with change in the experience of intimacy and interiority and relate to the exterior world (Attfield, 2006).

For the relationship between family life and indoor space, Janet Carsten (2004) argues that kinship is made in houses through the intimate sharing of space, food, and nurturance in domestic space. House does not shelter a given group called a family. House becomes social relations that it shelters and is engaged in "in the encoding and internalization of hierarchical principles that shape relations between those of different generation, age, or gender. And these valorizations have a significance beyond the intimate and everyday sphere of what happens in houses" (Carsten, year, p.37).

Ortakçılık differentiates from sharecropping in terms of the contract because the contract between family members is not apparent and set in stone. Most of the participants I interviewed said there had not been any kind of mutually decided arrangement for sharing the house. However, it can be said visible and invisible relations among family members constitute a contract. In that, a house is a contract, since the house becomes relations that it shelters. Such a contract is what renders Suna not demanding privacy and leaving instead. Within the same contract, Suna's husband, Celal, takes the position of a landlord, which is technically a non-existent position because he and his siblings are co-owners, and as the only living son of the family who maintains the house, he runs the house:

> I have partners, my older sister, and my deceased brother's wife and children... I tell them that nothing is mine, you can come and use everything…My sister and her family stay for a month or two every year; they bring nothing. They use everything that is mine. They are not concerned about electricity and gas bills, empty kitchen tubes, not working television or solar panels I installed… I wouldn't ask them to give money because they use those too. I have such partners. My partners have nothing to say to me. Everything is from Celal Ağa. You will come, you will sit, you will live… We built this place from scratch; the land is inherited from our grandfather… There is no agreement. As I said, I arranged everything; everyone can come and stay; this is like a free guesthouse, a hostel. They just bring their food. They may not bring everything; they complete the rest here... Of course, I'm looking after here; they come, free-ride, and leave. (Celal, Interview 11) (See Appendix C, 45)

Upon these words, Celal's neighbor, who was present during the interview, participated in the conversation and said, "[w]hen they come to this village, nobody thinks about whether they will spend money here or find a room… If this place is not available, I will open my house, or others will open theirs."[64] Therefore, while inside the house, laws of power relations between family members of a different generation, age, or gender are encoded and internalized, outside the house and in the village, proud hospitality reveals itself in a way to demonstrate how "private space is distinct from, but always connected with, public space" (Lefebvre, year, p. 166).

Celal positioned himself as a landowner who takes less than he gives. However, the relationship is an averted version of sharecropping, which brings forth the second translation of *ortakçılık,* which is commensalism. Commensalism refers to "interactions between two species in which one species benefits and the other experiences no net effect" (Mathis & Bronstein, 2020, p.167), and it derives from "eating together at the same table, sharing the table with the host,"[65] which is an essential expansion of meaning, recalling Carsten's argument that kinship is made in houses through the intimate sharing of space, food, and nurturance in domestic space. Compatible with Carsten's argument and the term's etymological aspect, kinship relations on the focus here has been made through sharing space, food, and nurturance when larger families shared houses and ate together. Moreover, though differentiated from its historical versions in the village, they still present a commensal relationality.

[64] Translated from "Bu köye gelirken kimse düşünmez, biz orada para verir miyiz, oda bulabilir miyiz gibi bir şeyi düşünmezler…Burası olmasa ben evimi açarım, öbürü evini açar." (Celal's neighbor, Interview 11)

[65] Etymologically speaking, it derives from Medieval Latin *commensalis,* from *com* "with, together" + *mensa* (genitive *mensalis*) "table."
Retrieved from https://www.etymonline.com/word/commensalism#etymonline_v_28405

As it diverts from sharecropping in several aspects, *ortakçılık* also diverts from commensalism despite its meaningful similarities. Within *ortakçılık, benefit* and *no net effect* become ambiguous since it may give rise to a sense of violated privacy or a sense of exploited hospitality, and it should be noted that there is only one participant who speaks of benefits of commensal relationality whose story will be at the end of this section. For those who reside in the family houses on their own, both a pride due to undertaking the burden of maintaining and caring for the house and a precariousness due to residing without a title deed registered on their name are experienced at the same time. For instance, Erhan, who has taken care of his parents, the family house, and the farm, and hosts the rest of the family when they come to the village, underlined that "they [his grandparents' siblings] are eight siblings together with step siblings…tomorrow they'll ask for their mother's share. When shared, my father gets a room. No one wants their share, so I live alone. But it's unclear what the future will bring."[66] Erhan also tied up resentments in families with topics such as whether the houses in the village are shared or cannot be shared, and commensal relationalities:

> We are seven siblings; I am the youngest. I am staying in this house now. For example, when my father dies tomorrow, the two of my siblings say that they are going to divide their sides... the fight starts from here. There is a mistake, ignorance, and nothing else. This is your father's property and her/his father's property, and s/he will get her/his share too. Resentments happen because you take part of the land and divide the house. Most resentments in this village are due to this father's property. There is nothing else… Now, Uncle Zafer comes to the village, his father has a house in Karaçam, and his brother says I will not let you in the village. His brother has been in the village for years; he has not moved to Ankara. He has worked and stayed in the village. He says I will not give you a place of the house from my father's lands, or he says I will not give you a field. Uncle Zafer also says I am the son of this house, show me a place, let me build a garden, a house, let my children come to this village... He says he will not give up; the fight starts from here. This is how

[66] Translated from "Adamlar zaten 8-9 kardeşler özlü üveyli…Onların anaları da bu evden gitme. Cenna halamız. Bu evin kızı. Yarın onlar gelecek diyecek ki bizim anamızın hissesini ver. Üleşmeye kalktığın zaman babama bir oda düşer. Ha şimdi şu an kalkıp da kimse benim burada hissem var demiyor, ben tek başıma durabiliyorum. Ama yarının ne getireceği belli değil" (Erhan, Interview 13)

> Eyüp Hoca's children started the fight... This is where the fights in this village always start. We are wrong; we are ignorant people. We didn't study; we're not cultured enough. (Erhan, Interview 13) (See Appendix C, 46)

Interestingly, Erhan timed the emergence of resentment in the family with the death of his father's. In a similar vein, Suna had ended her commitment to her parent's house after her brother, who used to take care of their mother and the house, had died. Some figures in families provide assurance against potential precarity and do not allow resentments to dominate among family members, and with their death, the ongoing contract is infringed:

> My brother passed away six months later he had a stroke…there is a saying, if you'll excuse the expression, that "the ox died, and the partnership broke down" [*öküz öldü ortaklık bozuldu*] …his wife didn't get along with us afterward. I took my mother with me; I did not leave her with them. (Suna, Interview 12) (See Appendix C, 47)

The saying Suna and others used mean that after the thing or the person that held everything together is no longer present, they have parted company. I did not come across it during the fieldwork, but there is another saying that draws an analogy through an ox; it roughly translates as "It is preferable to have an independent calf than a common ox."[67] Independent [*başkalık*] is the field that is cultivated and plowed independently, without entering into a sharecropping arrangement. The independent calf that will become an ox, if not today but tomorrow, is the means that will independently plow the field. That is, s/he who cultivates independently owns the means of production and works independently.

For example, Suzan "did not want partners,"[68] and waived her right to the house in the village, deciding to live alone in the house on the higher lands of the village due to a similar lines of reasoning and with a similar desire. Houses like

[67] Translated from: "Ortaklık öküzden başkalık buzağı yeğdir"
[68] Translated from: "ortak istemedim. Kaynım çok. Dokuz kişiler. Onlar üleşecek orayı alacaklar, ben de yukarı çıktım. Gelinler şimdi orada rahatça oturuyorlar…İstemem. Beraber uyum sağlamıyor kimse şimdi" (Interview 16)

Suzan's can also be called *başkalık,* since they are independently dwelled and divorced from commensal relationalities. Furthermore, keys to such houses are defined as objects of desire. In that, what makes them objects of desire is the desire for non-appropriated indoor space. Thus, both houses and their keys are reappropriated despite the risk of causing resentment among family members as Berna, Suzan, and Esma did. It is called reappropriation by choice since these *başkalık* houses were not taken through resolutions of conflicts among family members. They were instead claimed by individuals who strengthened their position in the family enough to claim what they desired. For sure, for all of them, there were some sources of assurance to take this path. Suzan and Esma's houses on the village's highlands are not registered with the title deed, so no one can legally reclaim them. For Berna, the land is co-owned by family members, but since she built a prefabricated house, she can quickly demolish it and leave if someone claims it. Necati, on the other hand, took a different path and strived to resolve the *çatalkazık* situation officially:

> [my son] said that these branches would be planted this year no matter what happens. Next door, we have our eldest uncle. We called him to the house in Çubuk… [his uncle] said let's get together, share what's left from my father and your father… We called our aunts and uncles and the children of the deceased… We invited them to a picnic in the village; we paid for all the expenses… We have twenty-three parcels of land registered under our grandfather's name in Karaçam Village… We didn't know the location of the three parcels; we had never seen them… My now deceased uncle was in the village, we asked him where those parcels were… One by one, together with my uncle, aunts, and my deceased uncles' children, we toured the entire land, twenty-three parcels of land. We said, how are we going to handle this? …Seven people…First, it will be divided on behalf of our fathers and behalf of their aunts. Then we will share them… We went to the Land Registry and Cadaster Office, and the manager said, "You can neither get the title deed nor share those parcels in this way. You'll make a consensual partition. You will match parcels with one another. You will divide one by one… by seven in total. You will give only one parcel to the one with a larger land and two parcels to the one with a smaller parcel of land. You will distribute it that way"… we came here again on a Sunday. We divided the land we call barley field as a place of the house for five people. There are two houses in the

> village. Seven in total. There are also those divided or remained undivided... We parted all the land that way... We numbered them up to seven and put them in a hat [they divided all the parcels into seven groups]... Everyone drew their number, and we wrote it down... We agreed on this and reported it to the Land Registry Office as a consensual partition. We just didn't get the deed. One of my deceased uncle's children lives in the Netherlands…we couldn't find him. We wrote a letter from the Consulate… The Netherlands could not find him and sent us his power of attorney. He doesn't come either... that way, we just made a consensual partition between ourselves... tomorrow, when my child objects to our verbal agreement, these will be valid any more [because there is no title deed]. So, nothing is official. (Taha, Interview 8) (See Appendix C, 48)

Therefore, Taha and his family ended their commensal relation, still needing a legal assurance against possible conflicts due after the death of now agreeing parties as experiences and observations show.

4.3 The village and the state

Here, the state's role, with its institutions to provide assurance, becomes crucial because those who avoid dealing with their families may prefer dealing with the state and its bureaucracy.[69] Alongside the troublesome process of buying land and building a house on it, the state is renowned for its nonrecognition of the village's idiosyncratic characteristics such as *çatalkazık* and *ortakçılık.* For example, participants said that to receive seedlings free of charge from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry or Metropolitan Municipality, one needs to have the title deed. Alternatively, when one builds a house in a field of their own in order to connect it to the electricity grid, they need to get the consent of each owner of land over which the electricity line will be transferred. When s/he is not the sole owner of the land, the consent of other parties sharing the title deed is also needed for

[69] See Appendix C, 66 for Ahmet's telling the procedures to buy land in the village from the state.

connection to the electricity grid or water infrastructure. Erhan said that there is nothing they can do "as long as the state does not recognize this."[70]

Taha's house is not zoned. Therefore, no road can be built to his house's entrance. In addition, he produces electricity via solar panels and gets water from a well in a relative's field, filling a tank and transferring it with a pipe. He said that he has been applying to the Municipality for his house to be zoned for years, but all they do is talk and take no action. About the lack of actions, the state and its institutions assume, Celal shared his rightful anger:

> They [villagers] collaboratively brought the water; they dug throughout 8 km and brought it here. The system now changed; the municipality is connecting the water to the clock. They did not bring this water; we brought it from the mountain. They did nothing. You didn't even lay the pipe; the people laid the pipe. I will say that a garbage truck comes here every Monday since this is now a neighborhood. They pick up the garbage and leave, nothing else. (Celal, Interview 11) (See Appendix C, 49)

Thus, the state, with its different institutions, appears as a figure that does not know the idiosyncratic conditions of the village or does not recognize these conditions even though it has the knowledge. This figure also expects more than it gives and takes over what the villages have done by their efforts and collectively generates income from it.

The relationship between the state and the village has long been a topic of interest across the world; Befu (1967) summarized this long history by classification of the village's relationship with "the primitive state," "the classical state," and "the modern state" and described the village's state and its relationship with the state during modernization process as:

> As the modernization process goes on, the village as a corporate entity, as a little polity, gradually loses significance. Kinship is much less important than in the previous stages, as increased mobility separates relatives from one another geographically as well as socially, and increased economic

[70] Translated from "Bunu devlet ayırt etmedikten sonra bizim yapacağımız bir şey yok" (Erhan, Interview 13)

> differentiation also puts relatives into different interest groups. Communal ownership of subsistence resources, which in previous stages often provided an important basis for the political integration of the community, is either absent or plays an insignificant part compared with the centrifugal forces based on social and geographical mobility and also with the penetration of government power. Industrialization and a market economy create an exchange system of much wider scope based on interdependence between villages and cities and between regions. This breakdown of village polity and the formation of wide-scale economic interdependence further make it easier for the government to penetrate the village and influence its internal activities. (Befu, 1967, p. 618)

This assessment is valid overall for the rural space in Turkey. However, as in many nation-states, it is necessary to pay special attention to the effects of spatial reorganization. The need to redesign the rural space never ceased to emerge from time to time. It was previously highlighted that the Turkish state was founded through 35.000 villages (and even more hamlets in number) and settling of almost all of Anatolia's semi-nomadic peoples and tribal groups in stable places and imposed migrations of masses.[71] On the side of the state, such high numbers of rural settlements and their dispersion over vast geography extending from a nine km settlement near Istanbul in the Marmara Region to a 77 km settlement in Hakkari in the Kurdish southeast were problematized (Tütengil, 1975), primarily because of accessibility issues. However, Jongerden (2009) observed that the nationalist ideology of the state worked as "as the natural and inevitable mediator" for the

[71] Settling of nomadic peoples and tribal groups, and imposed migration were not new phenomena in the geography in the question. Since the early years of its establishment, Ottoman Empire kept a "nomadic presence," particularly in frontiers, as a significant origin of power (Kasaba,2009). Thus, it was able to reach out to remote regions of its geography through working with tribal leaders, whereas tribal leaders were in return able to maintain their own power and ensure the existence of their tribes to contain their identities. Keeping a nomadic presence in the early years of the empire, particularly in frontier areas, was a significant source of power. The imperial center was able to effectively reach out to remote regions of the empire by working with tribal leaders, who could also maintain their own power and ensure the survival of their tribes as keepers of unique traditions and identities. In the 18th and 19th centuries, this relationship shifted as indigenous communities learned new ways to increase their own economic and political influence by seeking opportunities on a local, regional, and even global scale, independent of the Ottoman centers. Under these altering conditions, the Ottoman center's "loose, flexible relationship" with migrant communities turned into a burden, and the Ottoman state started efforts to settle tribes and control migrations. Kasaba (2009) concluded that mobility in the early 20th century had turned into forced migrations driven by ethnicity-based notions of nationality.

development of the nation through the social production of physical and discursive Turkish rural space; for the first of which he looked at the administrative and the architectural designs and rural development plans, and for the second at renaming and back-naming settlements. He explained that

> The existing rural settlement structure was regarded by Turkish nationalists as a barrier to the civilizing project of the republic, so spaces had to be crafted that would facilitate the production of a Turkish population, environments which would in of themselves develop citizenship. These spaces were attributed the agency to convert their inhabitants into Turks. Only the state could achieve this, through centralized design and planning – or at least, no other initiating organization was imagined. (Jongerden, 2009, p. 18-19)

Jongerden's approach partly depends on Kerem Öktem's (2005, 2009) work and 'material and discursive appropriation of space,' that is described as "the annihilation of 'the Other' from spatial representation by means of a geographical reproduction, primarily through the tactic of renaming and reconstruction, especially of urban space" (Jondergen, 2009, p.2). Following these points, changes in municipality laws in Turkey become thought-provoking. For example, with Law no. 6360 implemented in 2014, all the villages in 14 metropolitan cities had lost their status as a village and turned into neighborhoods of those cities. Thus, boundaries of metropolitan municipality's authority broadened to the extent that they had to serve rural areas where they were historically calibrated not to do so. However, in 2021, a new administrative status called 'rural neighborhood' was introduced, and villages were granted the right to obtain this position through application. Through not only organizing rural space in accordance with their boundaries and work plans but also changing and rechanging the status of villages (and rural settlements, but villages are the only rural administrative unit in the entire system) in the administrative system, municipality laws may exemplify "the annihilation of 'the Other,'" the other being the rural and the village.

4.4 Houses in the village, ruins in the village

There was a sole participant who spoke highly of *ortakçılık* and commensal relationality. Whereas Celal likens himself to a landlord and his house to a hostel free of charge, İsmet very willingly and proudly opens his house to his relatives who from time to time want to come to the village:

> Of course, I usually stay [in the house in the village]. What they say is that they have an open door here, when they come to a funeral today, a wedding, when they come to visit the cemetery, at least they have an open door. They'll come and have at least a cup of tea. At least we can have a chat. For this reason, they are also glad that we are here in this respect. They are contented. They say they don't stay inside the village; they have a place. For example, they come to a funeral, and we come home, it's warm, one of our stoves is burned, when winter comes, people can come and sit comfortably as if it is their home (İsmet, Interview 1) (See Appendix C, 50)

The house had so far been mainly discussed in relation to the tension between family and property relations, private and public spaces. That İsmet takes care of the family house and that this care enables finding an *open door* when needed may bring up a new perspective to *ortakçılık* and property relations, in which a different modality of sharing without resentments is possible. For sure, it should be underlined that İsmet is the eldest living son of the family. Therefore, the family house may be under his care and management by tradition, and İsmet's sisters may have different accounts concerning the family house. In the village, it is also expected that those who care for the house and keep the door open for others have more rights because otherwise, there will be no house where the door would open:

> This house wouldn't be what it is if I wasn't here. There was Ayhan who left here… He did not step foot in this village for 20 years. His house was in ruins; it was breaking down. He spent 50-60 thousand liras last year. He is living there now, not leaving. The house you don't dwell in in the village will collapse in two years. If it weren't for me, they wouldn't be able to come here. Not one but many houses were ruined. It collapses when you don't dwell. (Ali, Interview 17) (See Appendix C, 51)

> it's a bit unfair about that... You're giving your years here. If you don't dwell in that house, if you don't look after that house, if you don't repair what's broken down, that house will be ruined... Because we see the places that aren't dwelled. It's ruined; it's falling apart. You pay attention to its every need, someone comes and says, this is my father's, you go out, or s/he says, give me a room, and I will stay here. You involuntarily accept…If there were land, they would build themselves, but they can't do it either. (Erhan, Interview 13) (See Appendix C, 52)

These houses, which are protected from ruination by those who stayed in the village and serve as an open door to other members of families, pose essential questions, several of which are what ruin means in the context of the village, what ruined houses and house that are protected from ruination by families' care tell. Taken within the material culture of the village, depending on the premise at the beginning of the chapter, the ruined houses Ali and Erhan see in their village would help unravel the transformation of the rural space in Turkey because their symbolic and affective dimensions would show the path to unrecognized experiences, emotions, and loss.

However, ways of thinking about ruins also need attention since "[w]e are *schooled* to be alert to the fact that ruins hold histories, that ruins are the ground on which histories are contested and remade" (Stoler, 2013, p.14) (italics added). Contemplating on "ruins of empire," Stoler suggests "working explicitly against the melancholic gaze to reposition the present in the wider structures of vulnerability, damage, and refusal that imperial formations sustain" and "the wistful gaze of imperial nostalgia" (Stoler, 2013, p.9). Although Turkey's political construction of space (and rural space) has been all-encompassing, one must be cautious in bringing together "ruins of empire" and ruins in these villages. On the one hand, her framework on "imperial ruins" and ruination may be more effective in use where ecocide is operationalized through extractivist environment policies and mega projects, forced displacement of masses based on ethnic, religious, and political

identities, and rural gentrification have been constituents of the character of rural space in Turkey. On the other hand, observing how these villages and the region have taken their part in the transformation of rural space in Turkey and contemplating how they have diverged (or been spared) from the intense and mostly violent process the rural space in Turkey has gone through, ruins in these villages too can be thought within Stoler's framework.

Stoler argues that ruins "provide a favored image of a vanished past, what is beyond repair and in decay, thrown into aesthetic relief by nature's tangled growth" (Stoler, 2013, p.9). In the same manner that my mother described her surroundings as an *orphan* upon seeing the ruined millstone during the trip to the old mill of Karaçam Village, houses in the form of ruins are often subjected to both the melancholic gaze that romantically reconstructs the village with its large and prosperous households; and the wistful gaze of nostalgia that what belonged to the disappeared past cannot be retrieved. There also exists a different manner of relating to ruins and ruination in the village that avoids becoming "beyond repair and in decay" and, at least on the surface, precludes both the melancholic gaze and the gaze of nostalgia. Dwelling in and caring for houses in the village hinder them from becoming ruins and ruination causing "total loss or severe impairment, as of one's health, fortune, honor, or hopes."[72]

Therein also, the nature of sharing the house and its keys are defined because one of the parties asks for the right to sole ownership of the house in return for efforts to protect the house from ruination and keep its door open. In contrast, the other asks for the right to have a place for a possible return and an open door for an

[72]Retrieved from: https://www.thefreedictionary.com/ruination

occasional visit in return for leaving the house in the beginning. Following Testart's argument, what has been defined as a modality of sharing before takes the form of the exchange:

> [T]he gift is the transfer of a good that implies the renunciation of any right over this good, as well as of any right that might issue from this transfer, in particular something requiring a counterpart. . .The idea of gift contains the notion of abandoning. The donor abandons a good, any idea over this good, as well as any right that emanates from its transfer. . .In the exchange, on the contrary, whoever exchanges something has a right to require a counterpart- and it is the right itself that defines the exchange. (Testart, 2013, p. 258)

Protected from absolute ruination, houses stand as contested markers of these exchanges as property conflicts are sustained through them. In contrast, the gift in this context can only be those ruined houses that have been abandoned and *thrown into aesthetic relief by nature's tangled growth*. That may bring in mind trees in groves and forests surrounding these villages, on which a sign is attached by the General Directorate of Forestry, which says "this tree has been left to the nature for the biodiversity and the ecological balance" to declare that no more will be sought from these trees, nor will anything more be done for them to live. Within a similar logic, these trees can be *gifts to nature*, from which no more can be taken; therefore, no more care is given and thus abandoned to nature and its course. These ruined houses and abandoned trees can also lead to something different that will be marked as neither possession nor domination. Nevertheless, they will only open space since "we should make room, we should create the space for something else to happen" (Vittorio Aureli, 2015, p. 8).

In the village, what is seemingly beyond repair and in decay can sometimes be brought back; even in ruins, a standing house can make essential turning points in people's lives and return to the village. Rıza said, "[m]aybe our return would've been difficult without this old building. We would want to build a house; we wouldn't

know where to build it. Maybe we couldn't. Most people have that problem… This ruined house turned us to the village."[73] This can widen the perspective looking around the return to the village as returning to what is left behind, what is unchanged, and what is stable. Keeping in mind that these are houses where many returnees lived their childhood, several things emerge from there, the first of which thinking on and remembering the house and its ruins enables rethinking kinship relations made in these houses leading to grasping the kinship from the inside. Moreover, the other is that these houses, which render the return to the village possible, though they are in ruins, oppose that ruination is "total loss or severe impairment, as of one's health, fortune, honor, or hopes," because the return to these childhood houses and the village can be to continue imagining a future.

4.5 Kinship, community, and the village

A sizable portion of the families in the village are related to each other by kinship ties. For example, Celal says that "Here [Yıldırım Elören], everyone is from my own lineage, for example, your father, me, him; we're all from the same lineage. We're *Karabacaklar*… And you are too. They call the ones here *Çimenler*; they call them something else over there."[74] This is also the case for the other two villages of Yeşilkent and Karaçam. Although increasingly more people strive to reappropriate the house and its domestic space as their own, in the village, inside and outside of the house, spaces of individuals, families, and community are intertwined.

[73] Translated from: "Belki bu eski bina olmasaydı bizim dönüşümüz de zor olacaktı. Ya ev yapalım diyecektik nereye yapalım diyecektik. Belki yapamayacaktık. O sorun var çoğunda yani…Bizim, bu ev bizi çevirdi köye, bu ev. Şu yıkık ev var ya, bizi köye çevirdi bu ev." (Rıza, Interview 9)
[74] Translated from: "Burada bir de herkes kendi sülalem, mesela senin baban, ben, bu; biz üçümüz aynı sülaleyiz. Karabacaklarız…Bir de sen de varsın. Buralardakilere Çimenler diyolar, şuradakilere başka bir şey diyolar." (Interview 11)

Therefore, conflicts over property often appear to surpass the indoor space of the house and family. The conflicts arising from the property are not limited to the confined space of any house. In an interview in Karaçam Village, Faik and Gül told the story of the construction of a house and its owner Cemal Ağa, who is notable for his wealth and ambition by people, including even me, when I was a child. Faik said that he tried to talk sense into Cemal Ağa when he was trying to get hold of a common land called *katranlık* to build the mentioned house, saying that he didn't need all the land he had in the village because he owned property all around the city and attained a very high income at the time, to which Cemal Ağa responded "I have this ambition, I have this devil."[75]

Following the devils, Cemal Ağa tried to use three or four acres of *katranlık*, although he agreed with villagers to use five hundred meters and one acre of it at most. Angered by this, the villagers reported Cemal Ağa to authorities claiming that he had built a house in the forest. During the court process, Cemal Ağa was imprisoned for nine months in a different city. Meanwhile, Cemal Ağa did not stay calm and reported the villagers to the General Directorate of Forestry because they were collecting wood and cones from the forest. Each of those who reported him received was served heavy fines. Before this tension arose, Cemal Ağa's elder brother Ahmet Ağa told him not to quarrel with people in the village and build a house where there would be no conflict of interest, Faik said that Ahmet Ağa was a brave man.[76] It was told that Cemal Ağa was released from prison before serving his complete sentence because he bribed the judge. He then constructed his house on the common land he somehow got hold of. The house is a villa-type building above the

[75] Translated from: "Ya bekçi Fethi dedi, bende bu hırs var dedi ya. Bende bu hırs var dedi. Bu şeytan var dedi" (Interview 6)
[76] Interpreted from: "Ahmet Ağa'da mertlik vardı" (Interview 6)

mountain slopes overlooking the village, it must be said that many houses built by wealthy families in the surrounding villages were also built high above mountain slopes.

Gül said, "He seized many places; he uprooted all the pastures."[77] regarding Cemal Ağa's pattern of behavior. Whereas Cemal Ağa is attributed with characteristics causing to a long-lasting conflict in the village, there are characteristics, namely envy and gossiping, attributed to the people of the village, which are assumed as reasons for why the village has not flourished more and remained low-populated in comparison to the surrounding villages. Faik said that "there is envy in this village."[78] and added that

> here is full of those who do not want you to have more, there is no one to help you to have more… my mother used to say, "a judge and prosecutor came here and said that if this village has twelve of something, it will not be thirteen, there is gossip and envy in this village" (Faik, Interview 6) (See Appendix C, 53)

Uğur, on the other hand, had another story on how envy and gossip may have impeded the village from prosperity:

> While people from Central Asia were coming this way, they were divided into certain tribes, that is, to determine a place. Here is Kuzuören village, behind there is Dereköy, next to there is Evci, and then Elveren, Aydoğan, Uluağaç, Karaçam. They came here. They say that this grove, this location, this village is beautiful. They said let us settle here. One of them said that it's okay here, but nothing will increase or decrease here [*burada üçken beş olmaz, beşken üç* olmaz]. Someone asked what that meant, and the other said, "Do you know that there will be gossip in this village, people here do not want each other, there will be envy." He said that they don't think right. In the end, they settled here. (Uğur, Interview 2) (See Appendix C, 54)

Uğur then went on to describe the people of the village:

> Indeed, those old men knew …The man of this village is such a quitter. There is no one to talk to. No man is true to his word…There is only mukhtar, İsmet. I only know him. I don't know any loyal man other than him. That's why I don't want to go to them. Because they gossip. There are people here

[77] Translated from: "Zapt etti kızım, çok yerleri zapt etti, hep söktü meraları" (Interview 6)
[78] Translated from: "Bu köyde hasetçilik var" (Interview 6)

> who don't want you to have more than you have (Uğur, Interview 2) (See Appendix C, 55)

However, although envy and gossip are given as reasons why Karaçam Village has not prospered more and remained low populated compared to other villages, Uğur does not differentiate his village Karaçam from other villages. For him, there is something almost intrinsic to the region that renders people untrue to their word and jealous:

> For example, there is Uluağaç village; if you have done wrong to a man there, he goes to court without telling you. It continues like this. But we don't have this in our village. For example, Aydoğan is barbaric; people run business in a barbaric way. I mean, they're not true to their word either... But I think they exist in every village in these villages (Uğur, Interview 2) (See Appendix C, 56)

Similar to Uğur, Nur talked about the gossip in the village:

> They used to love gossip, whether it was true or not. They would just sit down and talk about you... Maybe this place didn't go any farther because of that too... They used to call nicknames, gossip, and slander. So I don't like this village. I like the current state. I don't like those people's time. Because there would be a lot of gossips. (Nur, Interview 18) (See Appendix C, 57)

When it comes to envy and gossip, Faik, Uğur, and Nur, who had so far responded by including themselves in the subject, now excluded themselves from the subject. As in Nur's phrasing, envious and gossiping people are or were those other people in the village. Gossip and envy are historicized in the village context by the people and are intrinsically attributed to the people.

There are multiple references to the changing character of the village, its community, and all the relations it contains. Murat told that

> [the village] has changed significantly since five or ten years ago. Nobody comes near to anybody. If someone suggests having a cup of tea, no one will come… first, few people had cars. Everyone has a car now, also money. Now, no one interferes with anyone because people no longer need each other. I know this; I don't know anything else… Everyone comes with their families or friends; they come together, eat and drink, then leave. The village has changed a lot. People in the village have changed a lot, the village has not

> changed, but the people have changed a lot. (Murat, Interview 7) (See Appendix C, 58)

Murat described a change in the sense of community where people do not engage with one another as they used to, which has occurred due to the disappearance of the need for and dependence on one another because economic conditions have improved. Thus, people can now spend time with their close family and friends and leave the village without engaging with other people, which can be thought of together with enclosed houses and gardens since fences separate them from the community and the village's public space.

In a different line of reasoning, one that was discussed through the thesis, Nur connects the change in the sense of community to outmigration and the disappearance of households:

> When the elders passed away, and the younger ones went to the town, there was no one to interfere… when I came [when she got married and came to Karaçam], it was crowded; everyone with their sheep, goat, and cattle was here. No one knew of a town... Şükrü Ağa's daughter-in-law died, his son died, Çakır Ağa of a house died. I mean, every house was jam-packed. All those elder ones passed away; who's left? Younger people. They also went to town. Only now are some people coming. (Nur, Interview 18) (See Appendix C, 59)

Those elders of now disappeared households to whom Nur attached great importance were also assumed to be ones to assure potential precarity and resentments afflicting family members, at least on the surface.

The village elders were those who could hold accountable those who violated unwritten rules, customs, and traditions. For example, Oya said that her mother-in-law, Taha's mother, was beaten and closed down in a room with no window by her in-laws when her husband served in the military. Oya further said that upon hearing the situation, the matchmaker of that marriage confronted the family and publicly humiliated them. This romantically reconstructed image of the village as a

coexistence such as of solidarity, self-sufficiency and crowd with its large and prosperous households, is very much alive in memories as in Murat's, Nur's, and Oya's.

However, it must be noted that those memories and others' also reside markers of a wide range of violent relations and inadequate living conditions. To give an example of the mildest ones, Suzan's father warned her when she was going to marry in one of the most prominent households of Yıldırım Elören and said, "We are not that crowded. You can't live among those people. Don't marry in that family."[79] Suzan described her life following that marriage: "There was no support from anywhere. Neither from father nor mother. For twelve years, I served the family's sons who would marry. I did not get a single thing for myself. Nothing. Nothing."[80] The change in the sense of community should not be explained through the basis of whose memory reflects the truth better since remembering can bring boundless associations and accounts, and lead to not-yet-discovered recollections.[81] Furthermore, when taking these memory narratives as oral sources, attention that Portelli (1991) draws to the connection of such oral sources of nonhegemonic classes to the folk narrative tradition should be noted. Portelli says that

> In this tradition, distinctions between narrative genres are perceived differently than in the written tradition of the educated classes. This is true of the generic distinction between "factual" and "artistic" narratives, between "events" and feeling or imagination. While the perception of an account as "true" is relevant as much to legend as to personal experience and historical memory, there are no formal oral genres specifically destined to transmit historical information; historical, poetical, and legendary narratives often become inextricably mixed up. The result is narratives in which the boundary between what takes place outside the narrator and what happens inside,

[79] Translated from: "Biz o kadar kalabalık değiliz. Sen bunların içinden çıkamazsın. Bunlara gelin olma" (Suzan's father, Interview 16)
[80] Translated from: "Hiçbir yerden bir destek gelmedi. Ne ne babadan, ne anadan, ne şeyden. On iki sene hizmet ettim o evlenecek oğlanlara. On iki sene kendime hiçbir şey almadım. Hiç. Hiç." (Interview 16)
[81] Benjamin said, "For an experienced event is finite at any rate, confined to one sphere of experience; a remembered event is infinite, because it is only a key to everything that happened before and after it" (1969, p. 202).

> between what concerns the individual and what concerns the group, may become more elusive than in established written genres, so that personal "truth'" may coincide with shared "imagination." (Portelli, 1991, p. 49)

In the context of the village, concerning what the village was and what it is now, *the personal truth* of participants and *shared imagination* have not entirely coincided with one another. What the village has changed into has been *elusive* itself. For some, the change in the sense of community in the village is concurrent with and inseparable from the changing society, which they described with dissolution or loosening of relational attachments. That relational attachments have been dissolving, or loosening is inferred because daughters-in-law and mothers-in-law do not live together anymore, and distant relatives, friends, and neighbors do not visit one another as they used to do. İsmet interpreted the situation as:

> I was on my own then. Now my God has given me, I have five children, and they have a social circle of their own. I have co-in-laws…I feel that my social environment is expanding…As the environment I'm familiar with expands, there is no room for a stranger…Now we only talk on the phone. (İsmet, Interview 1) (See Appendix C, 60)

İsmet's incisive interpretation, in this case, coincided with Murat's, in that people spend time with their close circle of family and friends when they come to the village. It is, in fact, possible to leave the village without seeing any other person. Otherwise, people gather and greet one another only around the van known as the market in the village. Esma also mentioned her distrust of other people in the village except for her only friend and neighbor Feza "If I go to their house, I will eat outside and then go. Because you don't know whatever happens. Because I can't trust them."[82] Oya and Taha told me how they were contented with their house being outside of the village; Oya said that "You don't sin, you're on your own," and Taha

[82] Translated from: "Evine gidersem karnımı dışarıda doyurur da giderim. Çünkü ne olur ne olmaz. Güvenemem onlara çünkü." (Interview 14)

that “You don’t get wet in the rain, no stones are thrown at you in a fight, it is excellent.”[83]

However, in Yıldırım Elören, as the village where husbandry and agriculture aimed husbandry are the most intense, working collectively and living in solidarity are what people are contented with. There were given several examples where people who are resentful to each other put aside their grudges and help each other when needed. Suna highlighted that this has always been the case

> For example, you have work. How many people in the village can do this? They would gather them all. They do your work that day. It is such solidarity. For example, they help the incapable; they help with their milk, yogurt, and everything. That is, the solidarity of this village is better. In Ankara, nobody can trust anybody. Do they? They won’t unless it is someone familiar. So you can’t do anything with anyone. (Suna, Interview 12) (See Appendix C, 61)

If this is the case, why do not people gather around or visit each other more? Celal explained in reference to people having no time to have conversations because they have so much to do in springs and summer. Only some retired people like himself have the time and desire to spend time socializing with others. He added that the familiarity that familial and communal ties provide form a commercial network between the village and the city where goods produced in the village are sold to the whole city

> About five thousand people [from this village] live in Ankara and Çubuk. They come to this village for a weekend vacation. Their fathers have a place here; those who do not have a place come for a picnic on the mountain. They also do their shopping here... you bring goods to the market, but I do not know you, I will not buy your cheese. I do not know if you are a clean woman. However, here people buy because they know you…Ten people who know you buy from you, and 10 people who know her buy from her. Which one has better quality is not relevant. The grass of our cattle is the same; the technique is the same. Same cheese and the same butter. Only how clean women who make these goods are different. (Celal, Interview 11) (See Appendix C, 62)

[83] Translated from: “Günaha girmiyorsun. Kendi halinde…Yağmurda yaş, kavgada taş görmüyorsun. Çok iyi.” (Oya and Taha, Interview 8)

One aspect that Yıldırım Elören diverged from the other two villages in narratives was how the sense of community was more intact. Suna described Yıldırım Elören with the word *tutkun,* which can be translated as passionate, and said that

> This place [people in the village] is more passionate… If you send an order, they are running away from each other in Çatak and Aydoğan. If you're going to get on someone's tractor, they are running away from each other... They don't have a passion... This village is very passionate. No one seeks consent when getting into someone's car; they get in. (Berna, Interview 15) (See Appendix C, 63)

Despite this passion, as other two villages, people in Yıldırım Elören too are concerned about the future of the village. That although participants in Yıldırım Elören expressed that the solidarity in the village is more robust and the community ties are tighter, that upcoming generations are not familiar with one another poses a threat to the future of the village. Addressing this anxiety, as the Çubuk Yıldırım Elören Village Association of Development, Beatification, Education, Culture, Assistance, and Solidarity[84], they organized an annual festival on the village's highlands to introduce younger generations to one another and older generations. Karaçam and Yeşilkent Villages also strived for the same purpose by expanding and improving the association buildings in the village. Whether these efforts of organizing festivals and establishing association buildings reached the aimed result is up for further analysis. However, festivals organized in Yıldırım Elören Village were canceled because a good proportion of the cattle died each year due to the plastic trash they ate after the festival.

As Berna described Yıldırım Elören Village as being more passionate, Celal compared villages in the region with villages in the east of Turkey based on his job experience as a special operations police and concluded that "people there are more

[84] Translated from "Çubuk Yıldırım Elören Köyü Kalkındırma, Güzelleştirme, Eğitim, Kültür, Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Derneği"

unionist...They are getting organized. It does not mean we should organize, oppose, and commit treason."[85] Given that "People there," in Celal's words, are Kurdish people. This was not the first time I heard about Kurdish people being more organized and solidarist, and I sensed that this was causing a sort of jealousy and distress. In Karaçam Village, a Kurdish farmer family from Ağrı rented an unoccupied barn, which has spread a fear in villages that Kurdish people would gradually invade the region.

The barn the Kurdish farmer rented belongs to one of the village's former mukhtars, who tragically died when his tractor fell on him while driving.[86] As the only farmer left in the village, he was described as the one keeping the village alive and together. After his death, his family moved to Çubuk and started to rent the barn; those who rented the barn are staying in the village's old chamber. Some people in the village used to regard this barn, which the mukhtar enlarged and modified into present-day's conditions over the years, as a symbol of his keeping the village alive and the village is being alive. In other villages, the image of a diligent farmer mukhtar also prevails. The image is also connected to how developed the village is. For some, when the mukhtar is too engaged with the work, s/he may not be responsible and attentive as much as is needed.

[85] Translated from "Vallahi o taraftaki adamlar daha şey. Nasıl söyleyeyim... dernekçi. Birbirileriyle şeyler kuruyolar. Örgütleniyorlar. Örgütlenip de karşı gelelim hainlik yapalım manasında değil." (Interview 11)

[86] According to Health and Safety Watch Turkey (2016) 107 of 133 laborers who died in the same month when the mukhtar of Karaçam Village died were employees, whereas other 26 self-employed consisted of six tradespeople and 20 farmers/smallholders (Retrieved from: http://isigmeclisi.org/17660-haziran-ayinda-en-az-133-yilin-ilk-yedi-ayinda-ise-en-az-1049-isci-yasamini-yitirdi). Whether the death of the mukhtar of the village was cited in these statistics is unknown. However, in another report (2021), Health and Safety Watch Turkey asserted that tractor rollovers are at the forefront of fatal occupational accidents together with overcrowded shuttles in the agricultural field (Retrieved from http://isigmeclisi.org/20635-tarimdaki-is-cinayetleri-tarim-politikasindan-bagimsiz-degil). When considered together with the image of the farmer mukhtar which is losing its power, the death of the mukhtar due to means of his production, his tractor, is thought-provoking, because such a death appears to symbolize the change in the character of the village.

For example, Celal said that "[p]eople here are engaged with their work, they aren't engaged with these [their duties]. When you don't, why should the state or municipality work for you for no reason? They don't come if you don't demand it... People get everything in Uluağaç and Yeşilkent because of their mukhtars..."[87] In a similar vein, Taha said that "Halil [mukhtar of Kışlacık Village] is dealing with his wife, İsmet [mukhtar of Karaçam Village] is dealing with his bees," whereas "Fuat [mukhtar of Uluağaç Village] is dealing with Mansur Yavaş, he's serving to his village, all he cares about is the Metropolitan Municipality. His phone never stops."[88] During my fieldwork, Fuat was renowned and admired mukhtar in villages because he prioritized his administrative duties as a mukhtar, whereas others were more concerned with their private lives. In that, the image of a diligent farmer mukhtar losing its power when receiving service is more critical than witnessing the hardship a farmer experiences.

This image's losing its power is connected with the changing character of rural space. While agricultural and husbandry work is gradually withdrawn from the rural space, laborious farm work and its subject lose their effect on identifying and describing what a village is. Therefore, a mukhtar who is a semi-manager and semi-politician is well desired in these villages. In contrast, the conventional perspective that "the headman is a spare-time position" in the village expires (Befu, 1964, p.606). Moreover, in the context of Karaçam Village, the weakening power of a diligent farmer mukhtar is not replaced with the other one. Instead, the place that used to

[87] Translated from: "Buradaki adamlar kendi öküzüyle ineğiyle uğraşıyor, bunlarla uğraşmıyor. Bununla uğraşmayınca devlet veya belediye durup dururken neden başına iş açsın da sana iş yapsın. Talep etmeyince onlar da gelmiyorlar yani…Mesela Uluağaç ve Yeşilkent'te her şeyi alıyor adamlar…" (Interview 11)

[88] Translated from: "Halil karıyla uğraşıyor, İsmet arıyla uğraşıyor, Fuat Mansur Yavaş'la uğraşıyor diyorum ben…Köyüne hizmet alıyor. İşi gücü büyükşehir belediyesi. Telefonu susmuyor." (Interview 8)

sustain that image and the mukhtar's work is filled by a stranger to the village, a Kurdish farmer and his family, who are in villages associated with several felonies such as drug-dealing and theft,[89] and unfaith.[90] Nevertheless, a Kurdish farmer is not an ordinary stranger in Karaçam and other villages where the overwhelming majority of people are Turkish and Sunni, and everyone is somehow familiar with each other at the level of ethnic and religious identity despite the absence of kin and community attachments. Against unknown roots[91] of villagers, the Kurdish farmer and his family become *absolute strangers* with their *unknown nature*:

> Faik: I sold [his field] to the people of Elören… Elören, Aydoğan is considered our fellow villagers…That man has no relevance. We know this place; we don't know that place. Those people are Kurds. The nature of those people is unknown. They are Eastern but are they PKK members?
> E: So, do you vouch for people from these villages?
> Faik: How can't I be? All around me is my fellow villagers, my root. What can happen?
> E: Well, you said that everyone is envious; they helped imprison Cemal Ağa for nine and a half months. They are also your fellow villagers.
> Faik: Yes, but that, too, has gone too far. (Faik, Interview 6) (See Appendix C, 64)

Discourses circulating around the barn being rented to a Kurdish family should be further discussed. However, underneath is the fear that communities in these villages are not organized as strong as Kurdish communities. Once a Kurdish

[89] Summarized from unrecorded conversations and fieldnotes: "Şimdi arazi para ediyor mu diye konuştuk demin…Şimdi o adama, Kürtlere, mesela bizim buradan bir yer sat, misal bir liraysa on-yirmi lirayı verir, alır. Onlar girdiği zaman da bu köye kendi köyünün halkından çok adam getiriyor. Yani köye yerleşiyor...Muhtarlığı ele geçirmişler çoğu yerde, yani çoğalmışlar…Buranın insanı olursa daha iyi olur…Biz bu sene rahatsız olduk mesela Karaçam'a geldi diye… bir motor ot az getiririz de ileride bir gün gerekirse devletten bir şeyler yapar araziden alır yerleşir yani...Onların o taraftan yüklü bir mal getirdiği söyleniyor, esrar gibi. Bütün araziye bağlayabiliyorlarmış yani. Ben öyle bir duyum aldım. Onun için onlarda para sıkıntısı yok yani...Biz civar köyler hep birbirimizi biliriz, burada hırsızlık olmaz, dolandırıcılık olmaz. Hayvanlarımızı yayladan geldiği zaman salarız buradan Karaçam'ın aşağıya. Tam Karaçam Köprüsü'ne kadar gider. Yayılır akşam geri gelir. O adam oradayken hadi sal, nasıl salacaksın. Üç beş tane ayırsın malının içine koysun. Akşam itiraz etsen bu benim diye, alamazsın." (Yıldırım Elören, 03.08.2021)

[90] Summarized from unrecorded conversations and fieldnotes: "İlla birine vereceklerse bir göğsü imanlıya versinler yani" (Yıldırım Elören, 03.08.2021)

[91] Some families have orally transmitted narratives of where their lineage began and how their ancestors came to these villages and settled. *Karabacaklar*, the most elaborate narrative I came across in the interview with Erhan, is given in Appendix C, 66.

family moved into the village, they would gradually bring the rest of their community and buy lands; they then would be legal residents and obtain the position of the mukhtars in the village, as happened in other villages of Çubuk.[92] The passion Berna attributed to Yıldırım Elören Village is this time attributed to Kurdish people by Ali, with an evident feeling of self-incompetence: "[their] environment is crowded, their children are crowded… They are passionate. They know how to do business with the state. We are people who are afraid of the police, the gendarme."[93] Therefore, in the absence of a diligent mukhtar who used to gather and keep the village alive, and once a Kurdish family is in his emptied place, the fear is that dissolving and loosening kinship and communal attachments would render them even more vulnerable.

This chapter was opened with house keys, the houses they opened, and the feelings, experiences, and memories of the people who shared the lands where those houses are located. The aim was to unravel the involvement of property, family, and community relations in a changing village by evaluating the house keys and the houses as components of the material culture. Meanwhile, various modalities of exchange, sharing, and/or ownership among members of families and in the village were discussed. Dissolving kinship and community attachments were deliberated concerning that the families' private space has been gradually separated from the village's public space. Finally, the fear of extinction of a village mourning its dissolving ties and protective figures and imagining its past self as crowded, self-sufficient, and in solidarity in the face of an absolute stranger was discussed.

[92] When asked, no one was able to remember names of those villages. They were rather in the form of rumors. Since I could not receive further information from them and in online research, I was unable to verify their claims.

[93] Translated from "[onların] çevresi kalabalık, bebesi kalabalık…tutkunlar. Devletle iş yapmayı biliyorlar. Biz polisten, jandarmadan korkan adamlarız." (Interview 17)

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This thesis investigated movements occurring at close distances, the mobility between rural and urban areas, and the return movement to the village. It revealed ways people engage in their villages as places to inhabit, settle or (ir)regularly move to and from and regard as home or foreign lands. It focused on the complex relationship between memory, landscape, and work within the effects of the process of deagrarianization of the rural space and diversification of economic activities in the village. Dwelling on the village's material and verbal culture, it demonstrated how people relate to one another in familial and communal attachments. Without overstepping to generalize its findings to the entire rural space of Turkey, everything included in the thesis was built on the ethnographic fieldwork conducted in the three villages of Çubuk District of Ankara, Karaçam, Yıldırım Elören, and Yeşilkent.

This thesis began with problematizing the image of the village as a faraway place in a national narrative because such an image conflicts with personal experiences. In a way, this thesis attempted to construct the village that is close enough through its participants' narratives. Between two villages, one far away and the other close enough, the immense history of the rural space's transformation and reorganization emerge. Inside this immense history, this thesis offers a stopping point in a dizzyingly fast-changing space and momentarily captures how the village, the relationship between the village and the city, and the change are experienced, remembered, and interpreted in the village. Even though it failed to integrate all, it tried to think together of different dimensions such as movements and mobility;

memory, landscape, and work; material culture and kinship and community relations. With this encompassing attitude, it resembles village monographies. With its reflex and motivation to locate these villages at an intersection of political, social, and economic transformation of the rural space, it diverges from them.

Dealing with different yet connected objects of analysis, the central premise of this thesis was to present an approach to the analysis of the changing character of the rural space in Turkey and illustrate the diversity in experiences of subjects who have been engaged in villages in different ways and the ways in which places and movements are constructive of their subjectivities. For that matter, the first task was to describe the history of migration and movements from and towards the village and specify those occurring at a close distance between villages in the district of Çubuk and Ankara. As a result, it was observed that these movements are differentiated from those described in the literature, primarily because the thesis concentrated on villages where people move to and from and return to as their own and worked its way through the attachments which people have with their village. However, "counterurban movements" and "rural return movements" which Öztürk et al. defined as "rural-directed movements" seem to be the best options in which movements on the focus of this thesis fit.

The research in this thesis can contribute to Öztürk et al's work in two ways. The first is that this research enabled embodying how movements and mobility are included in the essentials of what a village is, relying on participants' narratives and memories, as well as the landscape, verbal, and material culture of the village, and it showed that the village as a place is fused with memories, experiences, affect-worlds related to movements. The second is that there emerged a new object of analysis,

"mixed system of the village, the district and the city" in a participant's words, that can be discussed together with Öztürk et al.'s term "rural-urbanite dual place residence" that defines the living structure of people who often move between the village and other places. When it is further studied, such "mixed system of the village, the district and the city" can be a unit that surpasses the dichotomy of the rural and the urban and thus deem our efforts to categorize movements, places, and lifestyles invalid.

The second task in presenting an approach to the analysis of the changing character of the rural space in Turkey was to show how the village as a place is perceived and experienced by participants who are engaged in different forms of movements throughout their lives. Concentrating on participants' memories of the village and landscape and their experience of the change, it was observed that the village has become a place containing conflicting aspects due to the transformation of the rural space. Here, it should be noted that the village was not taken as a monolithic entity in the past. The aim was to describe the diversity in perceptions and experiences of the village and demonstrate that the village as a place can contain conflicting aspects such as the "site of picnics" and "deprivation zone." This diversity in perceptions and experiences of the village among participants and each participant's life was associated with the change and the spatial reorganization, which were also observed elsewhere. The reorganization of the rural space is connected to deagrarianization, diversification of economic activities, the intensification of husbandry, and the return movement of retirees. In that matter, how memory, landscape, and work are entangled in the village became an important marker in unraveling the changing character of the rural space. Physical changes in the landscape of villages, such as fences put around houses and lands and forested lands that used to be planted fields, were constant focal points of

participants' narratives and memories. With feelings of nostalgia and melancholia, they were intimate reflections of the reorganization of the rural space.

Along these, there was also indicated that the current state of the relationship between work and non-work in the village. In that, as another reflection of the spatial reorganization, work historically associated with the rural appears as a matter of voluntary labor and an object of enjoyment, carried on not as an economic activity but as an activity to spend time. Based on what was included in the thesis from the fieldwork, it appears that whereas the rural space is increasingly associated with non-work, consumption, and enjoyment, the urban space is increasingly associated with work and boredom. However, based on what could not be included in the thesis from the fieldwork due to the time limitation, the experiences of women and people who make a living out of agriculture and husbandry in the village should be accounted for. Until then, that the rural space has become a space of enjoyment among other things will remain contested.

Nevertheless, the incorporation of experiences of women and people who work in agriculture and husbandry in the village will not refute the idea altogether. While different kinds of production activities are increasingly displaced from the rural space to the agribusiness and other facilities, it becomes increasingly more challenging to live in rural areas without income transfers from remittances, pensions, and paid employment. At the same time, it becomes harder and harder to live in urban areas for all, especially for retirees, the elderly, and people who work low-paid jobs. Within such reorganization, the rural space has come to be associated with non-work (voluntary labor such as gardening and beekeeping, recreational activities such as picnics and walking) and has become an object of enjoyment. The voluntariness of

labor and the nature of enjoyment it brings need to be further analyzed. However, answers to the questions of who enjoys the village and how they do will contribute to developing a more encompassing understanding of the spatial reorganization of Turkey's geography and, thus, a new approach to the changing character of the rural space.

How the rural space has come to be associated with non-work, and the questions of who enjoys the village and how they do are also important pertaining to *gurbetsizler* and regional differences in the spatial reorganization or in the transformation of the rural space as it was mentioned in several parts of the thesis. Due to various reasons, rationalities, motivations, and living conditions, *gurbetsizler* are those who have stayed at close distance to their village and their *memleket*. In what ways no or little experience of *gurbet* influences a person is still uncertain in the context of this research, yet the opportunity to keep the option to return to the village or visit the village any time in reserve appears to hold regional differences, which are steered by extractivist environmental policies, forced displacement of masses based on ethnic, religious, and political identities, and rural gentrification. Therefore, the return to the village and *memleket*, staying close to them, and even the inability to leave them appear to hold regional differences, which means, they appear to be differentiated according to identities in conflict with the state and the potential of profit from the village's sources. Thus, who sustains the attachments to their memleket, and in what forms they sustain these attachments, are also reorganized along with the reorganization of the rural space.

Considering these attachments, the story told so far is also a story of returning and making a home. Thus the third task in the matter of presenting an approach to the

changing character of the rural space is brought about: unraveling the symbolic and affective dimensions of the material and verbal culture of the village to deliberate on various modalities of exchange, sharing and/or ownership among family members, the conflict-ridden commensal relationalities, the tension between private space and public space, and the relation between care work on houses and ruination. Therein, the idea that communal and familial attachments have been dissolving emerges; meanwhile, the village's past is retrieved as a place that was crowded, self-sufficient and in solidarity, and its future is feared that the village will be taken over by outsiders, such as a Kurdish farmer who rented a barn in the village and his relatives.

Therefore, even if these tasks still require a great deal of effort to be completed, there emerges an approach to investigate the rural space and its changing character from diverse dimensions based on the experiences, narratives, memories, affect, and meaning worlds of its dwellers. Including movements, landscape, material, and verbal culture in the essentials of the village in such an investigation puts forward how the rural space is "alive, mobile and versatile." Leaning on different forms of relations offers a chance to grasp the reality of the rural space from the inside and integrate that reality into the history of the spatial reorganization of the rural space in Turkey. Thus, that the attachment to a place, a village, or a home has not been constructed in isolation from the political, social, and economic history of Turkey's geography can be better comprehended.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Interview No.	Name	Birthplace	Hometown	Official Residence	Age	Occupational Status
1	İsmet	Karaçam	Karaçam	Karaçam	67	Retired, Mukhtar
2	Uğur	Karaçam	Karaçam	Ankara	66	Retired
3	Ahmet	Karaçam	Karaçam	Ankara	62	Retired
4	Esin	Kızılca-hamam	Kızılca-hamam	Ankara	61	Housewife
5	Feza	Kuzuören	Kuzuören	Karaçam	59	Housewife
6	Faik	Karaçam	Karaçam	Karaçam	78	Retired
	Gül	Kızılca-hamam	Kızılca-hamam	Karaçam	71	Housewife
7	Murat	Karaçam	Karaçam	Çubuk	56	Retired, Blacksmith
8	Taha	Karaçam	Karaçam	Ankara	66	Retired
	Oya	Kışlacık	Kışlacık	Ankara	?	Housewife
9	Rıza	Karaçam	Karaçam	Karaçam	72	Retired, Farmer
	İnci	Kuzuören	Kuzören	Karaçam	65	Housewife, Farmer
10	Arif	Yeşilkent	Yeşilkent	Tarsus	70	Retired
11	Celal	Y. Elören	Y. Elören	Ankara	72	Retired
12	Suna	Sirkeli	Y. Elören	Ankara	63	Housewife
13	Erhan	Y. Elören	Y. Elören	Y. Elören	46	Farmer
14	Esma	Ankara	Çankırı	Ankara	64	Retired, Housewife
15	Berna	Yıldırım Alıç	Yıldırım Alıç	Y. Elören	43	Housewife, Farmer
16	Suzan	Y. Elören	Y. Elören	Y. Elören	56	Housewife, Farmer
17	Ali	Y. Elören	Y. Elören	Y. Elören	53	Farmer
18	Nur	Kızılca-hamam	Karaçam	Gölbaşı	78	Housewife
19	Ömer	Yeşilkent	Yeşilkent	Ankara	66	Retired
	Ayten	Yeşilkent	Yeşilkent	Ankara	64	Housewife

APPENDIX B

APPROVAL OF ETHICS COMMITTEE

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 29.05.2021-15561

T.C.
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER YÜKSEK LİSANS VE DOKTORA TEZLERİ ETİK İNCELEME KOMİSYONU
TOPLANTI TUTANAĞI

Toplantı Sayısı	:	17
Toplantı Tarihi	:	27.05.2021
Toplantı Saati	:	13:00
Toplantı Yeri	:	Zoom Sanal Toplantı
Bulunanlar	:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen, Prof. Dr. Ebru Kaya, Prof. Dr. Fatma Nevra Seggie
Bulunmayanlar	:	

Elif Hatice Taşyürek

Sosyoloji

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Yeterince Yakın Olan Köy: Türkiye'de Kırsal Alanın Değişen Karakteri Üzerine Bir Çalışma" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığınız SBB-EAK 2021/25 sayılı başvuru komisyonumuz tarafından 27 Mayıs 2021 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve uygun bulunmuştur.

Bu karar tüm üyelerin toplantıya çevrimiçi olarak katılımı ve oybirliği ile alınmıştır. COVID-19 önlemleri kapsamında kurul üyelerinden ıslak imza alınamadığı için bu onam mektubu üye ve raportör olarak Ebru Kaya tarafından bütün üyeler adına e-imzalanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla, bilgilerinizi rica ederiz.

Prof. Dr. Ebru KAYA
ÜYE

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr.Ebru KAYA
Raportör

SOBETİK 17 27.05.2021

Bu belge 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununun 5. Maddesi gereğince güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

APPENDIX C

LONG TRANSLATED QUOTES

1. Şimdi çarşamba günü saat üç dört sıraları buradan çıkarım. Doğru Kışlacık'a giderim. Kışlacık'ta orada yağını, yoğurduna bakarım, kovalarım var kovalarıma doldururum tartarım. Parasını öderim. Baldızımın evine geçerim. Oradan da aynısını yağısını yoğurdunu alırım. Peyniri varsa peynirini alırım. Oradan da geçerim. Köy köy aşağı doğru inerim. Ondan sonra devam eder gideriz. Akşam saat sekiz buçuk dokuz gibi, dokuz buçuk gibi evime girerim. Sabahleyin malımı yüklerim. Pazara giderim. Pazar saat beş buçuk altıda pazar tezgahı açmış oluruz. Ondan sonra müşteriler gelen olur. Satacağımız olur alacaklarımız olur. Onlarla haşır neşir olarak vakit geçer akşam saat yedi buçuk sekize kadar. Tekrar şöyle cuma pazarına Ankara'ya Keçiören tarafına giderim. Saray, Pursaklar, Bağlum, Ufuktepe, Kuşçağız. Bunun yanında aşağılardan ben süt alırım haftada bir üç yüz, üç yüz elli litre. Tek kişinin sütü, Hacı arkadaşımızın. Onu dağıtır gelirim. Akşam tekrar dönüşte doğru ya Karaçam ya Çubuk. Şimdi evdeki gelinin durumuna bağlı.
2. Öyle olmazsa zaten vakit geçmez. Böyle daha iyi vakit geçiyor. Bak dün Çubuk'a bir gittim geldim…Ben eşime öyle diyorum, yani devamlı burada kalma…şöyle bir git gel. Bazen ben babamgilde oluyorum o burada duruyor. Ya en azından bir iki hafta bir çık bir dolaş bir gel. Bir ay dursun, hiç imkanı yok, inmez. O da öyle hayatı seviyor.
3. hiç bırakmadık köyü. On beş günde, yirmi günde yayan da olsa, böyle şey de olsa gelip gidiyorduk devamlı, ziyaret ediyorduk. Hiç daha hiç köyü bırakmadım yani. 30 küsur sene çalıştım ama yine de bırakmadım. Yazları bir ay iznim olurdu, yirmi gün veya otuz gün, devamlı köyde dururduk. 2: Okullar kapanır kapanmaz biz buradayız üç ay, üç ay sonra giderdik okul açılırken... Hayvanların içinde de gttim geldim.

4. Komşunun, eşin dostun çocukları gidiyor. Buradan bir akım oldu. Bir göç olmaya başladı. Olmaya başlayınca, şimdi sen öğrencisin okuyorsun. Okulda 100 tane talebe var, 80'i bir yere gitmiş. Siz köyde geride kalan 20 tane talebe düşünüyorsunuz bu 80 gitti de biz burada niye duruyoruz. Ve biz de gittik çalıştık.
5. Köy şartları yüzünden ayrıldık, o zamanki şartlara göre... buralarda o zaman Ankara'ya daha çok akım vardı. Şimdiki gibi böyle mal, ondan sonra ne bileyim ben, imkanlar yoktu...O zaman elli koyun, on beş tane kara mal satıp bir traktör alamıyordun. Şimdi on tane dana sat, bir traktör al. Hani o şartlardan ötürü gittik o zaman. Köyde de herkes gitti. Fazla bir kimse kalmamıştı. Onun için biz de gittik. Daha iyi olur diye.
6. Köyde dursak ne yapacaktık? Hiçbir şey yapamazdık. E baktım bir şey yok. Arkamda iki tane daha oğlan kardeşim var. Bir de kız kardeşim var. E bakıyorsun burada bir şey yok. Sabah eşekle dağa gidiyorsun. Büyük odun getiriyorsun. Onu da bir günde yakıp bitiriyorsun. Hiçbir şey, hiçbir anlamı yoktu. Onun için işe girdik işte. Orada çalıştım.
7. Bu köy öyle kurulmuş…Yani ben burada durmayacaktım. Beyim askerden gelince ben Ankara'ya gidecektim…E kaynanam öldü. Kaynata da öldü…İkisi de ölünce evlenecek oğlanlar kaldı. Mallar başımıza kaldı. Gayrı onlar Ankara'dan tuttu. Biz de buradan tuttuk. Evlendirdik onları.
8. Şimdi burada aklı eren o zamanları hep Ankara'ya gitti. Yaşlılar kaldı. Yaşlılar da ellerini eteğini işten, şimdi bu sefer de emekliler geliyor. Şimdi önce Ankara Site'ye giderlerdi. Ankara site kaynaktı milletin. İş kaynağıydı o zamanlar iyiydi Site. Şimdi ise elli beşten çıkan siteye, beşten çıkan siteye. Öyleydi. Şimdi ise buralarda kimse kalmadı. Burada da yaşlılar kaldı. Yaşlılar da gidince ne olacak? Şimdi yeniden

emekliler geliyor. Şimdi işi olan buraya gelir mi? Gelmez. Ne iş yapacak adam burada? Ne kazanacak?

9. Şimdi bizim şimdi gençler köyde ne yapacak? Mecbur iş için gidiyor. Babaları da vefat ediyor. Anneleri de vefat ediyor. İster istemez burada nüfus azaldı köyde. Yoksa Ankara'da azaldı diye bir şey yok. Ha size bak. Amcanın çocuklarına bak. Benim biraderlere var. Ve diğer akrabalarım var. Ben şu anda kuzenlerimi hesaplasam belki yirmi beş otuz taneden aşağı değildir. E bunların hepsi nerede? Ankara'da Çubuk'ta Pursaklar'da. E şimdi bunlar köyde dursa ne olurdu? Köy nüfusu şu anda yüz elli iki yüz olurdu. Ama iş sahası olmadığı için anca bundan sonra dönüş nasıl olur? Ya emekli olacaksın ya da burada bir faaliyet yapacaksın. Dönüşü öyle olur. Yoksa köye başka dönüş olmaz. Şimdi biz mesela bizim gittikten sonra ha bizim çocukların birisi orada birisi orada birisi orada. Ancak onlardan biri emekli olur da buraya gelirse gelir. Yoksa onun haricinde günlük gelir giderler.

10. Emekli olarak köyümüz iyi. Yoksa ben köyde durayım da karın doyurayım veyahutta ben burada geçimimi sağlayayım diye öyle bir durum yok. Gençlerin burada durup geçimini sağlamasına ben karşıyım. Emekliler dönsün ya. Dönsün emekli ya...Çalışmıyorsa, emekliyse dönsün köyüne ya. Şu köye 10 kişi dönse Ankara'dan, Ankara daha boşalır. Öbür köye 50 kişi dönse, Ankara daha bir boşalır, yani hepten köye bir dönüş olur.

11. orada alışkın olmadım da biz sıkılıyoruz. İlla yine de bura daha rahat ediyorsun. Oralarda hani alışkın olmadığında bizler sıkılıyoruz…E demek doğma büyüme buralarda olduğumuzda ondan rahat geliyor bizlere. Çünkü öyle bir açılıp gurbet fazla vermedik önceden. Bizler hani şöyle uzaklaştığında sanki kaybolduk. Öyle düşünürüz. Halbuki bir gez güzel yerler gör işte.

12. Giderdik ya o şimdi şartlara bağlı şimdi. Bizim köyümüze yakın olduğu için zaten bizim köyümüz şehre yakın olduğu için biz ondan bir adam olmadık. Keşke köyümüz uzak olsaydı da geri dönemeseydik…Doğudan gelen adam şimdi Ankara'yı satın alıyor. Mesela İstanbul'u satın alıyor. Adamlar gelmiş de geri dönememişler. Dönememişler derken zor yani. Ama ben şimdi bir saat sonra çıkacağım elli dakikada ben evimdeyim. Evde yemek hazırlanana kadar eve gidiyorum. Çay demlenene kadar.
13. daha farklı illere gidebilirdin. Farklı illerin geleneklerini göreneklerini görmüş olurdun. Çocukların farklı olabilirdi. Daha iyi bir şey olabilirdin. Okumuş olabilirdin. Belli bir kariyerin olabilirdi. Ekonomin biraz daha iyi olabilirdi. İçeride pek ekonomin yok ama dışarı çıktığın zaman ekonomiyi daha fazla görürsün…Çünkü başına kalmış oluyor, baş başa kalıyorsun gurbette. Pek yardımcı olan olmuyor. İster istemez çabalıyorsun. Daha ileriyi görmeye gayret gösteriyorsun. Daha cesur davranıyorsun yani.
14. Alime sormuşlar gezen mi çok bilir kütüğünün dibinde duran mı? Alim demiş ki gezen bilir. Topluma girersen sağda solda düğünde cenazede ne bileyim hani bir çevreyi gezersen sen bilirsin. Burada şu evin içinde büyüyen adam hiçbir şey görmez. Kapıdan dışarıya bakamaz. Bakış açısı hep ev içerisinde olur dışarıyı görmez. Sen Dünya'yı dolaşırsın bakış açın çok geniş olur…Bir insan gezecek. Varını yoğunu görecek. Ne bileyim misafir olacak. Misafir edilmesini bilecek. Misafire nasıl bir hürmet edilmesini bilecek.
15. Ben çalıştığım yerde inşaat mühendisi, makine mühendisi mimarlar, mühendisler vardı. Ben onlardan ne gördüysem, belki ben böyle olmazdım. Bu kadar da bilgili olmazdım veya bu kadar da efendi olmazdım. Onların içinde yaşaya yaşaya adamlar sabah gelirdi günaydın, hayırlı sabahlar derdi. Ya biz ne diyor derdik ilk işe

girdiğimiz zaman? Bunlar ne? Ne ya bu? Kendi kendimize onlara baka baka biraz oturaklaştık.

16. Öyle İbrahim amcana derdi, köye bakın köye sahip çıkın. Öldü gitti öyle dedi. Bünyamin'im gitti. Köye sahip çıkın. Kendi hani köyde olduğu için köyü seviyordu. Ne kadar Ankara'da ne kadar rahat etsin ne kadar şöyle güle beleseler seni illa o vatanın. İlla bura annanenin. Ona göre. İlla o balkona oturmak bir seyretmek manzarayı. Çünkü çocukluğu şeyi burada geçti. Yılları burada geçti.

17. Bura burada durur. Ora orada durur. Fazla şey taşımayız. Yiyecek kısmını getiririz. Baktın ne eksikse ne ihtiyaç varsa onları getiririz... Bahçeden kaldırırsan bir şeyler götürüyorsun...Su götürürüz, götürüp isteyene dağıtırız.

18. Ankara beni çürüttü ya! Ankara'da gidecek yerin yok...Önceden evden işe işten eve. Ama emekli olduktan sonra insan bunalıma giriyor. Yani kendine göre bir iş bulmazsa, bir gayreti olmazsa bir yerde, bunalıma giriyor. Ben bunalıma girdim. Ve hasta oldum…Ben Ankara'da ben solunum sıkıntısı çekiyorum. Hap falan kullanıyorum. Ama buraya geldiğim zaman solunumdan şikayetim yok. Kalmıyor. Hapı falan atıyorum, kullanmıyorum. Çok rahat nefes alıyorum. Ama oraya gittiğim zaman nefes almakta zorlanıyorum...İşte köyün faydaları şeyleri böyle.

19. Suyu güzel, havası güzel. Dağlarda geziyorsun. Burada işte domates, biber dallarım var. Su salıyordum siz geldiğinizde. Sabah 6'da namazdan sonra geldim ben buraya...Hava temiz, kimseyle işim yok…Şehir sıcak...Bir de hep ben sıcak bölgelerde çalıştım Doğu'da. Burası iyi geliyor. Geliyoruz burada vakit geçiriyoruz işte.

20. Burada milletle uğraşmıyorum. Televizyon izlemiyorum, haber izlemiyorum, o adamları dinlemiyorum hiç...bir de burada geçim kolay...Ne bulursan onu yersin. Marketçi gelirse ya da Çubuk'a gidersen alırsın. Ankara'da öyle değil. Çarşıya çık, et

gör, et canın çekiyor, bal gör, bal canın çekiyor...Burada masrafımda az oluyor… ...şehirde her şeyi görüp alabilirsin, gücün yetebilir yetmeyebilir. Yetmediği zaman mağdur olursun. Ama burada öyle değil. Haftada birkaç kere market geliyor. Market dediğim bir araba, kapalı araba. Ekmek satıyor, domates biber, marketlerde ne varsa hepsi var. Buzdolabı var et satıyor, dondurma satıyor.

21. burası mahrumiyet bölgesi tabii…Şurada canın bir dondurma istese yok. Çubuk'tan alayım geleyim dedim. Gelinceye kadar eriyecek…Evet tabii ben çok severim. Ben Ankara'da mesela cüzdanı alıp hemen hop dışarı çıkıvermem lazım. Her şeyin olsun. Mutlaka bir şey alır da gelirdim. Burada para biriktiriyorsun işte. O yönden şanslısın. Harcayamıyorsun. Ancak market gelince…Burada yani ihtiyacını görüyorsun ama fazla bir şey harcayamıyorsun en azından. Çıkıp bir şey alamadığına göre. Orada her şeyin olsa. Şöyle bir çıkıyor. Aaa şunu da alayım. Ama gözüme dün Çubuk'a indim geldim. Allah'ım sobacıların oradan geçiyorum. Bir mangal. Mangalım yok mu? Var. Ama bu da daha değişik geldi. Evet dedim şu mangalı da alayım da gideyim ya…Temelli çatlar ölürüm ben burada ya. Bak dün hemen bir çubuğa gittim geldim kendimi bir dışarı attım. Eşime dedim ki vallahi gel bir de dışarıda söylemesi ayıp bir karnımızı doyuralım. Ben çünkü alışkınım öyle şeylere. Eşim maaşını alsın, ben maaşımı alayım. Mutlaka bir dışarıda yemeğimizi yeriz. Torunları bir alır götürürüm. Onun için torunlar beni daha çok sever…Şehir hayatı sevilmez mi? Orada büyümüşüz. Orada şey ettik. Oraya alıştık çünkü. Buraya devamlı nereden olacak. Devamlı burada insan çatlar ölür ya.

22. Çok güzel bir köydü bura, kimse kalmayıverince sonradan, güzel Allah'ım, bu sefer de kar yağmadı, su olmadı. O bizim şu çoraklar, buralar cennet gibiydi yavrum, şu halının desenini görüyorsun ya, bu Karaçam halının deseni gibi her taraf çiçekti. Allah'ın vergisi meyvelerle, senin benim ettiğim meyvelerle, o bahçeler öyle güzel.

Şu etraf köyden, Kuzuören'den Evci'den, etraf köyden en güzeli buraydı. Kuytuda, güneşe karşı ya bir de insan da az. Ektiği tarlalar, tabanlar, otlar, oraklar, gidip de kasabadan bir tane ot orak gelmezdi, saman gelmezdi. Bura yeterdi. Herkesin kaldırdığı yeterdi.

23. Tarım bitti yeğenim tarım bitti. Burada zaten bir yarıma iki yarım üç yarımı zor kaldırıyordun. Bire iki üç, buranın verimi yoktu Karaçam'ın. Karaçam olsa da toprak, yani şurada yani emeğini kurutmuyordu. Çıkarıyorlardı 5-10 kağnıyla sap, kaldırıyordun 10 yarım ekini, zor alıyordun on beş yarım ekini. Ondan emeğini kurutmuyordu yani şimdi onları herkes, gençler gitti işe girdi. Kendine göre emeklisi var. Sigortası var. E burada ne yapacak adam? Ekse zaten emeğini kurutmuyor. Şimdi malcılık yapıyor çoğu. Adam olan mal besi diyor.

24. Otuz beş kırka yakın var buzağılarıyla beraber. İşte onun etinden yağından yoğurdundan faydalanıyoruz. Aynı zamanda yani satmak için değil de onun yiyeceğini karşılamak için rençperlik yapıyoruz. Anca onun yiyeceğini karşılayabiliyoruz biz. Bu sene yetmeyebilir yani bu sene alabiliriz…Rençper emeğini saymaz. Bizde böyle bir deyim vardır, böyle bir söz vardır. Çok mantıklı bir sözdür. Yani emeğini sayarsan yaptığın işten zarar ediyorsun demektir. Saymazsan kafa kafaya çıkıyorsun demektir. Ne kar ne zarar.

25. Ayrılan'da biri varmış, adamın bir keçisi varmış. Yağ alır satarmış bundan elli sene önce pazarda ya da eşine dostuna. Biri sormuş ne yaptın demiş? Kar zarar ne demiş? Kendi yağını saymazsan ne kar var ne zarar var demiş. Adam kendi yağını da satmış zararı kurtarmış.

26. Ben köy işini pek şey edemedim yani bu rençperlik işini pek anlıyor şey edemedim. O kadar da şeyimiz yoktu eskiden motor olacaktı. Öküz olacaktı. Öküzümüz yoktu. Motorumuz yoktu. Elin yapacağı işle… Yeri olacak, öküze sürükleyeceksin. Eskiden

öküzü koşardın. Onun için illerden bitecek işle pek şey olmuyordu. Çok şükür öyle bir iş oldu. Ankara'ya gittik işte öyle.

27. Ayten: Malı yayılıyor seninkine

Ömer: Onların pek şeyi olmuyor bazı. Köyde yaşayanların mal sahiplerinin

E: Ha siz yokken sizin olan yere bırakıyorlardı

Ayten: tabi canım, ben şimdi bir yere çeviriyorum. Güzel bahçe yapıyorum. Onun malı giremiyor yayılamıyor. Onun için bazılarının gönülleri olmuyor bazı şeylerde.

E: E peki yani bahçeler çevrildiği zaman yetecek kadar ot olmuyor mu?

Ömer: Var ot çok. Eskiden bizim köyümüzde üç bin davar olurdu. Dört, üç dört yüz sığır olurdu. Öküz, affedersin öküzü ayrı olurdu. Kömüşü ayrı olurdu.

Ayten: Buzağı ayrı olurdu

Ömer: Ayrı ayrı güderlerdi. Onlara yetiyordu. Şimdi yüz mal yok hocam. İnanın sekizinci ay çıksın ki bu ay çıksın başlarlar şu bahçelere. Elmalara. Bu elmaları niye zor alırız gayri, götürürler hemen bahçelere sürerler.

Ayten: Salarlar

Ömer: Eskiden bir tane on birinci ay, on iki ay olmayınca bahçelere mal koymazlardı.

E: Neden yani?

Ömer: E ağaçları yiyor

E: Uzağa sürmüyorlar mı?

Ömer: Ya uzağa sürüyorlar, götürmek şey olmuyor. Buralar daha kolay geliyor şimdi. Kimse yok. Sahibi yoktu şimdiye kadar. Sahiplendiğin zaman da onların gönlü olmuyorlar. Bunlar geliyor bizim rahatımızı bozdu diyorlar çoğu. Duyuyoruz da yani.

E: Böyle bir söylenti oluyor yani.

Ömer: Oluyor oluyor.

Ayten: İşine gelmiyor ki adamın

Ömer: Bunların işine gelmiyor. Şimdi geri dönenler telle çeviriyor hocam gibi böyle bahçesini. Malı giremiyor. Sığırı giremiyor. Kimse giremiyor.

E: Önceden o da yoktu pek değil mi? Hani bahçeni evini çevirmek?

Ömer: Önceden hiç barı ne hiçbir şeyi yoktu. Her taraf ekin ekmekti. Ekin ekerlerdi. Fii ekerlerdi. Her tarafta davar. Affedersin davarı şu kadar yerden geçirirlerdi, malı böyle, öbür tarafa geçirmek için, iki tarafa gelirlerdi, bunlara zarar vermesin, tarlaya zarar vermesin diye ama şimdi öyle yok sal sal buradan teeeee şeye kadar boş. Ekin eken yok o kadar. İşte birkaç kişi ekiyor bunlar. Buralara ekiyorlar.

28. Zafer: Karaçam'da değirmenin arazisine indik inmesi zor bir yere indim üçgülü biliyorsun değil mi, üçgül şöyle kalkmış

Ali: Evet öyledir öyle

Zafer: yemyeşil. Ondan sonra Aydoğan'ın altında bizim çamurcuk dediğimiz mezarlığın öbür tarafında bir yer var böyle geziyordum zor gezdim de yemin ediyorum öyle bir ot var ki yemyeşil

Ali: her yer öyle abi her yer bu sene yaylım otu çok

29. Taha: Ora ekin ney ektiklerini bilirim ben.

Oya: Evet.

Taha: Orada bir tane ağaç yoktu.

Oya: Aynı kuskuru tarlaydı

E: Peki nasıl ormanlaştı?

Oya: Bakılmayı bakılmayı gelmeye gelmeye gidilmedikçe

Taha: Şeyler kozalaklar yuvarlandıkça

Oya: Evet. E şu yolun kenarı ben gelin geldiğimde ne, tarla oraya ekilirdi, biçilirdi.

E: Köyün iç tarafının yani bizim evin arka tarafı da orman ya şimdi. Orası hep orman mıydı?

Oya: Ora koru olarak hemen hemen çalıdan başka bir şey yoktu.

Taha: Çam yoktu ya yani, koru diye geçerdi de

30. Eskisi gibi değil bura da. Ayı da var, canavar var. Ne diyeyim sana domuz var onun korkusunda, dışarıda yatar gezerdi mallar eskiden. Korku yoktu. Böyle orman yoktu. O şimdi o bir dana kayboluversin çıldırır herkes.

31. Ömer: Tatil için gelmiyoruz Elif.

E: Burada çalışmaya geliyorsunuz

Ömer: Çalışmaya geliyoruz babamıza. Babamıza onun işini yapmaya geliyorduk.

Ayten: Tatili nerede gördük

E: Bir yandan bakanlıkta çalışırken bir yandan buraya çalışmaya geliyorsunuz

Ömer: İzne ayrılırız, vişnesini toplarız, o ekin ekerdi onu toplayıverir getiriveririz, deste şey ederiz, harmanını koyuveririz, samanını koyuyoruz. Ondan sonra giderdik. Ama yine de hafta sonları böyle iznimiz oldukları zaman gelir ziyaret ederdik. Hiç bırakmadık zaten.

32. Ben Ankara'da rahatsızlanıyorum. Neden rahatsızlanıyorum? Çünkü ben orada bunalıma giriyorum. Bir işim gücüm yok. Bunalıma giriyorum. Bunalıma girdiğim zaman da hasta oluyorum. Ama oradan buraya geldiğim zaman burada çok canlarım, çok yani şeyim yani dinç oluyorum burada, havasından suyundan şundan buradan falan filan dinç oluyorum yani burada köy yerinde

33. Sabah uyanıp, çalışmayla bahçeyle geçiyor. Ormanlara gidiyorum, geziyorum, tozuyorum. Mantar arıyorum, şunu arıyorum bunu arıyorum falan filan. Bazen bahçeyle uğraşıyorum. Yani ormanda gezmek bile beni rahatlatıyor. O çamın hışıltısı beni rahatlatıyor. Anlatabiliyor muyum? ... Ben burada mesela Ankara'da ben

solunum sıkıntısı çekiyorum. Hap falan kullanıyorum. Ama buraya geldiğim zaman bu solunumdan şikayetim yok. Kalmıyor. Hapı falan atıyorum, kullanmıyorum. Çok rahat nefes alıyorum. Ama oraya gittiğim zaman solunum nefes almakta zorlanıyorum. Anlatabiliyor muyum? İşte köyün şeyleri böyle. Faydaları böyle. İnsan sağlığı açısından var ya köyün havası faydalı böyle.

34. Yok burada olmuyor benim sıkıldığım... Şehirde oluyor. Geçen sene gittim mesela soğuklarda, pandemiden dolayı, bu yasaklardan dolayı gelemedim ya, e orada dışarı çıkamıyorum. Oradaki evimiz sekizinci kat. Mesela buranın balkonundan da büyük. Otuz otuz iki metre balkonum var. Ankara manzaralı bir de. Şentepe'de, o tarafı biliyorsundur. Ostim, Demet, Batıkent, Eryaman...Ankara'nın üçte ikisini görüyorsun yani. Ta öyle yani. Evim de çok güzel, yüz altmış metrekare ev. Balkonun da önü açık. Daha bir şey yok. Orada da çok ama şimdi bana diyor ki balkonda oturuyorsun daha ne diyor. Ya balkonda otur kaç saat otursun rahat edersin bir de güneş vuruyor yani. Ama bura öyle değil. Şurada oturmak benim için çok büyük bir nimet. Balkonda oturuyorum. Sabah söylemesi gibi ayaklarım balkonun köşesine koyuyorum. Çayımı da yanıma alıyorum. Benim için artık yani onun bir fiyatı yok yani.

35. Tabii yani. Şimdi burada oturuyorum. Akşam çayını içiyorum mesela. Şuraya bakıyorum, yaptığım işe bakıyorum. O kadar yorulduğum halde kalkıyorum, gene çalışıyorum. Hani ben zaten köyü seviyordum yani. Daha önceden de seviyordum köyü. Ben buralara geldim, dağlara giderdim, otları, kekikleri koklardım böyle yani. Böyle köyü seviyordum ben ya. Allah nasip etti de geldik yani. Yani gerçekten böyle bir evi hayal etmiştim yani. Yani keşke bir evim olsa şöyle büyük değilse de ufak bir şey olsa da şöyle bir önde bir ağaç. Ağacın dibinde bir masa atalım ya ölürsün buna da dedim yani. Dün de hatta dün çay içerken ha burada dedim ki ya, şöyle bir dedim

oturup da dedim şey yapmayı hayal etmiştim dedim, doğayı ben çok seviyorum yani, ben böyle bir hiçbir şeye de zarar vermek, içimden gelmez yani böyle. Ne bileyim börtü böceğe veyahut da ağaca herhangi bir şekilde bunları çok severim yani. O bakımdan köy belki şimdi köyde mesela namaza gidip geliyorum bir işte. Ondan sonra buradayım. Ya çok sıkıldım, bir arkadaş gelse de konuşsak diye bir şeyim olmuyor yani.

36. Sekize falan kalkarım. Sağ olsun hanım da işte kahvaltıyı hazırlar. Sekiz buçuk dokuz buçuk gibi kahvaltımızı yaparız. Ondan sonra ben hemen ne yaparım? Namazımızı falan kılalım. Ondan sonra doğru ben arılarımın yanına giderim. Arılarım yanında bu iki ay en azından sabah dokuz akşam beşte gelirim. Oğul mevsimi olur. Arılara vakit onlarla ilgilenirim. Mesela şimdi siz geldiniz ben hemen arıların bakımından geldim dokuzdan beri. Hemen bir namazımı kıldım. Hemen şimdi arıların yanına döneceğim. Beşe kadar oradayım. Bugün düğün var. Dörtte bırakacağım ama aklımda burada olacak. Niye? Oğul mevsimi var…Onların bakım bakımını yapmak zorundayım. Çıtasıydı mumuydu hangi arı görevi yapıyor? Hangi arı görev yapmıyor? Çocuk gibi takip etmek zorundasın.

37. Tabii az çok bilebiliyorum. Bayağı zamandır babam yapardı ama şimdi babamın bakımıyla bizim bakımımız çok farklı yani…İşte o da öyle bakmış yani. Çok farklı bakımdan...Tabii babam olduğu için gidip gelirken o benim yaklaşmazsam gel buraya şunu tut diyordu. Atandır, bakmak zorundasın. Getirmek zorundasın...Oradan biraz daha düzen olunca babamda, 2007 yılında rahmetli oldu babam, düzenli olunca bakmak zorunda kaldık. İşte şimdi onlarla oyalanıyorum. Mesela dallar var mesela. Onları sürdürüyorum. Diplerini kazıyorum. İlacını veriyorum. Boş yok. Hep meşguliyet. Kendine göre bir iş bulursun. Zaten burada boş olursan, vakit geçiremezsin ya. Ben geçiremem şahsen. Ama adam alışmıştır artık, gücü

yetmiyordur ona saygı duyarım. Hamdolsun benim de gücüm yetiyor şimdi. Koşturabiliyorum her şeyi.

38. Sakın dedim. Bak evin anahtarını onlara verirsek ben bir daha buraya gelmem dedim. Ha ben varken gelsin gitsinler. Ama ben yokken dedim anahtarı verip de onlar kalmasın. Çünkü benim görümcelerim başkaları gibi değil öyle hiç. Bana yardımcı olan bir tipten değil. Hiç. Ha yüzüme gülerler.

39. Kayınlarımın evleri vardı. Benimki burayı yıktı ya. Bizim ev yok. Kayınlarımın anahtarını sorardık. Sana bana hep kim anahtar verirse onun evine gelirdik. Yiyeceğimizi ne içeceğimizi ötemizle berimizle orada sabahlardık. O evde pişiriyoruz, yiyoruz, içeriz, yatarız. Erken kalktığımızda bile çayın kıyılarına. Çayın kıyılarında ne yapacaksak orada akşama kadar otururuz pikniğimizi mi yaparız, gezer tozarız dalların dibinde. Allah'a ısmarladık Gölbaşı…Böyle kaç senedir böyle gelip gidiyorduk. Yani anahtar istemekten bıktı bizim bu. Anne dedi bir daha anahtar istemeyeceğim. Ne oldu? ... Ben dedi orada bir ev yapacağım…Gene bununla ikimiz. Kaynımın evine indik geldik. Kaynımdan anahtar istedik. Hı mı dedi gelin ama dedim ev yapacağız canına sefa oldu. Hah ev yapacak ya, evi bizden kurtaracak

40. Tabii canım zaten kanunen bir insanın kaç tane çocuğu varsa o hak sahibi. Ama orada birisi oturur orada on kişi de oturamaz ki yani. Zaten iki odalık bir eskiden kalma bir şey var. Ha şimdi oranın nerede hakkın var? Her şeyinde hakkın var. Onların üstünde yeni yapmadı. Tabanından hakkın var ama şimdi burada benim hakkım var diye oraya ne diyebileceksin ki? Şimdi sen oraya çık, benim buraya geleceğim diyemezsin. Çünkü senin kadar onun da hakkı var. Ama çok geniş bir yer olur, gidersin bir yerine bir köşesine yaparsın o ayrı bir şey. Niye? Sen oraya yapmışsın... Ha şöyle bir şey var. Orası eskiden beri ortak kullanımda olsaydı, anahtar herkes olsaydı olurdu. O zaman dersin ki ya sen bir hafta gelip kalacağım

oradan. Bir haftalığına bana bırak. Hani bu yazlıklar var ya şeyler onun gibi. Böyle ama öyle bir şey de olmaz zaten.

41. Ben burayı vermem. Ben öyle bu kadar yerim bile yoktu, ben kendim yaptırdım eşimle. İkimiz yaptık. Buraya bir oda ekledi, önce kullanılmış bir döşek bile yoktu eskiden…Yani her biri çıkabilir sözde kaynata yaptı ya…Ben de olmaz diyorum, benim de dört tane çocuğum var…Babam dedi saati oğlum üstüne al, ben sebep oldum köyde durdurmana, kimse almaya kalkamaz diyor. Ama köydeki evi, kızlar da hepsi de alabilir. Anahtarları var alma diyemem…Paylaşılır tabi, alma diyemezsin orası tapulu, babalarının evi ama burası tapulu değil alamazlar.

42. Şimdi biz bakıyoruz. Adamları bulamıyoruz. Adamları biliyoruz kardeşim diyoruz yani verin, eğer buradan sizin bizden alacağınız mı? Yok. Biz biliyoruz Celal seni burada, parasını ödendiğini biz biliyoruz ama aradan zaman geçti, öbürü gitti öbürü gitti öbürü gitti öbürü gitti bulamıyorum, diyorum birine parasını vereyim metre paralarını toplayım bunların. Bir yanı Esenboğa'da, bir yanı İstanbul'da, bir yanı bilmem nerede bir yanı bilmem nerede. Adam zamanında terk etmiş gitmiş orayı…E şimdi ben bulamıyorum. Artık bulamadığım için de ben de vazgeçtim. Zaten benim ömrüm de kafi gelmez. Artık bizim Enes ney mi bakar kim bakar bilemiyorum.

43. Burası Saray gibi olsa Ali de hakkını alır ben de alırım baban da de alır amcan da alır…değersiz olduğu için kimse talep etmiyor...Aydoğan'da, Karaçam'da, bizim köyde arazi para etse, herkes hakkını alır. Para etmediğinden kimse bir şey talep etmiyor...İki üç tarla var, onların değeri biçilmez. Onlar da muhtarın tarla, bizim tarla, Yunus Ağa'nın tarla. Köye yakınlar. Yani tek tapu olsa her işini yapabilirsin, yani ahır yapabilirsin, ev yapabilirsin...değerlendirebilirsin yani...Yani değeri biçilmez ama Aydoğan'da da burada da anamdan bana ne düşecek? Ha Altınova gibi olsa, bir dönüme beş-altı yüz milyar, bir trilyon para ödeniyor.

44. Görümcemle daha çok eşim duruyordu. Ben çocuklara baktığım için çok gelemiyordum. Geldiğim zaman bir de baktım görümcemin oğlu ve gelini de geldi. Öyle olunca ben geri gittim…Aynı evin içinde başka erkeklerle olmuyor. Celal yine kaldı ama ben gittim…yatma düzenin rahat olmuyor, açık yatarsın, derli toplu olmazsın...

45. Benim ortağım var. Ablam var, Neriman var, Ziya rahmetlinin karısı ve çocukları var. Ben oraya o evi yapmışım, buraya bu evi yapmışım. Buraya bahçe yapmışım. Hiçbir şey benim değil diyorum. Siz gelip kullanabilirsiniz…Ablamgil her sene bir ay iki ay duruyorlar hiçbir şeyleri yok. Her şey bana ait kullanıyorlar. Elektrik gelmiş, doğalgaz gelmiş, tüp kalmış, televizyon bozulmuş, güneş enerjisi almışım…Ver para siz de kullanıyorsunuz yok. Böyle benim ortaklarım var. Benim ortaklarımın bana diyecek bir lafı yok. Tamam mı? Her şey Cemil Ağa'dan. Geleceksin, oturacaksın, yaşayacaksın…Burayı sıfırdan yaptık da arazi dedelerimizden kalma…Anlaşma yok. Dediğim gibi her şeyini ben ayarlamışım herkes gelip kalabilir, şey gibi burası beleş misafirhane. Pansiyon gibi. Sadece gelenler yiyeceğini getiriyorlar. Eksik de getirebilirler. Gerisini burada tamamlarlar... Tabi ben burada bekliyorum onlar geliyor hampaya konuyorlar gidiyorlar.

46. Biz 7 kardeşiz, en ufakları benim. Şu evde şimdi ben duruyorum. Misal yarın babam vefat ettiği zaman ikisi gelip diyor ki ben bu tarafa böleceğim...kavga buradan başlıyor. Ortada bir yanlış, cahillik var, başka bir şey yok. Burası senin de babanın malı, onun da babasının malı, o da hissesini alacak. Sen topraktan aldın eve girdin diye arada küslük. Bu köyde çoğu kırgınlıklar bundan. Baba malı. Başka bir şey yok…Şimdi Zafer amca köye geliyor, Karaçam'da babasının evi var, kardeşi diyor ki seni köye koymam. Kardeşi yıllardır köyde duruyor, Ankara'ya gitmemiş, emek vermiş, köyde kalmış. Ben babamın yerinden sana ev yeri vermem diyor veya tarla

vermem diyor. Zafer Amca da diyor ki kardeşim ben de bu evin evladıyım, bana bir yer göster, bahçe yapayım, ev yapayım, çoluğum çocuğum gelsin...Vermem diyor, kavga buradan başlıyor. Eyüp Hoca'nın çocuklar bu şekilde kavgayı başlattılar...İşte bu köydeki kavgalar hep temeli bundan başlıyor. Yanlış insanlarız cahil insanlarız. Bir okumadık, kültürümüz zayıf.

47. Kardeşim felç geçirdi…vefat etti altı ay sonra…hani bir laf var sözde şey olmasın, öküz öldü ortakçılık bozuldu derler ya…gelin filan çok şey yapmadı. Ben annemi yanıma aldım. Bırakmadım.

48. [oğlum] ne olursa olsun bu sene bu dallar dikilecek, ölümse ölüm kalımsa kalım…üleşilecek bura dedi. Bitişiğimizde en büyüğümüz amcamız var. Onu Çubuk'taki eve çağırdık…[amcası] toplanalım, benim babamdan, sizin babanızdan kalanları üleşelim dedi…Halalarımızı, amcalarımızı aradık. Rahmetli olanların çocuklarını aradık…köyde pikniğe çağırdık, bütün masrafları da biz çekiyoruz…Bizim Karaçam Köyü'nde dedemiz adına kayıtlı yirmi üç parça yerimiz var…Bunların üç parçasının yerini bilmiyoruz, hiç gidip görmedik…rahmetli amcam köydeydi, amca dedik bunlar nerelerde…Tek tek amcamla, halalarım ve ölen amcalarımın çocuklarıyla beraber araziyi, yirmi üç parça yeri tamamen gezdik. Dedik ki biz bunu nasıl üleşeceğiz? …Yedi kişi…Önce babalarımız adına, halalarının adına üleşilecek. Sonra biz üleşeceğiz…Tapu dairesine gittik, müdür dedi ki "siz bu şekilde ne tapu alabilirsiniz ne de üleşebilirsiniz, siz rıza-yı taksim yapacaksınız, masrafı da az olur…Tarlanın birini komple birine çıkacaksınız. Birini birine çıkacaksınız. Birini birine… yediye böleceksiniz. Metresi büyük olanın yanına tek vereceksiniz, küçüğün yanına iki tane vereceksiniz. O şekilde dağıtacaksınız"… bir pazar günü yine geldik buraya. Arpalık dediğimiz yeri beş kişiye ev yeri olarak böldük. İki ev yeri de köyün içinde var, yedi etti. Diğerlerinde de tek olanlar var

bölünenler var... O şekilde taksim yaptık…Yediye kadar numaralandırdık şapkaya attık [bütün parçaları yedi gruba ayırdılar]…Herkes numarasını çekti, yazdık…Bu şekilde üleştik, rızayı taksim olarak da tapu dairesine bildirdik. Sadece tapuyu alamadık. Rahmetli amcamın çocuklarından biri Hollanda'da yaşıyor…kendisini bulamadık. Konsolosluk'tan yazı yazdırdık…Hollanda onu bulup da bize vekaletini gönderemedi. Kendisi de gelmiyor…o şekilde sadece rızayı taksim yaptık kendi aramızda…[Tapu olmayınca] yarın benim çocuk buna itiraz ediyorum dediği an hepsi bozulur. Yani resmi bir şey yok

49. İmece usulü suyu getiriyorlar. İmece usulü suyu getirmişler buraya 8 km kazmışlar getirmişler. Sistem değişmiş, belediye gelmiş su saati bağlıyorlar. Sen getirmedin ki bu suyu, biz dağdan getirdik. Sen hiçbir şey yapmadın. Boru bile döşemedin, boruyu millet döşedi. Diyeceğim, bir buraya çöpçü geliyor. Her pazartesi günü bir çöp arabası geliyor, mahalle olmuş ya burası. Çöpleri toplayıp gidiyor, onun haricinde bir şey yok

50. Tabi genelde ben kalıyorum. Dedikleri şu, orada bir açık kapımız olsun, bugün cenazeye geldiğim zaman, düğüne geldiğim zaman, bir mezarlıklara geldiğimiz zaman en azından bir açık kapımız olsun. Geliriz en azından bir bardak çay içeriz. En azından bir sohbet ederiz. Bu amaçla onlar da bu yönünden bizim burada oluşumuza seviniyorlar yani. Memnun kalıyorlar. Köy tabir ederek, köy içinde kalmıyoruz en azından derler. Yerimiz var. E öyle de oluyor. Cenazeye geliyor adam. Mesela sıcak geliyoruz bir sobamız yanmış oluyor, kış günü geliyor vatandaş girebiliyor yani, oturabiliyor evim diye rahatlıkla

51. ben burada olmasaydım bu ev bu hale gelmezdi. Osman Abi vardı buradan gitti…20 sene bu köye adım atmadı. Ev virane oldu, yıkıldı gidiyor. Geçen sene 50-60 milyar para harcadı. Şimdi de oturuyor, gitmiyor. Köyde oturmadığın ev iki yılda

çöker…Ben olmasam onlar buraya gelemezler…Kaç tane burada öyle yıkılan ev var. Bir tane değil bir sürü ev var yıkılan. Oturmadığın zaman çöküyor.

52. biraz haksızlık oluyor o konuda…Sen yıllarını buraya veriyorsun. O evde oturmazsan, o eve bakmazsan, yıkığını çıkığını onarmazsan, o ev zaten yıkılır…Çünkü oturulmayan yerleri görüyoruz biz. Harabe oluyor, yıkılıyor. İlgileniyorsun her şeyiyle, çıkıp geliyor birileri diyor ki burası benim babamın sen çık veya diyor ki bir odasını bana ver ben oturacağım. E ister istemez veriyorsun da…yer olsa o da yapacak dışarıya da o da yapamıyor.

53. Birininki birse iki olmasını istemeyen dolu, ben de yardım edeyim iki olsun diyen yok … anam rahmetlik derdi ki "buraya hakim, savcı geldi dedi ki, bu köy on ikisiyse on üç olmaz, bu köyde gıybetçilik, hasetçilik var"

54. Orta Asya'dan insanlar bu tarafa doğru gelirken birtakım kavimlere ayrılmışlar, yani yer belirlemek için. İşte şurada Kuzuören köy var. Onun arkasında Dereköy var. Onun yanında Evci var. Elveren, Aydoğan, Uluağaç, Karaçam. Buraya gelmişler. Demişler ki ya bu koru, bu konum, bu köy güzel. Buraya konalım demişler. İçlerinden birisi demiş ki, ya bura iyi de demiş, fakat demiş burada beşken üç olmaz, üçken beş olmaz demiş. Birisi demiş ki bu ne demek oluyor. Öteki de biliyor musun demiş, bu köyde dedikoducu olur, burada millet birbirini istemez, çekemezlik olur demiş. Yani doğru düşünmezler demiş adam. Öteki de yok ya öyle şey olur mu demiş. Olur olmaz derken en sonunda buraya yerleşmişler.

55. Hakikaten o eski adamlar biliyorlar…Bu köyün adamı böyle dönek. Konuşacak adam yok. Sözüne sadık adam yok. Anlatabiliyor muyum? Bir muhtar var İsmet. Bir onu bilirim ben. Onun dışında sadık adamı ben görmüyorum. Onun için ben onların yanına da gitmek istemiyorum. Çünkü adamlar dedikoducu. Yani senin bir malın iki olmasını istemeyen insanlar var burada

56. …mesela şurada Uluağaç köyü var, şimdi sen Uluağaç köyünde, sen adama bir haksızlık yapmış olsan adam sana söylemeden gidip seni mahkemeye veriyor. Halen devam eder böyle. Ama bizim köyde bu yok. Bizim köyde bu yok. O köylerde var. Mesela Aydoğan barbarca. Adamlar bar barına iş yürütüyorlar. Yani onlar da sözlerine sadık değiller... Ama her köylerde var mı, her köylerde olduğunu düşünüyorum. Bu köylerde var yani…

57. Ta eskiden dedikoduyu pek severlerdi, aslı olsun olmasın. Hemen oturur senin lafını ederlerdi... Bura belki de ondan da ilerlemedi...Lakap takarlardı, dedikodu yaparlardı, iftira atarlardı. Ben bu köyü sevmem yani. Şimdiki halini severim. O insanların zamanını sevmem. Çünkü dedikoduları çok olurdu.

58. en az beş on sene önceden bu tarafa çok değişti. Kimse kimsenin yanına gelmiyor. Yani herkes şuraya bir çay demleyip de çay da içelim desen adam gelmiyor buraya… önce sayılı kişilerde araba vardı. Şimdi herkesin arabası var. Parası da var. Şimdi kimse kimseye hiç müdahale etmiyor vallahi…İhtiyacı kalmadı, insanların birbirine ihtiyacı kalmadığı için onun için kimse kimsenin yanına gelmiyor. Ben bunu biliyorum başka bir şey tanımıyorum…Herkes eşi dostu olursa ancak geliyor beraber arkalı önlü, ondan sonra yiyip içip gidiyor. Köy çok değişti yani. Köyde insanlar çok değişti, köy değişmedi de insanlar çok değişti.

59. O, bu büyükler gidince küçükler de kasabaya gidince yavrum, karışan kimse kalmıyor…Önce bu öyle benim geldiğimde önce böyle kalabalıktı. Davarın sığırı herkes burada. Kasaba diye bir şey bilen yoktu…Şükrü dayının delini öldü, oğlu öldü, Çakır Ağa öldü bak bir evden. Diyorum ya her ev sıkım sıkım doluydu. Hep onlar gidince büyükler, ne kaldı? Ufak tefek kişiler kaldı. Onlar da kasabaya gidiverdi. Şimdi yeni yeni bir iki kişi geliyor.

60. Biraz da şuna kanaat ediyorum. Ben mesela o zaman bir kişiydim. Şimdi benim Allah'ım verdi, beş tane çocuğum var, beş tane çocuğun kendisine göre bir çevresi oldu. Dünürlerim oldu…Biraz daha ben ortamda çevrenin genişlediğini hissediyorum…Tanıdık olduğum çevre genişlediği için yabancıya biraz yer düşmüyor ya... Şimdi alo, tamam. Alo, tamam. Yani anca aloyla işi bitiriyoruz.

61. Şimdi burada şöyle, eskiden hep öyleydi. Mesela sizin bir işiniz var ya. Köyde kaç kişi var genç böyle yapabilecek? Hepsini toplarlardı. Senin o işini o gün yaparlar. Öyle bir dayanışma. Mesela gücü yetmeyene yardım ederler. Sütünü, yoğurdunu, ondan sonra her şeyini yani köyün şeyi daha iyi dayanışması böyle birbirine şey olarak. Ve Ankara'da kimse kimseye güvenemiyor yani. Güveniyor mu? Güvenmiyor. Tanıdığın olmadıktan sonra. Kimseyle şey yapamıyorsun yani…

62. [bu köyden] 5 bin kişi falan Ankara'da ve Çubuk'ta yaşıyor. Onlar bu köye hafta sonu tatile geliyorlar...Babalarının yerleri var, babalarının yerleri olmayanlar dağlarda pikniğe geliyorlar. Alışverişi de burada yapıyorlar... sen pazara mal getirmişsin ama ben seni tanımıyorum, senin peynirini almam. Temiz kadın mısın? Ama burada birebir tanıyor da alıyor yani…Seni tanıyan 10 kişi senden alıyor, onu tanıyan 10 kişi ondan alıyor. O mu kaliteli bu mu kaliteli öyle bişey yok. Bizim buradaki hayvanların otu aynı, teknik aynı. Peynir de aynı yağ da aynı. Sadece bunu yapan kadınların temziliği farklı olur.

63. Burası daha tutkun…Şimdi Çatak, Aydoğan bir sipariş yollayacaksın ya kaçıyorlar birbirinden. Birinin motoruna bineceksin ya, kaçıyorlar birbirilerinde…Çatak da öyle. Onlarda tutkunluk yok. Burası tutkun bak. Bu köy çok tutkun oluyor. Kim kimsenin arabasına binerken danışmazlar binerler.

64. Faik: Ben [tarlasını] Elörenlilere sattım…Elören, Aydoğan bizim köylümüz sayılır yani…O adamın alakası yok. Burayı tanırız, orayı tanımayız. O adamlar Kürt. O adamların yapısı, ne olduğu meçhul. Doğulu ama PKKlı mı?

E: Peki diğer köylerden insanlara kefil olur musunuz yani?

Faik: Olmaz olur muyum ya. Köylüm, köküm, her tarafım. Ne olacak?

E: E herkes hasetlik diyordunuz, Cemal Ağa'ya dokuz buçuk ay hapis yatırmışlar. Onlar da köylüleriniz.

Faik: İşte ama o da haddini fazla geçmiş.

65. Bizim sülaleye Karabacaklar derler, Çimenler derler, Cingözler derler, Mollalar derler. Böyle herkesin bir lakabı var. Bizim bu Karabacak'ın kökeni Erzurum Horasan'dan. Özbekistan'dan Erzurum Horasan'a yerleşiyorlar. Erzurum Horasan'da bu insanlar eskiye göre çok vahşi insanlarmış, orada bir olay işliyorlar. Bunlar yedi kardeşmiş, üçü Erzurum Horasan'dan kaçıyor, Çerkes'in Hacıbey köyüne yerleşiyorlar…Bu köyde padişahlık zamanında tarla tapan, yer üleşme, eskiden böyle tapu mapu yok. Kendi gücünle neyi zapt edebiliyorsan orası senin. Adamlar Çerkes'te birkaç adam buluyorlar ve kaçmaya başlıyorlar. Padişahın askerleri, şimdi asker diyoruz ama o zaman muhafız, muhafızlar bunların peşine düşüyor. Bunlar ormana girerken bir çoban kadın davar güdüyormuş, bunların da kaçanların da çorapları siyah, tiftik çorap, dizlerine kadar çorap çekili, onlara tek şiş çorap derler, şimdi o çorapları örecek insan da yok…Muhafızlar diyor ki kadına, buradan üç kişi geçti mi? Gördüm diyor üç tane kara çoraplı geçti diyor. Karabacak ismini bizim sülale oradan alıyor…Bunu ebem rahmetli anlattı. Oradan kaçıyorlar biri bu köye yerleşiyor, biri Polatlı tarafına yerleşiyor, biri de Kalecik tarafına yerleşiyor. Bizim Kalecik'te de var bu Karabacakların kökünden…Ve bu Karabacak Hoca dediğimiz adam çok ünlü bir adammış. Adam sonra büyümüş. Benim bu havalede tırpanım

çıkacağını bilseydim bu köyden Yağcı'ya kadar kimseye bir karış yer vermezdim demiş…Padişah bunu davet ediyor. Bu Karabacak Hoca çok namlı bir adam. Şimdi nasıl namlı bir adam, diyelim şimdi Türkiye'nin başında kim var Cumhurbaşkanı Tayyip Erdoğan var, o zaman da bu Karabacak Hoca'yı Ankara, Çubuk'tur, Akyurt'tur, Kalecik'tir, Bağla, Güdül hepsi tanıyor. Padişah diyor ki şu adamı davet edelim, bir gelsin bir görüşelim tanışalım. Dedem buradan Ankara'ya gidiyor... Karabacak Hoca 40 atlı gidiyor misafirliğe. Diyor ki biz bir savaşa girsek bana kaç asker verirsin, sana 10 bin asker veririm diyor Karabacak Hoca. Bu toprağın hepsi vatandaş, hani eskiden, Doğu'da hala var, bir ağanın 14 tane köyü var, o zamanda bu adam da öyleymiş…O Karabacak Hoca dediğim ne derse o oluyormuş. Bütün köyler bir insandan emir alıyormuş. İşte diyor bir yıl senin 5000 askerine yiyecek içecek veririm diyor. Padişah diyor ki yaverine, bunu zehirleyin, bu devlete baş kaldırır. Adamı Ankara'da öldürüyorlar, zehirliyorlar. Esas bizim Karabacak Hoca'yı Ankara'da öldürmüşler.

66. Milli Emlak'a başvurduk. Gittik. Milli Emlak dedi ki kiralama işi zor dedi. Satın alma işine bakın dedi. Kiralama işin zor olur dedi. Ne yapacağını şey yapacaksın ama dedi satın alma işine bakın dedi…Bu teknik bürolar var, getirdik biz onları, şurayı beğendik şu sırt var ya…orman sınırları buradan geçmediği için, orman sınırları belli değildi, şu anda belli mi bilmiyorum. Yani köyle ormanın arasında bir sınır yok burada, veyahut da köy arazisiyle, ormanlar arazisi diye bir şey yok, haritada bir sınır yok. Adam açtı baktı dedi ki buraların hepsi yeşil görünüyor. O zaman da bu kadar yeşil değildi. Ta 2006'da biz müracaat ettik. Neredeyse on dört sene. On beş sene. Buralar bu kadar yeşil değildi ama orada yeşil görünüyor…bir de şey olacak hazine olmayacak. Ham toprak olacak yani hali arazi diye geçiyor buralar...Ondan sonra ben dedim ki siz nereyi uygun görüyorsanız orayı verin dedim yani. Onlar da buraya

kaydırmışlar. Orman'dan kurtarmışlar…Bizim önerdiğimiz yeri kabul ediyor musunuz diye sordular. Biz de olsun dedik…Şimdi devlette bir yer alacağın zaman en az on kurumdan şey alıyorlar. Görüş alıyorlar. Askeriyeden soruyorlar. Burası sana lazım mı? Devlet Su İşleri'nin soruyorlar. Su havzasına yakın mı? Suyla ilgili problem var mı? Tarımdan soruyorlar sana yakın mı? Odalar Birliği'ne kadar sormuşlar. Burası size uygun mu? Sizlere yarar mı? Yoksa vermeyecekler yani. Devletin herhangi bir kurumuna buna uygun bir uygun bana razı mesela Devlet Su İşleri dese ki burası su havzasına yakın yer veyahut da benim için sakıncalıysa vermeyecekler. Askeriyeden sormuşlar. bu dosyaları bana orada kız gösterdi yani, hepsine olumlu geldi…En son muhtar da demiş ki işte bir ev yapacak kadar verilebilir demiş. Dosyayı kapattılar. Dosya ihaleye çıktı. Bize kağıt geldi. Talep ettiğiniz yeri ama biz yerin tam neresi olduğunu bilmiyoruz şimdi. Ama bu civarda olduğunu biliyoruz da. On beş gün ihale askıda durdu Milli Emlak'ta…o zamanın parasıyla iki üç milyon liralık bir şeyimiz oldu, o adam sana dosya hazırlıyor içeri veriyor… Onu senin adına o takip ediyor, özel firma…Ta o zaman burada ölçüm yok. Ta şu dağın tepesinde buranın mihenk taşı varmış. Bir o tepede, bir o tepede…Biz buraya geldik o adamlarla. O adamlarla ciple gittik o mihenk taşını bulduk. O adamlar harita üzerinden baktı. Ellerinde hiç gelmemiş adamlar burada bir ilgisi yok. Biz dağ dağa gezdik. O mihenk taşını orada bulduk. O mihenk taşından çıkardılar buranın rakımını, bu dosyayı hazırladılar verdiler 30C üzerinden Milli Emlak bizim işlemimizi bu resmî kurumlardan sordu. Onlar da onay verdi. İhaleye çıktı. Biz de gittik ihaleye girdik. İhaleden burayı aldık.

REFERENCES

Akşit, B. (1993). The genesis of petty commodity production in agriculture. In P. - Stirling (Ed.), *Culture and economy changes in Turkish villages* (pp. 171-186). Huntingdon: The Eothen Press.

Attfield, J. (2000). *The material culture of everyday life*. Berg.

Aydın, S. (2010). Neo-liberal transformation of Turkish agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change, 10*(2), 149–187.

Aykut, E. (2007). Constructing divisions between city and countryside. *Journal of Historical Studies*, *5*(2007), 69–82.

Bairoch, P. (1988). *Cities and economic development: From the dawn of history to the present.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, C. M, & Morrison, A. R. (1999). Urbanization in transforming economies. In P. Cheshire & E. S. Mills (Eds.), *Handbook on Applied Urban Economics* (pp. 1673-1790). New York: Oxford University Press.

Befu, H. (1967). The political relations of the village to the state. *World Politics 19*(4), 601-620.

Benjamin, W. (1969). *Illuminations* (H. Zohn, Trans.). New York: Schocken Books. [Original work published 1961].

Berkes, N. (1942). *Bazı Ankara köyleri üzerine bir araştırma.* Uzluk Basımevi: Ankara.

Bernstein, H. (2003). Farewells to the peasantry. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, *52*(1), 1–19. doi:10.1353/trn.2003.0027

Bernstein, H., (2004). Changing before our very eyes: agrarian questions and the politics of land in capitalism today. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *4*(1–2), 190–225.

Birtek, F., & Keyder, C. (1975). Agriculture and the state: an inquiry into agricultural differentiation and political alliances: The case of Turkey. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *2*(4), 446–467.

Brokerhoff, M. (1999). Urban growth in developing countries. *Population and Development Review*, *25*(4), 757-778.

Bryceson, D. F. (2002). The scramble in Africa: Reorienting rural livelihoods. *World Development*, *30*(5), 725–39.

Büscher, M., Urry, J. & Witchger, K. (2011). *Mobile methods*. Routledge, London.

Canatan, A. (2008) *Sosyal yönleriyle yaşlılık,* Ankara: Palme.

Carsten, J. (2004). *After kinship.* Cambridge University Press.

Ceyhan, S. & Tekkanat, S.S. (2018), 6360 sayılı kanun ve Ankara iline etkileri, *Bitlis Eren University Journal of Academic Projection*, *3*(2), ss. 20-42.

Champion, T. & Hugo, G. (2004). Moving beyond the urban–rural dichotomy. In T. Champion & G. Hugo (Eds.), *New forms of urbanisation: Beyond the urban–rural dichotomy* (pp. 1-24). Ashgate Publishing Company: Aldershot, UK/Burlington.

Çiğdem, A. (2005). Taşra karalaması-küçük bir sosyolojik deneme. in Bora, T. (Ed.) *Taşraya bakmak*. İletişim.

Dericioğulları Ergun, A. (2019). Bermuda şeytan üçgeni: Kırsal alanda yaşlı kadın olmak. *Beyond İstanbul: Mekanda Adalet ve Yaşlılık.*

Ekinci, M. (2018). Köy okulları ve madalyonun iki yüzü. *Beyond İstanbul: Mekanda Adalet ve Çocuk.*

EYHGM (2019) Engelli ve yaşlı bireylere ilişkin istatistiki bilgiler. Retrieved from http://www.eyh.aile.gov.tr/uploads/pages/engelli-ve-yasli-bireylere-iliskin-istatistiki-bilgiler/ bulten-ocak2019.pdf

Genç, N. (2014). 6360 sayılı kanun ve Aydın'a etkileri. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1*(Special Issue), 1-29.

Gubrium, J. F. & Holstein, J. A. (1999). At the border of narrative and ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *28*(5), 561-573. doi:10.1177/089124199129023550

Gürsoy, Ö. B. & Dodurka, B. Z. (2016). *Türkiye'de kırsal yoksulluğun güncel durumu üzerine bir inceleme*. Paper presented at Boğaziçi University Social Policy Forum.

Güzelsu, K. (1983). *Türkiye'de köy kalkınması ve kentleşme ve kent sorunları*. Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı: Ankara.

Halfacree, K. & Boyle, P. (1993). The challenge facing migration research: The case for a biographical approach. *Progress in Human Geography*. *17*(3), 333–348.

Halfacree, K. (2004). Rethinking 'rurality'. In T. Champion & G. Hugo (Eds.), *New forms of urbanisation: Beyond the urban–rural dichotomy* (pp. 285-304). Ashgate Publishing Company: Aldershot, UK/Burlington.

Halfacree K. (2012). Heterolocal identities? Counter-urbanisation, second homes and rural consumption in an era of mobilities. *Population, Space and Place, 18*(2), 209-224.

Hann, Chris. 1990. Tea and the domestication of the Turkish state. *Occasional Papers in Modern Turkish Studies: no 1*. Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.

Harvey, D. (1993). From space to place and back again: Reflections on the condition of postmodernity. In J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson, & L. Tickner (Eds.), *Mapping the futures: Local cultures, global change* (pp. 3–29). London and New York: Routledge.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature, and the geography of difference*. Blackwell: Cambridge MA.

İçduygu, A. (2009). International migration and human development in Turkey. *Human Development Research Paper (HDRP) Series, 52*, UNDP.

http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/ global/hdr2009/papers/HDRP_2009_52.pdf.

İzci, F. & Turan, M. (2013). Türkiye'de büyükşehir belediyesi sistemi ve 6360 sayılı yasa ile büyükşehir belediyesi sisteminde meydana gelen değişimler: Van örneği. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 18* (1), 117-152.

Jongerden, J. (2007). *The settlement issue in Turkey and the Kurds: An analysis of apatial policies, Modernity and War*. Brill: Leiden/Boston.

Jongerden, J. (2009). Crafting space, making People: The spatial design of nation in modern Turkey , *European Journal of Turkish Studies, 10.* doi:10.4000/ejts.4014

Karaömerlioğlu, A. (1998). The village institutes experience in Turkey. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *25*(1), 47-73.

Kelly, A. C. & Williamson, J. (1984). Population growth, industrial revolutions and the urban transition. *Population and Development Review, 10*(3), 419-441.

Keyder, Ç. (1983) The cycle of sharecropping and the consolidation of small peasant ownership in Turkey. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *10*(2-3), 130-145. doi:10.1080/03066158308438202

Keyder, Ç. (1983). Paths of rural transformation in Turkey. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *11*(1), 34-49.

Keyder, Ç. (1993). The genesis of petty commodity production in agriculture. In P. Stirling (ed.), *Culture and economy changes in Turkish villages*. (pp. 171-186). Huntingdon: The Eothen Press.

Keyder, Ç & Yenal, Z. (2004). Kalkınmacılık sonrası dönemde Türkiye'de kırsal dönüşüm eğilimleri ve sosyal politikalar. In A. H. Köse, F. Şenses & E. Yeldan (Eds.), *Küresel düzen: Birikim, devlet ve sınıflar* (pp. 357–382). İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.

Keyder Ç & Yenal S. (2011). Agrarian change under globalisation: markets and insecurity in Turkish agriculture. *Journal of Agrarian Change, 11*(1), 60–86.

Kılıç, Ö. & İpek, S. (2022). Kırsal mahalle: Büyükşehirlerde tekrar köye dönüş mü? *TroyAcademy , 7*(1), 1-16. doi:10.31454/troyacademy.901752

King, R. 2012. Geography and migration studies: retrospect and prospect. *Population, Space and Place*, *18*(2), 134–153. doi:10.1002/psp.685

Köymen, N. (1934). Köycülük esasları*, Ülkü, 20*(4).

Lefebvre, H. (1996). *The production of space*. (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lerner, D. (1958). *The passing away of traditional society.* The Free Press.

Lipton, M. (1976). *Why poor people stay poor: Urban bias in world development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marcus, G. (1995), Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *24*(1), 95-117.

Mathis, K. A., & Bronstein, J. L. (2020). Our current understanding of commensalism. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 51*(1), 167-189. doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-011720-040844

Merrifield A. (1993). Place and space: a Lefebvrian reconciliation. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 18*(4), 516–531.

Milbourne P. (2007). Re-populating rural studies: migrations, movements and mobilities. *Journal of Rural Studies, 23*(3), 381–386.

Mitchell, C. J. A. (2004). Making sense of counterurbanization. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *20*(1), 15-34.

Novoa, A. (2015). Mobile ethnography: emergence, techniques and its importance to geography. *Journal of Studies and Research in Human Geography, 9*(1).

Okumuş, D. (2018). *Rethinking rural transitions: The case of Bozcaada, Turkey* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from http://theses.ncl.ac.uk/jspui/handle/10443/4150

Öktem, K. (2009). The nation's imprint: Demographic engineering and the change of toponymes in republican Turkey, *European Journal of Turkish Studies, 7*(7). doi:10.4000/ejts.2243

Özçağlar, A. (2016). Büyükşehir belediyeli illerde kır ve kent nüfusunun tespiti mümkün mü?. *TÜCAUM Uluslararası Coğrafya Sempozyumu*.

Öztürk, H. (2015). *Yaşlanma ve kırsal yaşlılık: mevcut durum raporu.* Kalkınma Atölyesi, Ankara: Altan Matbaası.

Öztürk, M. (2010). 1980 sonrası yıllarda Türkiye tarımında değişme eğilimleri, köysüzleşen kırlar, banliyöleşen köyler, zayıfların sığınağı köyler. *Monthly Review, 23,* 113–183.

Öztürk, M. (2012). *Agriculture, peasantry and poverty in Turkey in the neo-liberal age*. Wageningen Academic Publishers: Wageningen, NL.

Öztürk, M., Hilton, A. & Jongerden, J. (2013). Migration as movement and multiplace life: Some recent developments in rural living structures in Turkey. *Population, Place, Space, 20*(4), 370–88.

Öztürk, M., Jongerden, J. & Hilton, A. (2014). Commodification and the social commons: Smallholder autonomy and rural–urban kinship communalism in Turkey. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy, 3*(3), 337–367.

Öztürk, M., Topaloğlu B., Hilton, A. & Jongerden, J. (2017). Rural–urban mobilities in Turkey: Socio-spatial perspectives on migration and return movements. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies, 20*(5), 513-530. doi:10.1080/19448953.2018.1406696

Öztürkmen, A. (2003). Remembering through material culture: Local knowledge of past communities in a Turkish Black Sea town. *Middle Eastern Studies, 39*(2), 179–193.

Phillips, M. (2010). Counterurbanization and rural gentrification: An exploration of the terms. *Population, Space and Place, 16*(6), 539-558.

Pine, F. (1994). Memories of movement and the stillness of place: Kinship memory in the Polish highlands. In J. Carsten (Ed.), *Ghosts of Memory Essays on Remembrance and Relatedness.* Blackwell Publishing.

Pink, S. (2009). *Doing sensory ethnography*. London: Sage Publications.

Portelli, A. (1991). *The death of Luigi Trastulli and other stories*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reid, J. D. (1975). Sharecropping in history and theory. *Agricultural History*, *49*(2), 426–440.

Rivera Escribano, M. J. (2007). Migration to rural Navarre: questioning the experience of counterurbanisation. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, *98*(1), 32–41.

Sağlam, S. (2006). Türkiye'de iç göç olgusu ve kentleşme. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları (HÜTAD), 5*, 33-44 . Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/turkiyat/issue/16667/330762

Satterwaite, D. (1996). *The scale and nature of urban change in the South.* London: International Institute for Environment and Development.

Savaş Yavuzçehre, P. (2016). The effects of the law no. 6360 on metropolitan municipality system in Turkey. *European Scientific Journal, 12*(10), 291-303.

Seddon, D., & Margulies, R. (1984). The politics of the agrarian question in turkey: Review of a debate. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *11*(3), 28–59. doi:10.1080/03066158408438237

Seremetakis, N. C. (1993). The memory of the senses: Historical perception, commensal exchange and modernity. *Visual Anthropology Review*, *9*(2), 2–18. doi:10.1525/var.1993.9.2.2

Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning*, *38*(2), 207–226.

Sirman, N. (1988). Peasants and family farms: The position of households in cotton production in a village of western turkey (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation). Department of Anthropology, University College London.

Sirman, N. (1996). From economic integration to cultural strategies of power: The study of rural change in turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, *14*, 115–125. doi:10.1017/S0896634600006270

Sirman, N. (2001). Sosyal bilimlerde gelişmecilik ve köy çalışmaları. *Toplum ve Bilim*, *Spring*, 251–254.

Stirling, P. (1993). *Culture and economy changes in Turkish villages.* Huntingdon: The Eothen Press

Stoler, A. L. (2013). Introduction 'The Rot Remains': From ruins to ruination. In A. L. Stoler (Ed.), *Imperial debris: On ruins and ruination* (pp.1-35). Duke University Press.

Sutherland, L. (2012). Return of the gentleman farmer?: Conceptualising gentrification in UK agriculture. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *28*(4), 568-576.

Tekeli I. (2008). *Göç ve ötesi*. Tarih Vakfı Yayınları: İstanbul.

Testart, A. (2013). What is a gift? (S. Emanuel & L. Perlman, Trans.). *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory, 3*(1), 249-261.

Tilley, C. Y. (1994). *A phenomenology of landscape: Places, paths, and monuments*. Berg.

Turkish Statistical Institute (2000). *Genel nüfus sayımları 1927–2000*. Ankara: TÜİK.

Turkish Statistical Institute (2010). *Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi Sonuçları [Results of Address Based Population System]*. Ankara: TÜİK.

Turkish Statistical Institute (2018). *Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi Sonuçları [Results of Address Based Population System]*. Ankara: TÜİK.

Tütengil, C. O. (1975). *Kırsal Türkiye'nin yapısı sorunlar.* Ankara: Gerçek Yayınevi.

Uysal, A. B. & Sakarya, İ. (2018). Rural gentrification in the North Aegean countryside (Turkey). *International Journal of Architecture and Planning, 6*(4), 99-125.

Vittorio Aureli, P. (2015). The theology of tabula rasa: Walter Benjamin and architecture in the age of precarity. Retrieved from http://thecityasaproject.org/2015/05/the-theology-of-tabula-rasa-walterbenjamin-and-architecture-in-the-age-of-precarity/

Woods, M. (2005). *Rural geography: processes, responses and experiences in rural restructuring*. London: SAGE.

Yakin, A. Y. (2007). "There is a village somewhere out there": Representations of Anatolia as terra incognita. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, *20*(1–2), 182–199. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6443.2007.00305.x

Yasa, İ. (1969). *Yirmibeş yıl sonra Hasanoğlan Koyü: Karsılaştırmalı bir toplumbilimsel araştırma,* AUSBF Yayinlari.

Zeybek, S. O. (2011). Small towns in Turkey: Footnotes in somebody else's history. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 24*(1), 100–115. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6443.2011.01391.x