DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

„An ecovillage-initiative and its interact: "Developing a village" in Central Anatolia"

Verfasserin

Theresa Weitzhofer-Yurtışık

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. Phil.)

Wien, 2012

Acknowledgements

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> We know anyways that we can accomplish something like this. We know that we can accomplish this there. But the important thing is to spread it. That is why this, these works need to be an example for the villagers.[1] (Interview Alp, GK, 14.12.2010)

Changing society seems to be an omnipresent issue in human history, might it be for personal profit, because of wanting to counter a condition considered as harmful or threatening or also for engaging in realizing a vision of a 'better world'. Ecovillages, or ecological communities, can be seen as communities of change that emerged as critique and at the same time attempt to create an alternative to capitalist consumption society and emphasise the importance of resource sensitive treatment of nature.

One such community is Güneşköy[2], literally meaning "Sun-Village", an ecovillage-initiative close to Ankara (Turkey), where a group of committed persons, most of them attached to Middle East Technical University, one of the most renowned universities in Turkey, works some land owned by them according to principles of organic agriculture and experiments to optimize the use of especially solar energy. This small land in the hilly countryside of Central Anatolia was the first place that I was taken to outside Ankara when I came to Turkey for an Erasmus exchange in late summer 2007. I went there several times but it was only during my second year in Ankara that I realized some of the wider dimensions of Güneşköy, going well beyond being an experimental gardening project by a group of academicians. This initiative, the motivations and targeted changes and the contestations by the persons in the neighbouring village of Hisarköy embedded in discourses of environmentalism and development are the topic of this thesis.

---

[1] "Biz bunu sadece kendi başımıza yapıp, uygulasak…Biz zaten böyle bir şey başaribileceğimiz biliyoruz. Orada böyle bir şey başaribileceğimiz biliyoruz. Ama önemli olanı bunu yaygınlaştırmak. Dolaysıyla bunun, bu çalışmalar köylüye örnek olması gerekiyor."
[2] Pronounced in a way similar to [Guneshkoy]; for a short explanation of Turkish letters, pronunciation and glossary see appendix.

1.1 Introducing the Field

Hisarköy and Güneşköy are situated in Balaban Valley in the Kırıkkale district just beyond the district border of Ankara, the capital of Turkey. Using the highway to Elmadağ and then smaller roads, it is a little more than one hour drive by car from central Ankara. This drive itself is an experience: passing through the crowded traffic of the capital with sky-scrapers, shopping malls, rows of apartment buildings, in the outskirts *gecekondus* (shantytowns) transpersed by more apartment buildings, that seem displaced among the small houses, to the left and right – in short an impression of a metropolis marked by globalization and fast urbanization. After passing a ridge in the hills around Elmadağ, this view changes: turning the back to the plain with the city at the horizon and the highway leading to it, the view opens to a valley with hardly any human presence visible. Pastel colours dominate the image, with more green in spring, turning to yellow and different earth colours over summer. Reddish, brownish and bluish rocks make up the surrounding rocks. The road, which is covered with earth and mud after rainfalls, leads down the valley, passes a few houses, kilometres of grazing land and small fields, a small village with houses made of stone and lime and covered with white chalk, some more grazing land and fields and then arrives at the village of Hisarköy.

Hisarköy

Hisarköy is a village with a population of about 250 persons living there and composed of a centre and *Çiftlik Mahalle*, a second settlement with five families living there, about two kilometres away from the centre at the opposite side of the small Balaban River. The houses in the centre of Hisarköy are arranged in a chessboard structure (similar to for example Chicago); the reason for this structure is that the original village was relocated from some kilometres away due to increasing danger of flash floods and rebuilt from the sketch by the state (Gökmen et al. 2004). Mosque, *muhtarlık* (the office of the mayor of the village), tea-house, school, a small health station as well as a small market are in the centre of the village. These places are the work opportunities in the village apart from agriculture. Reforestation projects by the Ministry of Forestry allow for an additional possibility of paid day labour in the surroundings of the village.

For the health centre, designed and built by university students of Middle East Technical University in a summer-project led with the initiative of Güneşköy members, no doctor was sent by the health ministry due to a change in legislation that does not provide for doctors in villages that small anymore. For the time being, the building is empty and not used. The school, combining first to fifth grade, had 21 students in the 2010/11 academic year, who are taught by one teacher together in one classroom. The older students are at boarding schools in the surrounding towns.

The main occupation in the village is agriculture, with most villagers cultivating their own small land. It is usual to further have at least one or two cows to cover the own needs of milk, butter and yogurt, but also to sell dairy products together with the vegetables and fruits from the fields at the bazaar. In the mornings, the cows are brought next to the fountain behind the school, from where a herdsman takes them for grazing in the surrounding hills. Those with more cows or sheep prefer their own shepherds. Most households do further own a donkey with donkey-carts being the main means of transportation to and from the fields.

The houses visited are one floor buildings with kitchen, living room, bathroom and one or two more rooms for sleeping and storage. Meals are taken sitting on the carpets on the floor around an about 15cm high table that is removed again after the meal. Besides the vegetables grown on the fields and home-made yogurt, bread is an essential part of the meals. The bread is made in a *tandır*, a bread oven that consists of a hole in the ground where first fire is lightened and once it is burnt down, the dough is pressed to the hot brick earth walls and baked for a few minutes. Most households do have their own tandır in a hut next to the house or share one with their close neighbours.

Güneşköy

From Hisarköy, the Güneşköy land is visible on the opposite side of the valley, but by car it needs another two-kilometre turn to be able to cross the small river meandering through the valley. After a last kilometre of unpaved path one passes the *Çiftlik mahalle* and reaches the land limited on the one side by the path and on the other side by the rocky hills of the south-facing valley slope. An orange-earth-coloured building with a ground plan in the shape of an '8' is close to the entrance with two tables and benches in front of it, another, slightly bigger round building is further up the slope and to its left side, behind a flat stone building

half under earth, a roof-shaped metal construction gets visible – the solar-greenhouse. The flat parts of the land closer to the road are used as fields for vegetables and one part also as vineyard.

The Güneşköy cooperative was officially established in Ankara in 2000 by nine founding members most of whom graduated from or work at Middle East Technical University. Two years later the cooperative purchased the 75 hectare land in Hisarköy. This land was worked since then especially by gardening according to principles of organic agriculture and companion planting. The use of solar energy as well as the development and application of environmentally friendly technologies are further points of focus: the agricultural areas for example are watered not by flooding, a method that is very water consuming, but through drip irrigation. Ongoing tasks of existing projects and the planning of new ones are discussed in a weekly meeting in Ankara.

The project is supposed to be an example of how to use existing natural resources in Central Anatolia, without destroying them and today, it is a registered member of the Global Ecovillage Network Europe (GEN-Europe) in Turkey and locally as well as internationally well connected through different networks. The Güneşköy project involves a number of persons: the official members as well as several other active participants, the persons employed on the land, volunteers, consumers of the produced food, and participants in day-trips to the land. My focus will be on members, especially those actually working on the land.

1.2 Research interest

What first caught my attention were comments on Güneşköy being an example for Central Anatolian villages, like the citation given by Alp at the beginning of this chapter. This led me directly to the question of how the project is seen by the neighbouring village and how Hisarköy and Güneşköy interact. In the preliminary phase during the first visits where I started to look at Güneşköy and Hisarköy as my field of research, it became very apparent that there are different perceptions of what Güneşköy is and what it should be.

Intensifying relations with the group and the village brought up questions on the

perspectives on nature and agriculture, to interests, priorities and the issue of power relations the discourse is produced and embedded in. I want to shed light on the project-village relationship by looking at meanings given to project-related attitudes by project members and villagers, the perception and representation of the self and the other, and their implications for the social relationship between them.

A first question of the empirical research is what different aims and descriptions of Güneşköy exist for its members and how the project can be situated among other ecovillages. What are its parallels with and particularities in regard to other ecovillages?

The arguably best known aspect about the cooperative in the village is organic agriculture and the group also incited some farmers from Hisarköy to change to this mode of production. A second field of questions therefore is how this form of agriculture is presented and talked about by Güneşköy members and villagers and more general what a 'healthy, natural and ecological lifestyle', that is written as an aim of the cooperative in the Global Ecovillage Network's registry, means. What do these discourses say about different positions in Güneşköy and Hisarköy?

One of the (cl)aims of Güneşköy I encountered in early phases of my research and that was repeated at several occasions is to 'develop' villagers, to create an example for villagers, especially in Central Anatolia. The centrality of this term 'to develop' as well as its ambiguity is stressed in the title of this thesis, referring to both, the development in the meaning of building up Güneşköy as an ecovillage-initiative, and the negotiations around village-development. To find responses to questions of how such an aim is perceived and whether and how the presentations of Güneşköy are contested, the view of its 'interact'[3], of villagers living in Hisarköy is essential. In a last empirical part I thus concentrate more specifically on the perception of the project and project members by the villagers and vice versa, the perception of the village and villagers by the project members. How do they interact?

A fourth question that at the same time overarches the earlier ones is about which discourses and researches exist on the three areas of interest (eco-community,

---

[3] 'Interact' as a noun is a neologism used by one of the interviewees from Güneşköy for someone a person interacts with. In lack of an English alternative and considering the neologism well suited to express dynamic reciprocity, 'interact' is used as a central term throughout this thesis in the meaning of "someone interacting".

environmentalism and development), with a special focus on the specific context of Turkey and what lessons can be taken from them for this research.

1.3 Overview

Before presenting the empirical material in regard to those questions obtained through ethnological fieldwork in 2010 and 2011, chapter II gives an introduction to central concepts used in this thesis. It presents a discussion of concepts of 'development' and 'environmentalism' especially in social sciences, followed by a historical overview of environmentalism in Turkey, the development of ecovillages and organic production, as well as a short discussion of 'modernisation' and 'development' in regard to rural areas in Turkey. Chapter III outlines the methodology used, the process leading up to the writing of this thesis and experiences during my fieldwork. The following three chapters are dedicated to the empirical findings: Chapter IV outlines the self-representation of the Güneşköy members, their reasons to join, the project's aims, and evaluations of the initiative so far. Chapter V takes the example of organic agriculture as aspect of the activities of the Güneşköy group and the concept of 'a healthy lifestyle' as starting point for analysis of different positions and negotiations. Chapter VI focuses on the perception of Güneşköy by Hisarköy and vice versa and the interaction between the two sides; singling out further arguments in regard to above mentioned 'developing' villagers. In Chapter VII, main aspects of this work are summarized in a final conclusion, supplemented by an outlook of questions for further considerations.

CHAPTER II

ENVIRONMENTALISM, DEVELOPMENT AND MODERNISATION

BETWEEN CRITIQUE AND ALTERNATIVE

Environmentalism, development and modernisation are all much used terms in academia as well as the public discourse especially since the second half of the last century. Another common point of all three concepts is that they are used in a variety of contexts and are attributed different meanings. While in common usage development for example, mainly refers to some economic progress and growth; as Ray (1998) states in summary of the statements of the book "Discourses of Development", "it is always an alien, non-local ideology, that precedes and dictates how the problem and its solution are defined" (Ray 1998, 244), thus underlining the subjectivity of 'modernisation'.

The first part of this chapter presents main discourses on the concept of development and the closely related, historically as well as in regard to the critiques brought up, concept of environmentalism. A special focus is on argumentations in social sciences and particularly anthropology. The second part of the following chapter tries to give an overview over the intertwined history of development, modernisation and environmentalism in Turkey, using the terms as they are used in main documents by ministries, international institutions, civil society associations and other actors in the field. This overview is followed by another section comprising a short description of (certified) organic agriculture in Turkey and especially in Kırıkkale, the district Güneşköy and Hisarköy are situated in. History of ecovillages and the ecovillage movement, examples and existing researches constitute the third part of this chapter.

The chapter as a whole aims at situating Güneşköy, the ecovillage initiative with an aim to improve agricultural methods and life conditions in rural areas, in the local, national and international context it is embedded in and to delineate the theoretical background that will help to shed light on different perspectives on Güneşköy and its relation to Hisarköy.

2.1 Contested fields of "Development" and "Environment(alism)"

Development is a term frequently used in recent decades by policy makers as well as civil society organizations (CSOs). International development institutions, like UNDP, USAID, World Bank, were established in the last century, but also the national and regional level saw the foundation of numerous development institutions. In academia, an own interdisciplinary field of development studies emerged. Nowadays a number of research and education institutes exist focussing on development with different attributes, as for example international development, development policies, development aid and sustainable development. This last, sustainable development, leads to the second important concept: how nature and environment is understood, conceptualized and treated and the formation of the sector of environmentalism.

Discourses on development – historical view

Edelman and Haugerud (2005) mention the late 18th and the 19th century as first phase of development theory in their introduction to the "Anthropology of Development and Globalization Reader". In this early phase theoretical approaches were "attempts to understand the rise of capitalism in the 15th and 16th century, and the startling changes associated with the emergence of industrial capitalism in the late 18th century" (ibid, 6).

Other authors see the emergence of development theory situated in the post-WWII context (Ferguson 2006, 189; Arce and Long 2000). Influent institutions such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund (IMF) were established to prevent further economic crisis like those in the years preceding WWII[4]. In 1950, the US American "Point Four Program" was established with two main goals: "creating markets for the United States by reducing poverty and increasing production in developing countries[5], and diminishing the

---

[4] Both established at the Bretton-Woods Conference in 1944 to regulate post WWII-economy. http://www.imf.org/external/about/histcoop.htm; http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/0,,contentMDK:20653660~menuPK:72312~pagePK:51123644~piPK:329829~theSitePK:29708,00.html
[5] Such a focus on preparing markets, or more general on optimizing conditions for the own country's economy is not limited to this US-program. Leys (1996) sees the aim of international development institutions of those early years generally on "how the economies of the colonies of Britain, France, Portugal and other European powers, colonies comprising some 18% of the world's population, might be transformed and made more productive as decolonisation approached (Leys 1996:5)" (cited in Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 6).

threat of communism by helping countries prosper under capitalism"[6]. This program, together with the 1947 Marshall Plan might be seen as the predecessor of USAID, together with the World Bank and UN institutions, one of the arguably globally most influential development institutions today. In 1961, UN launched the first "development decade" with the meaningful subtitle "A programme for international economic co-operation" (United Nations 1961).

From economical perspective, development policies were in the first years of those institutions directed by a Keynesian idea that a strong state control of the market is essential. The 1970s saw a shift from the idea that the state should control the market to a liberal or neo-liberal view that the market controls itself and that the state should not limit it. A promotion of economic liberalism was prevalent in, among others, USAID and World Bank development policies for two decades until in the mid-90s criticism of their incentives to reduce state control led to a change in policy priorities. Critics dismantled the "myth of (neo)liberalism", that the "self-regulating market was a 19th century 'utopian experiment' that had failed" (Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 17) and showed that liberalization cannot solve everything but in contrary might lead to an aggravated situation in some cases (ibid, 8;17).

Although much talked about and used in a multitude of contexts by a multitude of actors, there is no consensus on what is understood as development or what development aims at. Jane I. Guyer (2001) defines development in the Dictionary of Anthropology as

> a process of change through which an increasing proportion of a nation's citizens are able to enjoy a higher material standard of living, healthier and longer lives, more education and greater control and choice over how they live. (Guyer 2001, 113)

She nevertheless also notes that leaders, policy makers and academicians' ideas about the relative importance of specific aims diverge.

Reinhard Stockmann (2010) shortly summarizes the changes in the meaning of the term 'development' over the last decades as follows: in the 50s, the term was used mainly for economic growth. In the 60s, dependency theories related development and underdevelopment, thus seeing both caused by the same processes. In the 70s, lack of expected success reduced the aims to ensure basic needs of humans and mainstream

---

[6] http://www.usaid.gov/about_usaid/usaidhist.html

institutions started to differentiate between 'quantitative development' measured as economic growth and a more inclusive 'qualitative development' expressed in indicators of human welfare, like education, child mortality or life expectancy. In the 80s, concerns in regard to the depletion of resources grew and caused a change from "nachholender" (catching up) to "nachhaltiger" (sustainable) development (Stockmann 2010, 2). In the same introductory text he presents five elements of development specified by Nohlen and Nuscheler (1993, 67ff): growth, employment, equality and justice, participation and independence/autonomy. In reference to Senghaas' "hexagon of development politics", Ulrich Menzel later added sustainability as sixth dimension to form the "hexagon of development" (Menzel 2010, 14). In this hexagon, economic productivity, social justice, ecological sustainability, cultural identity, social participation and political stability are identified as cornerstones around the central target of fulfilling human needs. The different dimensions are not valued one over the other and they are embedded in the larger global context (see Menzel 2010, 13ff). Such models, although in a simplified way show an understanding of development as a multi-dimensional process which factors are subject to changes over time.

What is inherent in all definitions and what at the same time differentiates it from aid- or relief work, that aims at restoring a situation (Strang and Powell 2009, 37), is that it implies a vision of change (see Strang and Powell 2009; Guyer 2001; Olivier de Sardan 2005).

Development and Anthropology

In an effort to shed some light on the understanding of 'development' in anthropology, Ferguson (2005) points at conceptualizations of developments of society as a socio-cultural evolution from savage to civilized as coined by Louis H. Morgan and Edward B. Tylor and a view of development as an economic process to expand production and rise standards of living in so called developing countries. Such early concepts of development that were later much criticised within anthropology, are nevertheless closely linked to the emergence of anthropology as a discipline (ibid).

In anthropology, the popularity of a linear development of societies *à la* Morgan or Tylor ended in the first half of the 20th century with criticisms by Boas (American Anthropology) and Malinowski (British anthropology) that lead to a change to relativism, where each society was tried to be understood "'in its own terms' as one of many possible

ways of meeting human social and psychological needs (Malinowski)" as Ferguson referring to Malinowski states (Ferguson 2002, 191).

Neo-Marxist critique / dependency theory

Neo-Marxist critique rejects two fundamental statements of the modernisation paradigm: Firstly, it rejects the picture of independent societies, i.e. societies existing and changing independent from each other, stating instead that the

> […] differences between societies had to be related to a common history of conquest, imperialism, and economic exploitation that systematically linked them. Supposedly 'traditional' practices and institutions, rather than being relics of a pre-capitalist past, might instead be interpreted as products of, or reactions to, processes of capitalist penetration, the articulation of modes of production, or world-system incorporation. And poverty, rather than an original condition, might be a result of such processes. Instead of being simply 'undeveloped' (an original state), the Third World now appeared as actively 'underdeveloped' by a first world that had 'underdeveloped' it. (Ferguson 2002, 193)

Secondly, it rejects the idea that development leads to improvement, arguing that on the contrary capitalist development might even worsen the situation of some already marginalized parts of society.

Taking not inter- but intra-national relations as starting point, the term 'internal colonialism' sees a similar mechanism working inside states with "urban zones as beneficiaries of surpluses extracted from rural areas" (Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 12), meaning that cleavages in the economical situation between villages and cities were perceived as "results of the same 'capitalist' historical process" (ibid, 13).

Post-development

Emerging in the 80s and based on liberal, Marxist and post-structuralist theories, post-developmentalism as described by Escobar (2006a) in his dictionary entry on post-development, questioned the very idea of development. Post-developmentalist see development as a Western discourse, a discourse by the 'developed' through which the 'underdeveloped' are constructed. In such analysis, development is seen as a new form of colonisation (Esteva and Prakash 1998).

Escobar (2006) talks about three main points of critique of post-development argumentation: First, poverty and capitalism are overlooked in the focus on discourse, second, development is generalised and essentialised and third, local traditions and social movements are perceived in a romantic way ignoring power relations at that level (ibid, 448). This critique is turned down by post-developmentalists, defending among others that they did not want to create "a more accurate representation of 'the real'", but that they see themselves rather as "political intellectuals constructing an object of critique for both scholarly and political action and debate" (ibid, 449).

Post-development is criticised for rejecting a concept altogether without providing for an alternative[7] (Stockmann 2010, 2f; Friedman 2006). Friedman (2006) acknowledges that "the post-structuralist critics have indeed created the space to imagine alternatives to development" (Friedman 2006, 205), but he adds, that they are not able to fill this space. Caught in their own critique, "[post-structuralist anthropologists] cannot offer any alternatives because then they too would be deploying knowledge as power in an effort to manage the 'Third World'" (ibid).

Friedman (2006), drawing upon his research in Namibia, advocates for an awareness for not one monolithic development discourse, but development discourses, as well as to see development as a dialectical instead of a hegemonic encounter, acknowledging that those 'to be developed' are not passive objects. He furthermore underlines the importance of long-term ethnographical fieldwork as a methodological tool that can and should be used to contribute to development debates.

Anthropologists in development

From the very first years of the creation of development institutions on, anthropologists were employed there. After decolonization, with a predominant modernisation paradigm, development became a field of 'applied' work (Ferguson 2005, 143ff). Anthropologists were employed by development institutions – as "experts on 'backward peoples,' anthropologists were clearly well positioned to play a role in any project for their advancement" as Ferguson

---

[7] A similar critique is used by Emery Roe (2005) in the case of "blueprint-development", meaning standard measures taken in specific situations, i.e. state authority controlled water management mechanisms in regions with water scarcity. He shows several examples where such blueprint measures are unsuccessful as they are not responsive to the respective context, but she defends, that as long as no alternatives are provided, they should not be abandonned completely but rather tried to be combined with other approaches (see Roe 2005).

(Ferguson 2005, 144) cynically remarks. But as Guyer (2001, 113) writes, nearly all of these anthropologists left the field in the 60s, due on the one side to an economist and urban focus of development projects, but also to a scepticism and critique within the discipline towards the practice of imposing a western- and euro-centric understanding in the name of development. Interestingly, it is the rise of this sharp critique of modernisation and development that according to Ferguson lead to a renewed interest of anthropologists in the field and a closer collaboration with capitalist development institutions:

> If nothing else, the radical critiques made it more legitimate, and more intellectually exciting, to study issues of 'development' in the context of an increasingly radicalized and politicized discipline. At a time when university-based scholarship was under pressure to demonstrate its relevance, and when anthropology was particularly challenged to show that it had something to say about change, not just stasis, and about the modern world, not just the 'tribal' one, a politically engaged and theoretically challenging approach to 'development' had considerable appeal. (Ferguson 2002, 193f)

Development anthropology and anthropology of development

This critique and the different approach it expresses, lead to the formation of what Escobar (1997) calls two different schools of thought existing in the late 90s: development anthropology and the anthropology of development. Convinced that anthropology can contribute to the work of development institutions especially after the changes these institutions underwent in the 70s, development anthropologists work closely with development institutions. By collaborating in development projects, they try to change practices from the inside. Adherents of anthropology of development in contrast distance themselves from development industry (see Escobar 1997, 498ff). Influenced by a post-structuralist emphasis on the importance of language in the construction of social reality, the concept of development itself is questioned. Anthropology of development takes a step back to study meaning and practices of development in historical, global and local contexts and take the very fundamental assumptions of development under scrutiny. In other words

> [w]hile development anthropologists focus on the project cycle, the use of knowledge to tailor projects to the beneficiaries' cultures and situations, and the possibility of contributing to the needs of the poor, the anthropologists of development centre their analysis on the institutional apparatus, the links to power established by expert knowledge, the ethnographic analysis and critique of modernist constructs, and the possibility of contributing to the political projects of the subaltern.
(Escobar 1997, 505)

Paralleling above described discussions and critiques of post-development, tensions between the two schools of thought are used to show the weaknesses of each: praxis anchored development anthropology faces the reproach of lacking theory, while theory-focused anthropology of development is reproached lacking practical relevance, leading to the question of how to combine the contributions of theoretical and applied anthropology in a fruitful way (Escobar 1997, 505ff).

Whereas Friedman (2009) laments such a distinction between practitioners and theorists, and the lack of respect or recognition for the contributions of each other, Bierschenk (2010) labels the distinction as aspect of a tradition of anthropology mainly situated in the US, mentioning that in European tradition most academicians do combine both – practical and theoretical focus – and show a "critical engagement in praxis" (Bierschenk 2010, 8, translation TWY; see also Rossi 2004). Nolan (2002) in this respect, for a further distinction proposes three different groups: academic anthropologist, applied anthropologists and practicing anthropologists, with the first group focussing on theoretical concepts, the second one on work in the field. Both groups are employed in academia, what contrasts them to the third group that is employed by among others development institutions or NGO's for specific projects (see Nolan 2002, 69). This latter means a strong dependency on employer's preferences with implications on the research process as well as on (the possibility to publish) critical reflections of the outcomes (see Friedman 2009, 326). Considering such a limitation, Friedman calls for development practitioners to resort to anthropology, but on the condition "to do so on anthropology's, rather than development's, own terms" (ibid, 328), meaning for example to assign enough time for research and to use evaluation criteria adopted for anthropological methods.

Strang and Powell (2009), in line with the distinction between development anthropology and anthropology of development, define both, the critical reflection on development practices and direct assistance to development institutions in parts of the process of development, as the two major roles of anthropologists.

Paralleling the concept of Environment and its -ism

> At the same time of this writing, the whole world's 'natural environment' is thought to be under threat from too much development, and the same people whom our forebears thought primitive are admired for their care and techniques of conservation. (Hendry 2008, 247)

Environmentalism can be seen as closely related to development. Although environmental concern has a long history, emergence and growth of an environmental movement coincide with what was earlier described as phases of (economic) development and modernisation. First famous movements and organizations formed to protest measures implemented in the name of 'development', such as deforestation or the construction of power plants. With negative consequences of such measures being increasingly recognised as such and the realization of some resources being finite, national and international, civil society and also governmental organizations formed to fight a further destruction of the earth and to counter (capitalist) modernisation.

Approaches to environment can be distinguished in human- and nature-centred. The first, as its name says, puts the human and its interests as central starting point, a "protecting nature, to save ourselves" understanding where humans are "stewards" for the environment (Argyrou 2005, 38); the second understanding sees the human as one of many beings within nature, as "denizens of the planet" (ibid, 50) who have to treat the environment with care because of an ethical responsibility (ibid, 37). What such a careful treatment means can be differentiated in preservationist and conservationist approaches (see May 2002). Preservationist environmentalists aim at protecting nature as it is by keeping it untouched, by not intervening in environmental processes. Adherents of the second approach, conservationist environmentalists aim at conserving nature in the meaning of "wise use of resources" (May 2002, 244). An example can be the question of whether or not to open a national park to visitors or to provide certain land or forest use permissions to locals.

Vassos Argyrou (2005) differentiates different phases of environmental perception: a phase of humans 'mastering' i.e. controlling nature, a condition that UN suggested as a prerequisite of economic development in a report in 1951 (United Nations 1951, 13 cited in Argyrou 2005, 27). This phase was followed by a deconstruction of the master-mastered dichotomy and the realization that nature is fragile and affected by human interventions. This means a turn from seeing humans fighting nature to humans living with nature (Argyrou 2005, 37).

In anthropological theory, environment – like development – is considered as a construct and not some objective reality (see Escobar 2006b; Taylor and Buttel 2006). Defining nature and more specifically protection and conservation worthy nature involves power and interests. A point of critique from social sciences that was raised in relation to 'development' (arguably in a more extensive way), is also brought up in connection with environmentalism:

> Environmentalism repeats the historical gesture that marked the colonial enterprise and its civilising mission. The rest of the world is once again presented with a new reality – presented, that is, fait accompli – and is expected, cajoled, encouraged, assisted, threatened to take a stance and come to recognise it as such a reality. (Argyrou 2005, xi)

Argyrou argues that environmentalism reflects "the reproduction of the same sort of global power relations and the same sort of logic that mark the modernist paradigm at its core" (ibid, x). Argyrou is neither alone nor the first one in criticising environmentalism this way: Esteva and Prakash (1998) include environmentalism as "green-tinted re-development" (Esteva and Prakash 1998, 281) in their post-development critique and reproach it – as they do with development – to not only maintain existing power relations but to serve "as a cosmetic cover to protect - instead of prevent - the continuation of damaging processes" (ibid, 281; see also Horuş 2007, 185).

Importance of science in the environmental movement

Comparing the environmentalist movement with other social movements, Yearley points at "its intimate relationship to science" (Yearley 2005, 25) as one of its special characteristics[8].

Yearley sees the reason for the importance given to science in a perception of everything scientific as serious. Therefore, "the centrality of scientific evidence held out the beguiling possibility of winning one's case simply through argument. [...] It would not be a question of opinion but a demonstrable fact" (ibid, 21). This method was especially used by more established groups (see ibid.).

---

[8] The two other characteristics defined by Yearley are strong international networking and "its ability to offer a concerted critique of, and alternative to, capitalist industrialism." (Yearley 2005, 25)

That the relationship between science and environmentalism is not as straightforward as it might seem is shown in three cases: First, science and its role in industrialization and increasing production is to be held partly responsible for today's environmental problems. Secondly, the objectivity of 'scientific facts' is contested, proving that in many cases they are rather a matter of argumentation than absolute truth. Third, differences between scientific data and inner group views and priorities might put organizations in a tricky position. As Yearley formulates it:

> [T]he tensions between movement organisations' commitment to the ideal of getting the technical correct answer and the need to listen to their members' views and priorities has led all of the leading environmentalist movement organisations to struggle with issues of internal democracy. Democracy implies the sovereignty of members' opinions, and this is at odds with campaigners' professional expertise. (Yearley 2005, 21)

The last point does not only apply to inner-group conflicts, but also to differences between environmentally focussed views and economic arguments. Whereas activists and academicians point at the continuing degradation and negative effects this degradation will have for society (Keleş 2007, 27), most laws are still half-heartedly implemented and breaches are often turned a blind eye on when environmental interests clash with economic ones.

Besides research, teaching takes another important role. Providing education, thus spreading (scientific) knowledge, is seen as a method to raise awareness for environmental processes and with it create change. Berry and Barlett (1980, 326) underline that education by itself is not enough; the capacity to act on it needs to be ensured as well.

Positions and Constructions – Different perceptions of Environment(alism)
Attitudes towards the environment and nature change according to the role and attributes given to them, what again is subjective and dependent on the respective situation (see Ingold 1992). I want to point at two studies showing different perspectives in the field of environmentalism and their implications:

Lene Hansen et al (2006) examine the understanding of nature and ecological farming of different stakeholders in this field: farmers, biologists and outdoor NGOs[9]. They identify different prevalent ideas of nature for each group: farmers see nature in its cultivated and uncultivated form as a partner and themselves living in interdependence with nature. Biologists distinguish between pristine, "authentic" and cultivated nature and qualify these two as "low quality" and "high quality nature". The third group, members of outdoor NGOs perceive nature as space for activity and experience. The authors identified tensions especially between the first two: Firstly, whereas biologists advocate conservation and followed a non-intervention approach, farmers see human interference as necessary. A second difference identified is that biologists look at details, at small biotopes while the farmers present a more holistic approach. The authors argue that these polarizing perspectives do not aid a constructive discussion where all parties are involved and that compromises are necessary to promote nature and landscape values. They see the outdoor NGO-perspective as a possible ground to start from: this perspective stresses both untouched and cultivated nature – the important thing is diversity. Hansen et al thus conclude that the level of personal experience unites all the actors. Their paper might be criticised for overly using generalizations, but their illustration of the interaction of farmers, scientists and NGOs very well shows "an underlying battle for the right to define nature and nature quality and essentially decide what organic farmers should work towards" (Hansen, Noe, and Højring 2006, 1).

Nora Haenn (2006) researched the perception of nature and the consequences for attitudes towards forest conservation in two different areas of Campeche in Mexico. In one area, forest is seen as enriching future farming, thus maintaining the forest is supported. In the second area, forest is seen as an obstacle to cultivation and wealth, thus the farmers prefer seeing it turned into farmland (Haenn 2006, 229). To gain support for environmental protection, government agents stressed that the aim was "to protect the environment so that people might use it" (Haenn 2006, 232). Although farmers linked conservation to corruption of the ruling authorities, they encompassed and reproduced notions of environmentalist discourses. Haenn concludes that "[r]ather than chang[ing] local ideas of the environment, conservation projects provided farmers with new rhetorical tools for appealing to people interested in environmental protection" (Haenn 2006, 233).

---

[9] The authors do acknowledge that the three groups of actors they identified are not the only ones in the field of environmental protection (Hansen, Noe, and Højring 2006, 1).

Pointing out perspectives, relations and interests of different actors and the resulting tensions helps to underline that concepts like nature and agriculture are constructed and negotiated. It at the same time shows processes underlying the use of and reactions to development practices; a knowledge that can be used to assist institutions that want to bring about change by contributing to a better understanding of meanings and practices.

Beyond criticism – focussing on the actors and agency

Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan, a French socio-anthropologist, who tries to go beyond criticism of development by combining aspects from Francophone and Anglophone, as well as anthropological and sociological debates, summarizes in his work "Anthropology and Development: Understanding Contemporary Social Change" several aspects, that I will draw from for this thesis. He defines development as

> […] the sum of the social processes induced by voluntarist acts aimed at transforming a social milieu instigated by institutions or actors who do not belong to the milieu in question, but who seek to mobilize the milieu, and who rely on the milieu in their attempt of grafting resources and/or techniques and/or knowledge. (Olivier de Sardan 2005, 24f)

Such a definition emphasises an outsider-insider relation between those who aim at change and their target group and an implied expectation of collaboration between both sides by the 'development actors'. Although I do not adhere to a strict insider-outsider distinction between actors and 'receivers' or 're-actors' of 'development' and the implied exclusion of grassroots organizations or movements that want to bring about change 'from within', the idea of bringing a new concept, a new idea, or also an existing one phrased in a new way to 'others' is a central issue in the present work. Küçükcan (2002, 95) in this regard mentions three phases of development interventions: a first input by development experts[10] is followed by a period of collaboration between both the experts and the target group. In the third phase the external support is withdrawn and the project supposed to continue in a self-sustaining way.

Olivier de Sardan (2005, 60f) points out fundamental statements in regard to processes of social change and development:

---

[10] The concept of "development experts" is critically reflected upon by Ferguson (1990) who was surprised to find local actors during his research in Zimbabwe seeing development as independent knowledge and questioned those actors prioritisation of 'development information' over knowledge of the local context.

- o   Involvement of relationships between heterogeneous groups, norms, values and knowledge systems; the tensions in this field, "phenomena of confrontation, negotiation, rejection, side-tracking, accommodation, subversion, power struggles, compromise and transaction" (Olivier de Sardan 2005, 60) are a central element of anthropology of social change and development
- o   Mobilization of intermediary and informal structures, in the meaning of a variety of (local, social, professional, kinship) relationships
- o   Processes are diachronic

He also underlines the importance of interdisciplinary approach, and an actor-centred perspective as characteristics of the anthropology of social change and development described by him.

Having his geographical focus on especially rural areas in Africa, he dedicates a part of the book to assumptions on peasants, where he rejects ideas of a homogenous village community as well as the opposite of villagers as individual entrepreneurs, ideas of traditional and of a passive and complying or the reversed image of a rebellious peasantry (ibid, 73ff). Instead he depicts a heterogeneous "arena" (referring to Bourdieu's "champ"), a space

> [...] comprising specific institutions, a particular language, an unequally structured market, in which competition occurs on unequal terms, and in which ideologies, salaries, competences, institutions, symbols etc. come face to face. (Olivier de Sardan 2005, 190)

He prefers 'arena' as the term gives more tribute to the interactive character of development negotiations than the more common 'field'. The actors in this 'arena' form "strategic groups" (ibid) based on common interests; groups that are subject to continuous changes. A variety of different coalitions can form this way according to the specific context.

Conclusion

Development – just like 'nature' and 'environment(alism)' – is a power-laden concept which attributions and the way it is talked about changed significantly especially over the last century. Used to impose a certain path to follow and representing a specific worldview, I do agree with post-developmentalists that the term 'development' is a very problematic one. When I put 'development' as a central issue of this thesis, I use a dialectical approach, examining how it is used by whom and the oscillation between different positions. I look at

'development' as an 'arena' (see Olivier de Sardan 2005, 189f) or a social field, where different actors construct and negotiate the meaning and conditions of it. The Güneşköy-group openly adheres to an aim of creating some change, an important connotation of development. The question is what this change means and how it is negotiated with and in relation to Hisarköy.

Development theory points at power relations in this arena, at the influential character of history, as well as the actors' interests and at the multidimensionality of development activities. It reminds of the situatedness and constructedness of 'development'. Very importantly too, the theoretical discourses on development and environment show the dilemma between the felt need to act, to engage in promoting what one thinks is 'good' and the risk of imposing one's own understanding of the world, of using power structures and maintaining a system that one actually tries to oppose. This arena is what I focus on in the case of the Güneşköy cooperative and neighbouring Hisarköy.

2.2 Environmentalism, Development and Modernisation – the example of Turkey

Today's Turkey, like many other parts of the world, faces several kinds of environmental problems. Adaman and Arsel (2005) summarize the main problems in Turkey as follows:

- o rapid, high and unplanned urbanization[11]
- o unregulated industrialization
- o heavy use of chemicals and pesticides in agriculture
- o ill-managed tourism
- o energy and irrigation projects ignoring environmental dynamics
- o high population growth
- o uneven development and income distribution
- o persistent poverty (Adaman and Arsel 2005, 3)

Adaman and Arsel also state a slow constitution of an environmental movement in Turkey resulting from a general slow emergence of green politics, environmental actions that are rather 'not in my backyard' reactions than ideologically motivated and an unwillingness of

---

[11] The urban areas of the province of Ankara for example had 4.140.890 persons registered in 2007, 4.762.116 in 2011 (http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/adnksdagitapp/adnks.zul; 18.06.2012)

the society to face environmental degradation as a problem to be solved. Thus there is not much pressure on politics to act. Turkey nevertheless has a legislation on environmental rights and responsibilities with a *çevre hakkı* (environmental right) already included in the 1982-Constitution (Horuş 2007, 180f), and several regulations, conventions and laws signed since then, especially in the EU-accession process. The problem is therefore not so much a lack of adequate legislation but "serious enforcement failures on the part of the public authorities" (Adaman and Arsel 2005, 5).

Especially two influential factors are mentioned when referring to the establishment of a still weak but growing environmentalist policy in Turkey. On the national level a 'modernisation- paradigm' is very dominant in Turkish politics since the foundation of the Republic. International influence, especially the accession negotiations to the European Union, is mentioned as a second important factor.

National Development and Modernisation

Since the first years of the Republic, economic growth was considered a remedy for most social problems and a tool for development that would promote modernisation (Arsel 2005; Adaman and Arsel 2005; Baloglu 2009). 'Western' countries were considered as examples of modern states; modernising and developing Turkey thus meant following these examples with the state taking the necessary measures to ensure, i.e. to control such a transition (Saka 2010, 99; Arsel 2005, 18). A further distinct feature of Turkish modernisation is the stance towards religion – religious institutions were sharply limited and officially excluded to a large extent from the political discourse in the secular system of the Republic (see Berkes 1998).

Bruno Latour (cited in Arsel 2005) separates modernisation in a simple or first modernisation, that is preoccupied with control and calculation and a second or reflexive modernisation where the impossibility of having full control is accepted, or in other words, where "[w]e become conscious that consciousness does not mean full control" (Arsel 2005, 10). In regard to the role of nature in these concepts, whereas an aim of the first one was to control nature, to master what is going on, a "subjugation of nature in the name of national progress" (ibid, 19), the second one has to cope with problems that resulted from first modernisation and resource use that did not consider effects on the environment.

Although Turkey faces environmental problems caused by what Latour calls "first modernization", for example effects of deforestation, extensive agriculture and lack of city-planning, Arsel claims that the environmentalist movements in Turkey can't be post-modernist as modernisation was never fully achieved; as there is neither a call to abandon the concept of modernisation, nor to lessen state power in policy making. Put differently, in Turkey, a country classified as "developing economy" by the IMF (2012), "the developmental debate has never moved from 'developmental alternatives' to 'alternatives to development'" (Arsel 2005, 19), meaning from a critique within the current (economic) system to a critique of the current system.

Rural Development

According to Stirling's work (1965) "Turkish Village", "[o]ne of the most often repeated statements about Middle East society is that town and countryside are completely divorced" (Stirling 1965, 266). Taking this thinking of city and village as opposites as starting point, several movements tried to bridge this gap between cities/central government and urban areas in Turkey and 'develop' villages. An example are the *Halkevleri* (Houses of the People), that first tried to influence villagers through conferences in the city and then – as this method did not bring the anticipated success, undertook trips to the villages. This too was considered little successful as, as Saka states, "the trips to villages by *Halkevleri* did not go beyond touristy activities for the academicians" (Saka 2010, 86). She continues that the academicians were described as behaving as strangers in the villages and none of those writing on the villages' problems actually adventured into staying there overnight (ibid).

A second early example, so called Village Institutes, played also an important role in the first half of the last century's efforts to 'develop villages'. They were established to, as one of the ideological founders puts it, "enliven the villages"[12] meaning among others teaching reading and writing, bringing knowledge about modern technologies, culture and economy and assuring health services (Tonguç 1961, 102ff in Aytemur 2007, 104). İsmail Hakkı Tonguç's approach that not 'the peasant' but 'the nature' should be made use of (Tonguç 1961, 89 in Aytemur 2007, 101) shows a very anthropocentric approach, seeing nature as resource that can and should be exploited with humans as its master. Village

---

[12] "köyler canlandırmak"

Institutes, being reproached to foster revolutionary thought, i.e. to be too political were closed down in the mid-50s. An interesting claim of many civil society organizations (as well as religious communities) of being 'non-political', of distancing themselves from politics still encountered today (see Dabağcı 2011), might be drawn back to restrictive state regulations towards 'political' associations.

On governmental level, within the accession process of Turkey to the European Union, in the framework of the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance - Rural Development Programme (IPARD) a seven year support program to foster rural development in Turkey was elaborated by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA). Main arguments in the mainly economy focused paper are based on an evaluation of the current situation from a viewpoint of rendering Turkey as competitive on the European/international market as possible. It admits that with the integration in a global market, although the overall profit increased, the gap between rich and poor increased as well and that most of the profit in fact went to European trading organizations and not the farmers (MARA 2007; see also Harris 2005). The report underlines that "[a]griculture alone cannot provide sufficient income and employment for the whole rural population, particularly since further modernisation, adaptation to markets and meeting standards are likely to drive more farmers – especially smaller farms and subsistence farmers – out of business" (MARA 2007, 63). Therefore, a diversification of the production by the farms is seen as an important measure, where "activities to be developed need to […] contain a relatively easy to acquire know-how, exploiting as much as possible the inherent knowledge of the local population about the endogenous resources that may be valorised at local level" (ibid, 64). An inclusion of villagers in the development projects would be desirable but it is admitted that for the time being is rarely practiced. Some examples of consultation in the planning process or collaboration do nevertheless exist (ibid, 74).

Concerning quality of life, the report mentions that almost all villages in Turkey do have electricity, but about 20% of them face problems in regard to fresh water. Computer and internet usage in the rural area is only one third of that in cities. Health services are less accessible, an issue reflected for example in higher infant and child mortality or prenatal medical care. With most persons in the rural area being self-employed as farmers, they most of the time are not included in the public social insurance system (ibid.). The 9th Development

Plan points out another statistical fact: whereas the employment rate of women in urban areas is at 19,3%, in rural areas it is at 33,7%. The difference is explained by employment of women in the agricultural sector being comparatively widespread, while in cities due to social pressure many women stay out of the labour market (TBMM 2006, 60f). This difference nevertheless should not divert the focus from a generally rather low employment rate of women in Turkey. Relatively more women appearing as employed in the statistics furthermore does not mean that they all do have adequate social and health security or a regular income.

Although such statistics do not provide information on specific villages, they reveal structural differences between centre and periphery, city and countryside[13]. At the same time such information on governmental and earlier mentioned CSO interventions sheds some light on what is identified as a 'problem'. While *Halkevleri* for example focussed mainly on education, the governmental development plan has its emphasis on economical and on statistically measurable factors. The accounts also reveal a perspective that sees the central policy makers as the key to solve such 'problems'. It further appears that government development institutions' solving 'local problems' is mainly a means to the bigger issue of ensuring Turkey's competitiveness on the European and international market.

Civil Society and the State
Especially until the 80s a 'strong' state, a state that controlled most spheres of life, was propagated. Civil society was to a large extent suppressed and the fields where civil society was free to form were limited: criticism of the foundations of the Republic or any movement putting the unity of the country in question, were persecuted. Environmentalist groups existed in the form of beautification and reforestation associations since the beginning of the Republic, but it was just after the military intervention in 1980 and afterwards imposed change to economic liberalism, that a strengthening and diversification of environmental activism, as of civil society organizations in general, took place. Paradoxically, many formations of those times such as the Green party, established following the example of other countries and mostly active in Western Turkey, are described by Şahin as motivated less by

---

[13] Focussing less on city-village disparities but on more general regional differences, the South East Anatolia Project (Turkish abbr: GAP), a national large-scale 'development project' was established to "eliminate regional development disparities" as well as fostering "social stability and economic growth" (http://www.gap.gov.tr/about-gap/what-is-gap). It is praised by many – especially from government side – for its effects on the region, but also receives harsh critique in regard to minority rights, inclusion of local population and from environmentalist perspective. For a critical analysis of the project see p.e. Çarkoğlu and Eder (2005)

environmental concern itself than by resistance against the authoritarian-liberal regime (Şahin 2007, 191).

Adem (2005) classifies Turkish post-1980 environmental activism – after the mainly beautification activities earlier – in four categories that overlap but in the given order also reflect the history of environmentalism in the two decades that embed the turn of the millennium:

- o organization and institution building
- o social movement
- o professionalization and institutionalization
- o internationalization and project based work (Adem 2005, 74)

Besides the Green party, other associations leading for example to the declaration of Köyceğiz-Dalyan (South-western coast of Turkey) a Special Environmental Protection Area in 1988 and thus preventing hotels being built there are mentioned as examples for the first category.

The end of the 80s also saw the birth of several active environmental social movements that prevented for example two parks in Ankara (Güvenpark and Zaferpark) being destroyed to give place to buildings and a parking lot and that fought against hydro-electric power stations being built in Yatağan, Aliağa and the Fırtına Valley. The arguably most famous and important movements in Turkish environmentalism were the movements against the planned construction of a nuclear power plant in Akkuyu and against a gold mine in Bergama, with this last being the best known (see Horuş 2007, 181). Those movements formed to oppose specific plans by companies or the government and as such were rather local and short lived movements, but the involvement of different actors (lawyers, doctors, engineers, CSOs, labour unions, etc.) helped in politicizing environmentalism. Among the different forms to protest governmental plans was also the way via national law. Referring to existing legislation they applied to courts to show that those plans are against the law and won in most cases. They thus used a system of state regulations, that at the same time restricted the formation of social movements, to assert their claims (Adem 2005, 77).

An important concept in the analysis of state-CSO relations is participation. Paley

(2001) shows with examples from her research in Chile that liberalization was mainly understood as the state handing over responsibilities of covering educational, health or other social services to citizens and expecting them to organise those services for and by themselves. Some CSOs agreed with this state policy under the heading of participation. Other groups on the contrary contested this interpretation of participation and advocated that the concept is not about CSOs fulfilling state-responsibilities. For them, participation means a collaboration in the decision making process and they see it as their duty to hold the state accountable for its responsibilities towards citizens (see Paley 2001, 2ff).

An environmental sector in government and academia emerged in the beginning of the 90s with the ministry of Environment[14] (1991) the Chamber of Environmental Engineers[15] (1992) and the establishment of research centres and student clubs working on environmentalist topics. The emergence of economy-led associations especially in the second half of the 90s marked a new kind of environmentalism. Adem (2005, 78) names ÇEVKO[16], a foundation specialized on recycling, and TEMA[17], specialized on fighting erosion and reforestation, as examples of such environmental actors.

In regard to civil society, besides the turning point in 1980, the collapse of the economy in 2001 is seen as another turning point with a shift away from an all-controlling state towards the search of a more sustainable way of governing where civil society would play an important role (Keyman 2005, 45ff). This optimistic view is nevertheless a contested one:

> The state becomes civil when the demands of civil society fit in with the interest of the dominant classes, but remains 'uncivil' otherwise. […] Environmental issues have been included in the state agenda as a public relations exercise, to please international agencies or so as to not appear uncaring about environmental issues in international conferences organized by the United Nations. (Aydın 2005)

The actors in Turkey are as differentiated as the field of environmentalism itself (see Adem 2000, 2), from state institutions, to civil society organizations, from state-support

---

[14] This ministry was fusioned with the Ministry for Forestry in 2003 and closed down with the establishment of two new ministries in 2011, the Ministry for Forest and Water Issues and the Ministry for Environment and Urban Planning.
[15] http://www.cmo.org.tr/
[16] http://www.cevko.org.tr/cevko/home.aspx?lang=fr-CA; founded 1991.
[17] http://www.tema.org.tr/; founded 1992. In Adem's article, TEMA is presented as anthropocentric association that stresses the joyful character of environmentalism, giving an impression of superficiency and valueing marketability of activities higher than actual environmental concerns (Adem 2000, 129)

associations to state-policy opponents, from large associations to individual activists, from national to international networks. It is hard to impossible to count all environmental organizations in Turkey; some are linked from the homepage of the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM)[18] and Organic-Europe[19], still none of them claims to be a comprehensive collection of all actors in the field.

International Influence

Several aspects of international influence were already mentioned above. The pressure from outside for example was one of the reasons that economy was opened to the global market as well as for a loosening of restrictions on civil society formation and participation. Turkey adopts international environmental conventions and guidelines and with the EU accession negotiations aligns its legislation according to the criteria prescribed by the European Union. European and other international institutions do not only affect legislation, they are also instances of control and evaluation, publishing regular reports. The Progress Report 2010 for example mentions some progress concerning environmental issues, but also continuing problems concerning water and air quality, pollution control and a lack of administrative capacity, stating that "[p]reparations in the field of environment are at an early stage" (European Commission 2010, 89ff).

On the civil society level, especially the HABITAT II Conference held in 1996 in Istanbul helped an increased international networking of environmental activists, facilitating the formerly rather local perception of environmental issues being supplemented by a global perspective. As main environmental issues are not only local, national or global problems, but a combination of all, the position taken is that tackling them can only be effective if it is done simultaneously at all three levels (Aydın 2005, 66; see Ergun 2010).

Apart from providing a widening of perspective, as well as support in the struggle for specific issues, the internationalization also facilitates a professionalisation, an exchange of know-how and access to an information and support network, as well as to international funding possibilities and other resources (Aydın 2005, 67).

---

[18] http://www.ifoam.org/organic_world/directory/Countries/Turkey-Members.html
[19] http://www.organic-europe.net/997.html?&L=0

(Certified) Organic Agriculture – At the intersection of Agriculture and Environmentalism?

Organic farming is "a production system which avoids or largely excludes the use of synthetically compounded fertilisers, pesticides, growth regulators, and livestock feed additives" (McLaughlin 2007, 236), but as McLaughlin stresses, its definition is an ongoing struggle between different actors:

> [T]he path of organic food development is producing organic as contentious concept – as farmers, consumers, agri-businesses, TNCs, national and regional governments, certifying bodies engage in a struggle to influence the definition of organic farming. In the future, whether organic farming is narrowly defined as an ecological label consistent with a set of standardized practice or considered as part of a socio-ecological and political process that moves the entire food system towards sustainability will depend on the outcome of today's struggles within the organic movement. (McLaughlin 2007, v)

An information video by the Turkish Ministry of Agriculture names four basic principles of organic agriculture: to use only seeds that were not genetically transformed; to not use any fertilizer that might harm the soil; to not use chemicals that harm nature or do not decompose; to get certified and adequately name the produce. If a farmer wants to change to organic agriculture, he/she will just be recognised as such after a one to three year transition period, depending on the produce. Organic agriculture is not used to describe a return to ancient methods, neither does it reject modern technology or developments; it is rather a method to leave as little impact on nature as possible reached through a combination of both, traditional ways of production (knowledge, no chemicals) and modern technology and scientific findings. As such, the concrete application, which methods and produce are best, varies regionally.[20]

> Organic farmers have tilled Anatolian soil since the birth of agriculture, but the modern-day organic movement is a relative newcomer to Turkey. Unlike other agricultural export powerhouses, Turkey has a large farm population living on and from small farms. While many of those farms have always, in effect, been organic, concepts like organic certification and price premia are novel. Now, driven by export demand, they're catching on with dazzling rapidity. (Harris 2005)

---

[20] http://www.tarimtv.gov.tr/VD139_organik-tarim-uretim-ilkeleri.html

Equalling modernisation and development with economic growth, meant for the agricultural sector a propagation of increased productivity that was and to a certain extent still is to be achieved through an increased use of fertilizers and pesticides. The report on rural development published in 1970 for example measures how developed a region is by looking at the percentage of farmers using chemicals. The higher this percentage is, the more 'developed' a region is considered. This use is in the report correlated with higher education and better access to information and resources, whereas lack of education, of knowledge and of mobility were given as reasons for not using pesticides (DPT 1970). This perception of rural development was not only presented by national agencies, but reflected an international standpoint, with national as well as international funds and credits being provided as incentives for farmers to intensify their agricultural production (Aydın 2005, 62; Aydın 1990).

The negative effects of overuse of land and chemicals in agriculture appeared soon and caused a rethinking. Actual organic production started in 1984/85 following the demands from Europe with organic figs and raisins from the Aegean region and soon expanded to other products and regions. In 1992, the Association for Organic Agricultural Organization (ETO) was founded as an umbrella organization for all those involved in the production of organic food from farmers, processing institutions and distributors to certification and control institutions (Harris 2005; İstanbul Ticaret Odası 2006, 11).

In 2004, an organic agriculture law was adopted[21]. In contrast to above mentioned research in 1970 where the use of pesticides and fertilizers was taken as criterion of development, now an increase in organic agriculture is presented as a sign of sustainable development (TÜİK 2010). The 5-year National Development Plan 2007-2013 assumes that organic agriculture will continue to gain in importance and expects that the area used for organic agriculture will rise from 1% of the overall agricultural area in 2006 to 3% in 2013 (TBMM 2006, 60f).

The National Rural Development Strategy published in 2006 (DPT 2006) is according to its self-definition based on principles of local sensibility, participation and collaboration, sustainability, social inclusion, coherence in policies, effective supervision and effective resource use. The plan in theory aims at the improvement and diversification of employment

---

[21] http://www.tarim.gov.tr/uretim/Organik_Tarim,Organik_Tarim_Kanunu.html

opportunities, inclusion of marginalized parts of society, improvement of education and health services, improvement of live quality, foster environmentally friendly agriculture as well as protection and development of the rural area.

Looking at statistics by the Department for Agriculture, the number of farmers doing organic agriculture tripled between 2008 and 2010 from 14.926 to 42.097 with the production rising to 1,343.737 tons. At the same time, statistics also show a very uneven distribution of the number of producers, the used area and the average area of production per producer in the different geographical regions in Turkey.

Table 1: General Organic Production Data (including transition)

Year	Number of products	Number of producers	Agricultural area (ha)	Picking area (ha)	Overall prod. area (ha)	Production (ton)
2002	150	12.428	57.365	32.462	89.827	310.125
2003	179	14.798	73.368	40.253	113.621	323.981
2004	174	12.806	108.598	100.975	209.573	378.803
2005	205	14.401	93.134	110.677	203.811	421.934
2006	203	14.256	100.275	92.514	192.789	458.095
2007	201	16.276	124.263	50.020	174.283	568.128
2008	247	14.926	109.387	57.496	166.883	530.225
2009	212	35.565	325.831	175.810	501.641	983.715
2010	216	42.097	383.782	126.251	510.033	1.343.737

Source: http://www.tarim.gov.tr/uretim/Organik_Tarim,Organik_Tarim_Statistikleri.html (18.06.2012); own translation from Turkish to English

The share of agricultural area with certified organic agriculture was according to 2010-statistics by the European section of the Organic World website at 1,6% in Turkey with the average share being at 2,1% in European and 5,1% in EU countries[22].

In the Kırıkkale district, according to the statistics published by the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry, the number of farmers doing organic agriculture in 2010 is three; the products grown are onions, potatoes, spinach, sunflower, carrots, honey melon, broccoli, romaine lettuce, corn, beet, arugula, cauliflower, parsley, silver beet, purslane, radish, okra, cabbage and broad beans. All together those products make up for nearly 40

---

[22] http://www.organic-europe.net/europe-data-tables.html?&L=0; According to the same statistics, within EU countries Austria has the proportionally largest share of organic agriculture with 20% of the agricultural area being worked according to organic standards.

tons. In Kırıkkale, there are additional four farmers in the transition period, with eight hectare production area and 31 tons of produce.

The increase in organic agriculture is celebrated as an improvement, but the question of who profits from this development shows sobering results:

> [T]he bulk of the economic returns from Turkey's organic produce don't stay at home. The problem isn't that organic doesn't fetch high prices – it's just that the majority of the increase is in retail markups not in the modest growers' premiums and the retail markups flow almost entirely to European-based exporters and supermarket chains. (Harris 2005)

The idea to change this and to empower local production with the respective local population as target customer is at the basis of the Buğday association, the main organization in Turkey in regard to organic agriculture. Its founder Victor Ananias[23] opinion was that "people have to grow first for themselves, consciously. Then for their communities, and only then for export" (Ananias in Harris 2005).

Local markets

Most of the exports go to EU countries, with Germany being one of the main receiving countries of Turkish organic products. To make organic produce available for a greater number of persons within the country, and at the same time to provide a platform for farmers to sell their produce in Turkey, organic bazaars were founded. The first one was opened in the district of Şişli in Istanbul in 2006. Currently four organic weekly bazaars exist in Istanbul and another two in Ankara opened in 2008 and 2011.

One of the reasons, why still a rather limited – although growing – number of persons is attracted to organic products might be explained by different reasons such as a lack of knowledge, little trust in the certificate, own sources of supply, such as family owning land, or also the relatively high price difference between conventional and certified organic products.

---

[23] Son of a Chilean-Turkish couple, Victor Ananias (1971 – 2011) spent his early childhood in Germany, and then grew up a village close to Bodrum (Aegean Coast of Turkey). He is described as one of the main environmental pioneers in Turkey, advancing organic agriculture, ecovillage philosophy, and environmental awareness in general. (for more information see http://victorananias.org/?p=127)

> Weaknesses towards higher domestic consumption of organic products include the fact that organic products can be 70-200% more expensive than conventional ones. Turkish consumers perceive food products as already very healthy, as their country has always been an agrarian country that traditionally produces most of its own food. Therefore the appeal of certified organic products is not immediately apparent to them. Low trust in authenticity of labels is also a barrier and increases the need for effective marketing strategies. (MARA 2007, 37)

Besides organic agriculture, Good Agricultural Practice certificates within the GlobalGAP (former EurepGAP)[24] framework might be seen as an application in between organic and conventional agriculture, with some regulations on environmentally friendly production, but not as inclusive as the organic agriculture certificate.

An often expressed sceptical stance at organic agriculture questions whether this way of production would be able to provide for the nutritional needs of the world-population. The internet presence of the Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development of the European Commission provides the following answer in this respect: for the time being, no clear conclusion was found on whether organic agricultural practices lead to an increase or decrease of production, but findings suggest that at long term, production is about the same with both methods. The page also refers to a report by Cornell University (USA) on an organic farming trial project, where "over a 22-year trial period, organic farming produced the same wheat and soybean yields as non-organic farms, but used 30% less energy, less water and no chemical synthetic pesticides"[25].

Conclusion – Environmentalism and development in Turkey

As a short conclusion in regard to environmentalism and modernisation in Turkey it might be said that modernisation, understood mainly in economic terms, played and plays an important role in the country. The perception of environment and its protection depends very much on the individual or the respective group and with this perception also the importance of environmentalist considerations. The growing of an environmentalist movement in Turkey coincides with economic liberalization and international influences, especially the ongoing EU accession negotiations, resulting in a general strengthening of civil society after 1980. Actors come from different backgrounds, including locals, scientists, lawyers, etc. and defend a variety of different forms of environmentalism, from radical critique of the current system to

---

[24] http://www.globalgap.org/cms/front_content.php?idcat=9
[25] http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/organic/organic-farming/true-false_en

occupying a niche within the system. They are connected among each other, as well as with national and international associations and institutions, with a move away over the last decade from a single focus on local problems to a struggle on local, national as well as global level. An optimistic view of a more environmentally sensitive society and state is nevertheless relativised by some who perceive an opportunistic rather than a freedom or environmental responsibility orientation.

2.3 Ecovillages

Ecovillages are a particular lifestyle within the environmentalist movement, where environmental and social sustainability play an important role. The term 'ecovillage' was popularized by Diane and Robert Gilman's presentation "Ecovillages and Sustainable Communities" at a conference held in Findhorn in 1991 (Wight 2008, 16) and a paper that became known as the Gilmans' Report. In this report, Diane and Robert Gilman present a definition that is ever since referred to in almost all works on ecovillages. They define ecovillages as

> […] a human-scale settlement, harmlessly integrated into the natural world in a way that is supportive of healthy human development and can be successfully continued into the indefinite future. (Gilmans' report in Dawson 2008, 13)

With the Danish Ecovillage Network, the first national network uniting ecovillages was created in 1993. Two years later the Global Ecovillage Network (GEN) was founded and officially inaugurated during the Habitat II Conference in Istanbul. GEN is now the biggest network for ecovillages worldwide and as of March 5, 2012 lists 561 members[26]. As becoming a member of GEN is optional and by far not all communities register, the actual number of ecovillages worldwide is estimated at several thousand or even tens of thousands (Wight 2008, 17).

The concept of ecological communities nevertheless goes well beyond (see ibid). Some of the communities now part of the ecovillage network also trace their foundations back to the mid- and early 20th century. For example the Findhorn community in Scotland was registered

---

[26] http://gen.ecovillage.org/members.html

as a foundation already in 1972. Auroville in India was founded three years earlier and Solheimar in Iceland even started in the 1930s. Taking these three well-known examples, another important aspect of ecovillages can be illustrated: they are heterogeneous (Dawson 2008, 21):

Findhorn[27] might be seen as the birthplace of the ecovillage movement as a host of and participant in networking meetings and conferences. Findhorn is now an NGO associated with the United Nations Department of Public Information and thus actively participating in UN events. It has about 120 residents and receives 9000 visitors per year.

Auroville[28] is very shortly described as "universal town" project with a goal of creating a settlement for tens of thousands of people. It has a strong spiritual basis with an environmental focus. Dawson points out, that "today Auroville has the biggest concentration of alternative and appropriate energy systems in India" (Dawson 2008, 25). As example he mentions a kitchen worked by solar collectors able to cook up to 1.000 meals a day. Auroville hosts a Centre for Scientific Research on among others biomass and renewable energy. The fact that Auroville enjoys the support of national leaders facilitates its activities.

The Solheimar[29] community in Iceland was founded as an orphanage and home for disabled persons. The approach of disabled and not disabled children living and being educated together, as well as a more vegetable than meat based nutrition was then much criticised, but after overcoming initial difficulties the project influenced by anthroposophist thought gained national and international recognition as an ecological and social model. At the moment, more than a hundred persons live and work in Solheimar.

The diversity of ecovillages and ecovillage projects led to several attempts of defining what an ecovillage actually is, with different definitions putting forth different aspects of what is understood as an ecovillage. Some actors in the ecovillage field strive for more concrete criteria that a community or project has to fulfil to be considered as ecovillage, including for example only communities with regular long-term residents, or of a specific minimum

---

[27] http://www.findhorn.org/aboutus/vision/history/
[28] http://www.auroville.org/vision/background.htm
[29] http://solheimar.is/index.php?msl=english

number of residents or fields of activities. Most definitions nevertheless are pretty wide and woolly, as is also for example the definition by GEN:

> Ecovillages are urban or rural communities of people, who strive to integrate a supportive social environment with a low-impact way of life. To achieve this, they integrate various aspects of ecological design, permaculture, ecological building, green production, alternative energy, community building practices, and much more. (GEN)

A common point of definitions is nevertheless a focus on community and a common vision of an environmentally and socially sustainable lifestyle that motivates the involved persons to do what they consider as steps towards realizing this vision.

A critique of society and a model for the future

> Around the world, people are building communities that attempt to get away from the waste, pollution, competition and violence of contemporary life. (Helena Norberg-Hodge, International Society for Ecology and Culture, cited in Dawson 2008, 21)

One aspect of analysis of ecovillage is their being a critique of the larger society they are situated in, a society with a lifestyle they see as contributing to environmental and social degradation (Dawson 2008; Nathan 2009).

> The vision of the ecovillage pioneers [...] was grounded in a radical critique of the whole 'development' paradigm that underlies and indeed defines post-Enlightenment society. In the place of a linear, developmental model where stragglers (the Third World) follow on a path defined by the leaders (the First World) of indefinite growth, the ecovillage philosophy was based on respect for equality and diversity within the confines of a finite Earth. (Dawson 2008, 18)

The idea of ecovillages goes beyond criticising: the communities try to show a lived example of an alternative society. Lucas, in her introduction to Dawson's book on ecovillages, writes that "[s]uch villages are homes to the pioneers of a global future, based on sustainable living" (Lucas 2008, 9). Lisa Nathan describes them as "birthplace for societal opportunities, new ways of thinking and living in the world" (Nathan 2009, 62). For some, above mentioned critique of mainstream society goes as far as to say that a change from within is not possible; it needs a deconstruction from without. It is not enough to reform the existing system, but it needs a complete alternative (Dawson 2008, 17). This idea also

underlies the emphasis of most ecovillages to self-sufficiency. By growing the own food, ensuring energy sources such as solar panels or wind mills and reducing the overall level of consumption, in short a strong 'make it yourself' tradition, the communities strive to be as independent from the capitalist system as possible, to become "a comprehensive microcosm of the whole society" (Gilmans' report). This nevertheless does not mean a rejection of technology. Quite on the contrary, science and modern technology play an important role in the set up of most ecovillages. The question is not about not using for example electricity at all, but to use it in a more energy-efficient way, to optimize resource use.

The independence from outside remains in most cases utopian: Whereas for a large part the communities might be self-sufficient, they still depend on subventions, project based financing and for example social security payments or donations. Thus a critique of ecovillages is that their form of contesting the current system could not exist without the benefits of this system they are trying to create an alternative to (see Mahaffy 2011; Centgraf 2009).

Conflict and conflict resolution in Ecovillages

Conflicts have a special position in ecovillage literature. As a matter of fact, everywhere where people live together and take decisions together, conflicts emerge; ecovillages with a 'harmonious lifestyle' as a proclaimed aim are no exception. Olivier de Sardan, points to three statements by Gluckman (1956) on conflicts: they are a component of social life, they show social positions, rifts and cleavages and they contribute to the reproduction and reinforcement of social groups (instead of destroying them) (Olivier de Sardan 2005, 188). He nevertheless disagrees with the last point, countering that they might be turned into strengthening community, but the existential threat of conflict that might lead to the dissolution of a group should not be lost of view (Olivier de Sardan 2005, 188f). This perspective of conflict as danger, or at least challenge is shared by Sargisson and Sargent (2004), who in their work on conflicts differentiate between three main forms encountered in the ecovillage-context: conflict of principle, conflict over relationship and domestic conflict.

The first one, conflict of principle, is described as especially critical as it puts the existence of the community in question. The community is founded on some shared basic principles that they want to realize together. Therefore "[a] serious challenge to these

principles from within the group challenges the community's reason for being" (Sargisson and Sargent 2004, 147).

The second one, conflict over relationship, concerns the interpersonal conflicts or difficulties between different individuals. Within an ecovillage, such conflicts do not only affect the directly concerned individuals, but the whole community, following pretty much the principle of "my problems are everybody's problems" (Sargisson and Sargent 2004, 150). On the one side, besides negatively affecting others, this 'sharing' of problems might also carry the risk of an overestimation or overreaction by the intervening ecovillage members. On the other side, this sharing has the positive side that others have the possibility to help the constructive resolution of a problem.

The last category mentioned, domestic conflict, is conflict over tasks and rules and their compliance (Sargisson and Sargent 2004, 147ff).

Diana Christian, a resident in an ecovillage in North-Carolina offering seminars on ecovillage and community topics and visiting ecovillages all over the world, states in her book "Creating a Life Together" that only ten percent of eco-communities survive, while ninety percent fail. As reason for this high rate of break-ups she sees mainly structural conflicts.

> Most new-community failures seemed to result from what I call "structural" conflict - problems that arise when founders don't explicitly put certain processes in place or make certain important decisions at the outset, creating one or more omissions in their organizational structure. These built-in structural problems seem to function like time bombs. Several weeks, months, or even years into the community-forming process the group erupts in major conflict that could have been largely prevented if they had handled these issues early on. Naturally, this triggers a great deal of interpersonal conflict at the same time, making the initial structural conflict much worse. (Christian 2003, 7)

To detect those 'time bombs' planted by misunderstandings before they explode, or at least to limit its destructive force, ecovillages do generally have specific mechanisms for conflict resolution in place such as regular exchange platforms and specially assigned mediators and facilitators. Besides group meetings where interpersonal feelings are talked about, members of ecovillages are encouraged to practice non-offensive ways of critique, as

well as to be aware of one's own feelings, as not understanding the self is one of the core reasons of discomfort or difficulties with others. Christian specifies that developing good communication skills and learning to deal well with conflict are both ongoing challenges an eco-community has to face (Christian 2003, 21).

Ecovillages in Turkey

From the very beginning of the Global Ecovillage Network, Turkish representatives participated in the movement. Demet Irklı for example was member of the administrative board of GEN Europe, the European regional sub-network of GEN from 1998 to 2000. Furthermore, she was also founding member of EKOOP, a cooperative associated with Hocamköy, a project that might be seen as a predecessor of Güneşköy. With Deniz Dinçer, a biologist from Turkey is currently the vice-president of GEN Europe. Garp ecovillage community in Çanakkale, İmeceevi close to Edremit, Eco-Foca Ecological Village close to İzmir and Knidia Eco-Farm close to Marmaris are listed besides Güneşköy among the registered ecovillages. Güneşköy is the only one in Central Anatolia; the others are on the Aegean and the Mediterranean Coast.

The Turkish Network for Ecological Settlements EKOYER[30] counts eleven members who regularly meet. Buğday Camtepe, Collective Evolutions, Dedetepe Çiftliği, Dutlar, Güneşköy, Kardeş Bitkiler, Knidia, Marmaric, Pastoral Vadi, Sinek Sekiz and Yeniköy all have different forms, different areas of work and different foci.

Marmaric[31], in inland Izmir, is an association aiming at creating an environmentally sustainable settlement and hosts today the internationally connected Permaculture Research Institute of Turkey. Pastoral Vadi[32] is an ecological farm at the Mediterranean Coast that aims at self-sufficiency and is specialized on eco-tourism. Another ecological settlement consists of a family-enterprise (Dedetepe; visitors not counted) and again another member is not an ecological settlement, but a magazine dedicated to environmental issues working closely with ecovillage(-initiative)s (Sinek Sekiz). The second project in Central Anatolia, Kardeş Bitkiler[33], has a land situated a little more than one hour drive north of Ankara in Güdül/ Tahtacıörencik Köyü. In collaboration with farmers from the village the group of several

---

[30] http://ekoyer.org/
[31] http://marmaric.org/english/
[32] http://www.pastoralvadi.com/pastoral_valley.aspx
[33] http://kardesbitkiler.blogspot.com/

families and individuals from Ankara wants to create an orchard of local fruit trees and foster companion planting with a special focus on medicinal herbs. They also organise eco-touristic and educational activities as well as social, ecological and economic activities in support of the local population.

The described projects all have in common that they try to create a space for a life combining the overlapping motivations of environmental sustainability, personal self-fulfilment and traits of what was earlier described as CSOs' involvement in rural development.

Existing Research and Research Networks

Research on and in ecovillages is increasing very fast. It is a preferred field for presentations, projects seminar papers, thesis and dissertations. A short search on ProQuest Thesis gives 61 hits[34] on the term 'ecovillage' with an exponential increase over the last years. Additionally, several web forums exist on ecovillage research[35] providing a platform for exchange for scientists and activists and some ecovillages even have a special person in charge of 'interested researchers'[36] with Sieben Linden in Germany being arguably the most demanded in Europe and effective in documenting. Its webpage lists different works written on and carried out in the community over the last years.[37] Whereas most of the researches in the fast growing field, where social scientists take an important share, focus on inner-community aspects like history, planning, decision making, ecology and conflict resolution, some few also look at the interaction with the 'outside', the interaction of the ecovillage with the surrounding villages and cities.

Andreas Marcus, an educational science and social and cultural anthropology graduate, currently works at the Rachel Carson Centre for his ongoing dissertations project on the model-character of ecovillages, where he – very close to my research structure – starts from the 'model character (cl)aim of ecovillages'.

Part of Salina Centgraf's thesis on Sieben Linden was the perception of Sieben Linden in the neighbouring villages/towns (Centgraf 2009). She found several challenges in the

---

[34] http://search.proquest.com/dissertations/; as of June 15, 2012
[35] p.e. www.globalecovillages.org; http://ecovillages.wordpress.com/gfg/; http://www.ic.org/
[36] http://www.auroville.org/research/academics.html
[37] http://www.siebenlinden.de/htmcontent9987.html

relationship between the community and its neighbours: lack of transparency by the ecovillage community, different values and priorities, geographical distance between the centres and the remote eco-community, as well as prejudices and a lack of interest on both sides (ibid, 91ff).

Elizabeth Mahaffy worked for her Master's thesis at the department of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning at Tufts University on Sirius ecovillage in the USA and the nearby town, starting from a question similar to Centgraf's. With similar results to the earlier study, Mahaffy takes her analysis a step further. One of her findings was that while she asked for how the communities interact, most of the interviewees emphasised a lack of interaction. The ecovillagers put forth differences in ideology and interests, whereas other persons from the town mentioned distance as reasons for little interaction. Three main limitations distilled by Mahaffy are a lack of specific programmes aiming at the town or at neighbours[38], a lack of neutral spaces where interaction could take place and that events of interaction were mainly one-time or past activities (Mahaffy 2011, 86). Financial aspects affected the perception of the ecovillage by town-residents insofar as Sirius as a non-profit association is tax-exempted, what is considered as unfair as they use the same public services as everyone else (ibid, 74ff). Notwithstanding these findings, she also uncovers "discrete points of interaction that, over time, can lead to inter-group connections" (ibid, 73). Those discrete points of interaction consist of participation in common events, volunteering in the municipality or the ecovillages community supported agriculture or bio-fuel projects (ibid, 70f).

Conclusion – Situating the research

Both concepts, environmentalism and development, face charges of post-colonial behaviour, of presenting a way to impose a worldview on others by the way it is put into practice and to reinforce existing power structures they claim to oppose. In the case of development, whereas in theoretical discourses on development, a sole focus on economy was mostly abandoned, in practice it seems to persist. Although most activities declared as 'development strategies' do recognise the multi-dimensionality of reasons to change, actual

---

[38] She shows that the ecovillage organizes activities where "everyone" is invited but that individuals often do not feel themselves addressed by this general invitation. A personal invitation on the contrary would appeal more according to the statement.

efforts to address this multi-dimensionality are criticised for being half-hearted, means of legitimating or fund-provider oriented.

In the same way, an understanding of a linear development was sceptically viewed in most development discourses (as is one of independent developments too) but the idea of model 'developed' countries and regions continues to persist. Growing recognition of the local and global interdependence of economical, social and political processes leads only in a few cases to a critique of the system rather than an ongoing grasp on the idea of change within the system. That is where the ecovillage movement comes in: many ecovillages actually engage in trying to search for an alternative lifestyle, with respect for each other and the environment and social and environmental sustainability being key targets. The theoretical discussions on environmentalism and development presented above poignantly show the dilemma between critique and providing for an alternative. This dilemma is one of the tensions in the 'arena' this research is situated in.

Another tension is the (alleged?) gap between city and village with a long tradition of 'rural development' activities in Turkey from CSO side but also an institutionalized state policy towards 'developing' and 'modernising' rural areas, understanding 'development' mainly as economic growth. A tension that relates with the need to critically reflect such divides and to show different perspectives

With those tensions in view, one of the questions treated in the current research is the presentation of Güneşköy – of the 'arena ecovillage-initiative' or the 'development institution' – by its members, trying to distinguish different levels in aims and to shed light on what kind of change the different members envision.

In a second step, I widen the arena to include Güneşköy's – as one member called it – 'interact', for the purpose of this study meaning farmers from Hisarköy. The Güneşköy cooperative practises and promotes organic agriculture as a part of healthy lifestyle respectful to the environment. After their arrival to Hisarköy, some farmers also obtained the certificate for organic agriculture. In a similar manner to the two above mentioned studies on different perspectives in environmentalism (cf Hansen, Noe, and Højring 2006; Haenn 2006), a second question is to take a closer look at how actors from the cooperative as well as from Hisarköy

engage in negotiating organic agriculture, how they present and 'sell' the concept. Whether and how villagers resist, encompass or change notions of organic. What kind of 'strategical groups' form in this process and what are the interests involved? From this concrete aspect of promoted change, I will turn to the question of how the project in general is perceived in Hisarköy, and how actors from both sides interact (cf Mahaffy 2011; Centgraf 2009), again focussing on differentiating strategical groups as well as on how participation is claimed and practiced.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH

The following chapter will dwell on the research process that preceded the final written version of this thesis. More specifically, I will focus on my access to the field, highlight some aspects of methodology and then describe and reflect on experiences in the field. Without referring to every single step and consideration during my research, they were mainly informed by the Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory (Charmaz and Bryant 2007), Basics of Qualitative Research (Corbin and Strauss 2008), Reflexive Ethnography (Davies 2008) and Research Methods in Anthropology (Bernard 2006) that were loyal guides and companions from starting formulating first questions to the present thesis, with all the advices on interaction in the field, on field notes, codes, memos and writing up, in short for the long process in between.

3.1 Access to the field

My first visit to Güneşköy was already in 2007, shortly after my arrival to Turkey and it was the first place that I saw apart from university campus and sightseeing places in Ankara. I was fascinated by the colours and shapes of the landscape and the possibility to get some experience of what it means to do agriculture in this region. I went there several more times during my Erasmus exchange year.

When I returned to Ankara in 2009, I again started going to the land and this time realized how much more than a 'green island to work with the earth and relax for academicians from the capital' it was – it is an ambitious project that combines many different aims, perspectives and expectations within the group as well as in relation to the nearby village.

Environmentalist activism was already a point of interest of mine for years, but I was for a long time uncertain of how to combine it with my studies. Hitting upon the reader "The Environment in Anthropology" (Haenn and Wilk 2006) during library research for one of my classes combined with the multifaceted image I got at that time from Güneşköy tipped the scales and I decided to dedicate my thesis research to the relationship between the environmental cooperative and the village it is part of.

In a first step, I approached my main contact person in the Güneşköy group who proposed me to write a short description of my project, explain my motivation and ask whether they would give their permission and support to such a study. That is what I did and she then forwarded this message to the other members via the internal mail group. The two written answers to the request both express careful support, but both not without reservations: the first mentions "if the conditions are suitable"; the second bases the support on the conclusion that "she knows Güneşköy well enough" (mail GK intern, May 11, 2010) and invites me to come to the Wednesday meeting the following day, where the decision would be taken. Thus, the following evening, I again presented my project in a few sentences. None of the present members had any objections and they promised me support, i.e. to give interviews, so I never learnt what "suitable conditions" were or what the reaction would have been if I had not known Güneşköy "well enough".

After the approval of the topic by my thesis supervisor Sabine Strasser, I again confirmed with the members of the group and this time also with the neighbour and at the same time *muhtar* of Hisarköy. The *muhtar*, the mayor of the village, is the official representative of the village and being elected to this position means besides some legal privileges (like the right to a service weapon that he proudly showed us as proof of his position), political and social capital in Hisarköy, thus 'having a say'. He too expressed positive attitudes and additionally assured me that there is no problem in talking to villagers and staying in the village for the time of the research. Moreover, he directly recommended his sister in law who lost her husband and lives with her two children and an aunt in the village centre as a "suitable place to stay for women".

Whereas the project members showed a lot of support during the whole research and spared a lot of their time to answer my questions, actual access to the village turned out to be

more difficult: limitations of language (Turkish as spoken in the university environment turned out to be quite different from the Turkish spoken in Hisarköy; see below), of being an outsider, of social conventions in the village did not provide the same starting situation and finding persons who know about the project and are willing to talk about it posed an unexpected challenge.

3.2 Methodology

I started joining weekend-trips as often as possible in April 2010 and first recorded interviews in July 2010. In June, I also stayed overnight in the village together with a Güneşköy member for the first time. We continued several overnight stays in the following months; three times I also went alone. These overnight stays were important for building relationships and trust and dinners or visits to the neighbours in long winter evenings were vital sources of information exchange (cf Saka 2010). What caught my attention in one of the first stays, were comments on Güneşköy being an example for Central Anatolian villages. This led me directly to the question "how then is the project seen by the neighbouring village and how are they interacting?" In the preliminary phase during the first visits where I started to look at Güneşköy and Hisarköy as my field of research, it became very apparent that there are many tensions concerning the perceptions of what Güneşköy is and what it should be, turning the focus to expectations, (dis)illusions and how they are coped with. Taking reference to Grounded Theory (Charmaz and Bryant 2007; Corbin and Strauss 2008), I tried to let the respondents guide part of the research direction by constantly evaluating and adjusting earlier questions in the light of the received answers.

Formal semi-structured face-to-face interviews
The face to face interviews were held in a semi-structural way, meaning that although I had my prepared questions, I was trying to follow the explanations instead of imposing my line of topics. Such interviews provided the space for all persons to express their opinions and at the same time established my image as a researcher. Bernard recommends this semi-structure especially for elite members of a community as it "shows that you are prepared and competent but that you are not trying to exercise excessive control." (Bernard 2006, 212) In the village, I felt that the pencil, notebook and recording device provided a certain necessary

authority and facilitated keeping persons concentrated on the interviews.

I prepared a guide in both Turkish and English consisting of three main parts for formal interviews being held with members of the Güneşköy group and villagers who are in close contact with Güneşköy: the first one consisted of learning what Güneşköy is, by asking the respondents to describe Güneşköy, its aims and activities and the members additionally why they joined, the motivation to continue and their role in the cooperative. The second part focused on learning more about the relationship and interaction with Hisarköy, meaning more specifically how the interaction started, i.e. how Güneşköy came to chose and buy the land in Hisarköy, how this relationship is perceived by villagers and members, what role Hisarköy plays for Güneşköy and vice versa, how they are interacting, how they are affecting each other and which expectations exist. The third part takes ecological agriculture as a common point of interest of both the cooperative and some farmers and looks at how its meaning is communicated.

The interviews in the village were all carried out in Turkish, among the members some replied in English, some in Turkish, some in a mixture of both. Throughout this thesis, citations from originally Turkish statements do have the original Turkish wording in the footnotes.

Transcription and analysis

Transcribing the recorded interviews – especially the ones that were made in Turkish – was a time consuming challenge that I nevertheless did not want to hand on to a paid transcriber, because I felt that doing it myself, even if it takes a lot of energy and time, will help me in the further research by on one side bringing me closer to my data and on the other side getting better acquainted with environmental vocabulary and especially the villagers' way of talking. As also in Austria and probably most parts of the world, every part of Turkey presents some peculiarities in spoken language; the pronunciation and sentence structure using in Hisarköy differs from the 'official' Turkish taught at university. For example the question *"biliyor musun?"* (do you know?) in standard Turkish would be pronounced *"biliyon?"* in the village, making it difficult to discern it as a question and the person it is referring to. That way, over time, I got used to swallowing some word-parts and softening others. Another time I was surprised to hear university students being named as *"ODTÜ'nün*

bebeleri" (ODTÜ babies) and learnt that also in other villages the term *"bebeler"* is used in a general, non-pejorative way for "children" and by elder persons also for university students. Furthermore, I learnt the terms for livestock units, some home-made food I have never seen before, the very fine sand that remains at the fields after flooding, etc, etc.

During days of listening and writing, first 'red lines' and 'hotspots' appeared, that took clearer shapes in the process of coding, organizing and first analysis of interviews and field notes. For this step the qualitative data analysis program MaxQDA[39] turned out very useful. When I finally felt that I got the main concepts, I transferred them first to a mindmap[40], where I structured and expanded them, and afterwards to the present format. During writing and rewriting, moving, deleting meant to continuously go back and forth between data and written document.

All names were changed, as I promised the interviewees that the data will be anonymous. For all citations from the field-data the context (interview or field notes from informal talk), the alias name, whether the person belongs to Güneşköy (GK) or Hisarköy (HK) and the date are given. When a description or citation would reveal the person behind an alias, an anonymous reference to "a Güneşköy member" or "a person from Hisarköy" is used instead of the alias.

3.3 Experiences in the field

Being a young female researcher
The probably most difficult part of staying in the village was due to me being a young female person. As such, I am not supposed to walk around in the village alone, especially anywhere close to the coffeehouse, where men are sitting, or talk to persons who I do not know. During my first stay alone in the village this was made very clear by the women I stayed with, as well as by the *muhtar*, a relative of her, who told me on the third day of my stay *„Aşağıya inme! Ayaklarını kıracağım!"* (Do not go down [close to the coffeehouse]! [If you go,] I will break your legs!) This was of course said jokingly, he would not have broken

---

[39] I first started with the data storage and analysis program Atlas ti, but then due to structuring and overview reasons and personal preferences MaxQDA seemed more suitable.
[40] Mindjet MindManager 7

my legs but I felt that the threat was real – not in its literal meaning as a physical threat, but that defying would mean a stop of support and thus render the continuation of my research impossible.

I, for my part, felt very secure in the village and never had any experience of disrespectful behaviour when walking around, and thus could not completely understand this restriction, but I felt like I have to comply with the social conventions for two reasons. Firstly, staying with one of the women in the village, I do not want to harm her reputation in the village and not make people talk bad about her letting a foreigner stay at her house. Secondly, with non-compliance with those conventions, I feel that people would not give me the opportunity to participate in their lives and to answer my questions. Thus, when staying in the village, I tried for example to respect the dress code for women: although I did not use a headscarf (in summer though some hat or scarf as protection against the sun), I always wore long, not tight pants and shirts. This way of dressing is also used by female Güneşköy members and besides preventing negative reactions, protects from sun, scratches and ticks or other insects.

Nevertheless, not being seen as a person with equal rights and freedom of move, the reduction to being a woman, and thus confined to staying in specified borders that I am not used to, was a psychologically exhausting experience for me and probably also for the persons 'parenting' me.[41] At one occasion for example, I planned to return to Ankara with the workers constructing the glasshouse in Güneşköy, but my hosts strongly resisted because as they saw it, I was entrusted to them. If anything happened to me on the way, they would feel responsible and like having to justify themselves in front of the Güneşköy members. In the end, I had to stay for one more day to wait for the next visit by the *hocas*. As a male researcher, or at least as an older woman, my insights in the village life and the things that were told me would probably be very different.

How much outsider am I? – Situational positioning within the field
A much encountered question was – usually not directly addressed to me but to anyone next to me – *"yabancı mı?"* (Is she a foreigner?). And yes, during my time in Güneşköy and

---

[41] In fact I was no stranger to such a 'protectionist' approach, that I saw as well by especially male friends during my years in Ankara, but city-life and my own environment, left more room for escapes and negotiations. For similar 'parenting' experiences during research see Ergun's account of her fieldwork in Azerbaidjan (Ergun and Erdemir 2010).

Hisarköy, I was a stranger, a foreigner, but at the same time I was also researcher, volunteer, guest, student and friend. Being mostly a stranger in the beginning, by time many of the relationships that I build with Güneşköy-members and villagers turned into something that I would call friendships. The ambivalent feeling that I have concerning those relationships might resemble those El-Or describes from her fieldwork in Tel Aviv, where she found it hard to traverse borders between her and her ultra-orthodox Jewish interviewee. Over time they developed a friendship, but within the framework of the research (El-Or 1997 cited in Coffey 1999, 43). It is a different field and a different situation but me too, especially in the village, I found it hard to get access and now, still feel myself distanced as I know that the closeness is limited in time. The life in the village is not my life; it is not a place where I could live forever. With this coming and going, not only back and forth between Hisarköy and Ankara but also between Austria and Turkey, with the freedom of travelling, of choosing the place to stay, with the education I got and the points of view I have, I would always be different, a double outsider as not from the village and as foreigner.

This double-foreignness in some cases turned out to be an asset, as that way I was not automatically supposed to know about conventions, I could ask questions that someone less foreign couldn't or wouldn't ask. I was able to question at points that would be considered disrespectful if done by 'insiders'.

Pranee Liamputtong (2010) lists James Banks' categorization into indigenous insider, indigenous outsider, internal insider and external outsider. Although this distinction might be useful in some cases, my research experience agrees more with Devika Chawla who says that "we are all 'another's' in the field, because there will always be facets of ourselves that connect us with the people we study and other factors that emphasise our differences" (Chawla 2007, 2 cited in Liamputtong 2010, 119) I felt myself in between: I grew up on a farm in a small village, thus knew about some aspects of village and farming reality, but for example the differences in treatment of women and men were new to me and I struggled with the limitations that I felt imposed upon me because of being female. Thus, some of the experiences are very different; some of them resemble very much what I know from home. I furthermore share values of environmental and social sustainability, organic agriculture, fair-trade, community focus, etc. In short, I felt many parallels during my research, but also very different in other moments. A feeling that cannot simply be classified as either out- or insider,

but although dominated by the first, includes both of them agreeing with Ergun and Erdemir that "there is neither a comfortable insider nor a comfortable outsider position" but rather "a dialectical process involving constant negotiation" (Ergun and Erdemir 2010, 34).

What is social anthropology?

>*"I study Social Anthropology" - "Eh, ne demek?" (What does it mean?), and*
>*"What do you actually do?"*

With those questions by villagers, I found myself confronted with the question that accompanied me during all my university life and still for me remains one of the most difficult to answer, especially if the answer is expected in one or two sentences and Turkish, so I contented by giving examples of research questions: "I try to find answers to a question. For example, what is the meaning of "environment"? How do people understand something? How do they interpret it, how do they talk about it? That's what I try to find out. And to do so, I ask questions, listen, observe, take notes." And then, if somebody who already knows me longer and is more familiar with what I am doing in the village is around, he/she gets impatient and resumes in few words: "She is researching us", "She is researching them [the project group]", "How we see them and so on" resulting in – what I could not get with my longer explanations – an understanding smile and a sighted "Ah!"

>*"What does this now have to do with anthropology? Where is the culture?"*

After one of the interviews one of the members asks me, with which programs I will analyze my material. When I answered that what I am going to use is not really an analysis method like SPSS, but for qualitative data processing, the reaction seemed to contain some disappointment.

Mid-December 2010 I presented some points from my 5-day stay in the village, like the feedbacks I got when asking about Güneşköy or organic agriculture, the situation at the school and the differential treatment of women and men in the village. Among the questions following my presentation was also "what does this now have to do with anthropology? Where is the culture?" After about half a year interviews, visits to the field and intensive talks, this comment showed that also within the project group, I failed in explaining clearly what my research was about and that there was little information on the broad field of social

anthropology. It also opened the way to the question of what is understood as culture. In an earlier interview, when I asked this same member for a definition, he explained that with culture he means

> […] the life-culture in Anatolia, practical culture […]. For example food culture; for example farming culture; for example the culture of producing naturally. That. Local culture, traditional culture, but this is a living and producing culture. Not some saloon-gossip. Could I make myself understood? … The way they live, stay alive, plant, harvest, sell the seeds; which kinds they use how; the way they collect them, produce them as food, as natural food.[42] (Interview Hakan, GK, 04.07.2010)

The question whether my research includes culture or not, is to be answered by the individual reader. I just want to refer to the plurality of definitions and understandings in regard to the term culture, changes in its use in discourses as well as its contestations over time. My aim is not engaging in a definition of culture, cultures or to culture, a discussion that is lead elsewhere (Rapport and Overing 2003, 92ff; Barnard and Spencer 2006, 136ff). Far from defending myself a concept of culture as only the from ancient ancestors submitted knowledge of practices, that if lost leads to 'cultureless' groups; as a set of practices of an exotic other (Rapport and Overing 2003, 100) or as something that allows to value some groups and practices over others; I acknowledge the importance of looking at the use and contestation of such concepts within development discourse.

---

[42] "Anadolu'daki yaşam kültürü, pratik kültürü […]. Mesela yemek kültürü, mesela tarım kültürü, mesela doğal üretim kültürü. Bu. Yani yerel kültür, geleneksel kültür, ama bu yaşayan ve üreten bir kültür. Öyle salon dedikodusu değil … Anlatabildim mi? … Nasıl yaşıyorlar, nasıl hayatta kalıyorlar, nasıl ekiyorlar, nasıl biçiyorlar, nasıl tohum satıyorlar, hangi türleri nasıl kullanıyorlar, bunları nasıl biriktiriyorlar, bunları nasıl gıda olarak, doğal gıda olarak üretiyorlar."

CHAPTER IV

GÜNEŞKÖY, AN ECOVILLAGE INITIATIVE

> The strong point of Güneşköy is that these crazy people are trying to do something like this. If you ask to some other people, they would not even start. [...] So the strong point is that these people have some will to do something. (Interview Bora, GK, 18.03.2011)

The following chapter is dedicated to descriptions of Güneşköy by its members, providing answers to what the aims and motivations of the group are and what the "something" is that "these crazy people are trying to do". The meaning of 'crazy' was specified by Bora as thinking and acting out of the mainstream, stating that the persons doing such a project might seem out of mind if seen from the viewpoint of capitalist consumption society. The following pages will present a variety of ideas and ideals that the members try to realize within the project, in order to show the approach and perspectives represented in the group, but also tensions and disillusions that they were and are confronted with.

4.1 General Presentations of a Güneşköy "We"

In all interviews, the first question after a short presentation of my research was how the respondents would explain Güneşköy to someone who doesn't know it. Statements differed from person to person, within the Güneşköy group as well as – as shown later on – among villagers, everyone putting forth different and various aspects. Güneşköy members used among others the terms ecovillage initiative, experimental place, the land, project for natural living or cooperative when talking about Güneşköy.

For a general introduction of the project, I will firstly present information provided at the homepage of Güneşköy[43] and in a second part focus on the legal status of Güneşköy.

---

[43] http://www.guneskoy.org.tr/

Written descriptions of Güneşköy

The webpage of Güneşköy is available both in Turkish and English. Concerning the general description, the Turkish version informs that the cooperative was established on 21 September 2000 in Ankara, that it owns 8,4 hectare land in Hisarköy, that it has nine members, is a member of Global Ecovillage Network (GEN) Europe and not profit-oriented. The English version is more detailed in its description of the cooperative. It lists the names of all the members, of some other active participants and volunteers from Ankara, Hisarköy and elsewhere. It then gives a short overview of what happened in Güneşköy, starting with the foundation of the cooperative in 2000, water problems, activities on the land, until the 4th vegetable boxes project of the cooperative in 2009.

By the Turkish version, the mission is described in one sentence as working on the realisation of a sustainable life[44] that does not destroy nature or more repair already destroyed structures. This is to be achieved by adapting planting/agriculture, energy resources, architecture, transportation and resource use more to the needs of nature and the environment. In the English version, the aims of Güneşköy are given as the reasons of its establishment:

> Why Güneşköy?
> o   Because we aim to design an example that will be able to inspire people living in villages anywhere in Turkey. That is why we chose to start with poor soil, that we intend to work and enrich using natural ecological means.
> o   Because we hope to show how cooperation between long-term residents of the area and others can benefit everyone: by reducing migration from villages, by using resources more effectively, by sharing information, by mutually supporting each other, by bridging between official sources and those who work the land.
> o   To prove what can be done without quality arable land by developing uncultivated land.

It is interesting to see, how central social relationships with the local population are in this account, whereas there is no mentioning of them in the Turkish version, revealing different foci and priorities among the members already from the official statements at the webpage with the texts not being translations but contributions of different members representing their positions.

---

[44] Güneşköy Kooperatifi kırsal kesimde sürdürülebilir yaşamı gerçekleştirmek üzere çalışmalar yapmak ve bunu yaymak amacını güder.

Company, cooperative foundation – confusion about the legal status of Günesköy

In interviews and informal talks the question of the legal status of Güneşköy was brought up, leading to blurred answers. On the website described as cooperative, in talks and interviews company and foundation were also mentioned: What then is the official legal status of Güneşköy?

One of the members explained that although in fact being a civil society organization, legally Güneşköy was a company (Interview Namık, GK, 01.07.2010). This same member also added that the term company is not among the preferred terms for Güneşköy, as it has the connotation of being directed towards profit, whereas Güneşköy does not have such an aim. Nevertheless, for the handling of financial and bureaucratic issues such as salaries and insurance for the employees, income and expenses, and taxes, there was a need to be registered as a company. Again another member specified that they established Güneşköy as cooperative, but in the future, if they produce more, they might have to get registered as company (Interview Bora, GK, 18.03.2011).

In general, 'cooperative' was the most used term among members to describe Güneşköy. On the webpage the project is also mentioned as the "first ecological cooperative" in the province. Some of the members pointed at the problem of environmental cooperatives being little known and thus people having the image of cooperatives usually being housing cooperatives, with the aim of constructing new buildings or like a dairy cooperative in Hisarköy, to be able to sell milk easier and at better prices. This image again involves to a certain extent a profit aim and thus - even if only in a slighter way - implies the same problems in perception as company. A description as foundation, for its part, was rejected by members of Güneşköy and only used by villagers as result of the earlier involvement of a foundation in Hisarköy, something that will be explained in detail later on. For the purpose of this thesis I will stick to the terms cooperative and project that I will use interchangeably for Güneşköy.

4.2 Aims and activities of Güneşköy

Güneşköy is registered as a member of the Global Ecovillage Network - Europe and

most of the members mentioned 'ecovillage' as aim at the beginning. But actually living together in community at the land was not given as one of today's aims by anyone. Not 'ecovillage' as a place where people actually live together but 'ecovillage' as a way of thought, as a vision of a more harmonious and respectful lifestyle including humans, animals and plants was put forth; the initiative, the project-character and the underlying philosophy and concerns were stressed.

Concerning the aims, the main themes that were brought up by the members can be summarized as social, environmental, educational, scientific and recreational aims with different target groups, some of them grounded in the present time and others more future-oriented. More specifically, issues mentioned emphasise community-building, within the group as well as with the villagers; improving life conditions in villages and in this way preventing migration to cities.

"Building community [...] and support each other"

A basic aspect of the ecovillage-philosophy is (re)building of community (see Dawson: 12f). This aspect, the importance given to social relationships were emphasised by all the members:

> The aim was going together; living together; realizing this together.[45] (Interview Hakan, GK, 04.07.2010)

> The main aim is building community. Working together [...] and support each other. [...] There are some projects where you do not need other people's support. But this is not my idea. I want the community to build around the activities and the people to support each other. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

Thus, this mentioned community does not only include the members of Güneşköy but also the villagers of Hisarköy, as the last citation shows, as well as all the people active in the projects. Efforts are taken to keep and improve social relationships. The community aimes at would mean working together, building by sharing, living following an *"imece usulü"* (Interview Namık, GK, 01.07.2010) – a term that refers to traditionally collective works in villages, as for example the construction of community buildings, maintenance of village pastures or the preparations of festivities. Concerning interaction, some of the members

---

[45] "Hedef; birlikte gidecektik, birlikte yaşayacaktık, yani onu birlikte gerçekleştirecektik."

56

appear very talented in creating respectful and constructive communication, whether by nature or enhanced by workshops in Non-Violent Communication that some of the members participated in. At the same time, it is especially those ones who also mention some sobering concerning this aim of community building:

> In Güneşköy, at least some of us try to establish a good social network, but I cannot tell that we were very successful on that. I see Güneşköy as a big family, or at least I wanted to see it as such but in the end I didn't feel that we have accomplished that goal. (Interview Filiz, GK, 22.09.2010)

The issue of social relationships between Güneşköy and Hisarköy, as well as the role of communication will be treated in detail later on.

"Creating some awareness"

Awareness-creating, educational aims focus on two different groups with different kinds of knowledge to be transmitted. For the first group, children and adults from the city, Güneşköy can provide a place for them where they can meet nature and learn about it by experience. Especially the group 'çocuk ve doğa' – 'children and nature' organises several trips every year to farming projects, among others to Güneşköy, where children (and their parents) can learn about processes in nature by experimenting, playing and helping the farmers in their work of checking the water system, weeding and collecting fruit and vegetables, for example fresh strawberries in early summer or yellow 'light bulb' tomatoes in fall.

> People, especially children, they do not know how the vegetables are grown. So they can come and they can see that the vegetables are grown on the soil, what they look like. (Interview Filiz, GK, 22.09.2010)

For the second group, villagers, Güneşköy aims at showing organic agriculture by giving an example of least harmful treatment of the soil. The aspect of raising awareness for processes in nature and the human-nature relationship is very important for changing considerations for nature of both targeted groups.

> Güneşköy to me is creating some awareness for sustainability, especially the sustainability in rural places like villages in Turkey. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

This awareness-creation works through informal talks with their neighbours, information sessions on different agricultural topics and by providing a living example in the activities at the land. Furthermore, workshops and seminars are organised in the city to provide information on for example permaculture as well as information, links, contacts and thoughts exchanged through the mail-group of Güneşköy.

"To do something ecologically important and relevant"

The educational and scientific aims are closely connected to the environmental aims, in some regard they are a tool for the realization of the latter. Changing attitudes and raising awareness combined with the know-how of less harmful methods and technologies open the way for a more sustainable way of agriculture and lifestyle. The ecologically sustainable lifestyle was already mentioned as at the core of the cooperative's mission statement on the Turkish version of the homepage and it was also the one aim mentioned in one or more aspects by all the members. Ayşen for example based her motivation to join the cooperative on her environmental concerns:

> I thought we are people living wrong and doing things very wrong. We are destroying the world. And there are ways to stop it. (Interview Ayşen, GK, 21.09.2010)

This lifestyle that she criticises is neglecting the environment either by a lack of understanding or out of convenience and is further promoted by the country's development paradigm of modernisation that puts economic growth over everything else, stating that economic development will be the magic potion bringing the solution for all other problems. Notwithstanding the enormity of environmental problems, the individuals of the Güneşköy group believe that they can do something, that by their actions, by their example they can provoke a change at least for some.

> The purpose was to do something ecologically relevant. (Interview Bora, GK, 18.03.2011)

From the seven fields of work on the website, especially organic agriculture, renewable energy sources, care for not destroying but repairing nature and ecological architecture were main aspects also mentioned in the interviews. The realization of those aspects is omnipresent at visits to the land: A mud brick-building just at the entrance, a bigger, round straw bale building further up with a wooden toilet and shower with solar heated water behind it and on

the other side a half under-earth depot building and the experimental big solar greenhouse that slowly takes shape representing outcomes of the architectural adventure. The latter, the greenhouse is at the same time an impressing example of the use of solar energy. Other renewable energy projects are the oil press for producing fuel out of rapeseed, the drying box for vegetables and fruits, the solar panels for hot water and the solar cookers. Protecting the land was in a first step achieved by fencing it, so animal herds could not enter it anymore. In following steps, trees were planted and biodiversity enhanced through careful treatment of the soil and permaculture. Not using any artificial pesticides or fertilizers was applied from the very beginning and the project was the first group in the province to obtain the certificate for organic agriculture. Over the last six years Güneşköy provided weekly organic produce to about 80 households in Ankara.

"An experimental place"

> You can discover how nature works and how we can manage systems which do not harm nature. Is it possible to create sustainable agricultural systems, renewable energies? So it is an experimental place, one can come and apply the ideas and see the results and interaction between the local village and Güneşköy, so it is an experimental study – you can put your ideas there and see the outcome. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

Güneşköy as an "experimental place", as a place to develop organic farming and renewable energy technologies serves for implementing new technologies using solar energy, trying construction with local materials and permaculture. At the moment especially the first of them, with the construction of the big solar greenhouse, is one of the most visible projects. This greenhouse, as already mentioned shortly above, is the outcome of years of research on constructing a greenhouse that is suitable for the climate in Central Anatolia by combining different ways of renewable energy use and optimizing the shape. The upcoming years will show the results of this experimental study.

Not all ideas to be implemented need that much preparation, smaller scale examples include learning by trial and error about the right proportions of different soil for brick-making, finding that strawberries can be dried in the drying system within two days, whether or not mice can be chased away by a mixture of peppermint and hot peppers, etc.

"One of our aims is to develop villagers"

Village development was mentioned by several members as one of the aims, either explicit by referring to *"kalkınma"* (development) or via using formulations of "improving the life conditions of villagers". Development as was made clear in the continuations of the statements was not meant to make villagers follow a mainstream town-dweller model, but rather the contrary. Following ecovillages' philosophy being "based on respect for equality and diversity", the diversity should be protected by ensuring that life in villages remains an option for the people living there:

> One of our aims is to develop villagers. In villages, you know, if there are 260 houses, there are only 160 with people living in them. The others live in Ankara or in other places. There is no land for subsistence, no animals. Then they adjust by working there; some of them rent a flat in Ankara. Of course, one of the aims, the main task of our social project, is to make villagers return from the cities and to increase their contribution to productivity, that is needed to in return increase their income/wealth.[46] (Interview Namık, GK, 01.07.2010)

This points at the problematic of rural exodus and goes in the same direction as the aim stated in the English version of the website – preventing further migration to the cities and keeping villagers in their villages by improving life conditions there, in the statement above more explicitly the income, thus reducing incentives or pressure to leave. Mass migration to the cities is seen as not desirable, neither for the migrating farmers who have to give up the way of life they were used to, nor the villages emptied from young working-age persons, nor the cities, that struggle to meet infrastructural needs of the fast growing population. Another member reflected on the vicious circle where migration to cities engenders a reduction of education and health services in the village, causing increased emigration, a problem experienced not only by Hisarköy:

> When the children grow up. the parents either send them to boarding schools or move to the city to be able to educate their children. That's how people leave their villages. That's also why there is no doctor at the health centre. But if there were people living in that village, then a doctor would be in the health centre. [...] People need to be attracted to villages. Their staying in the villages need to be ensured. [...] If the people earned money there, invest there, develop there, there would be a school there, a health centre, etc. and people would live in that village – and we would not

---

[46] "Bizim amaçlarımızın birisi köylüyü kalkındırmak. Köyde, biliyorsun, 260 tape ev varken, 160 tanesinde insan yaşıyor. Diğerleri Ankara veya başka yerlerde hayatlarını sürdürüyorlar. Orada geçinecek arazileri yok, hayvan yok. Bu sefer şehirliler gibi orada çalışarak, bazıları Ankara'da ev tutarak bu işi halediyor. Tabi bizim toplumsal projemizin ana görevi gibi, amaclarından birisi köylüyü şehirden tekrar döndürmek ve onu üretime katmak, üretime katkisi olmalı ki ortak havuza gelir sağlasın."

experience traffic problems in the city. [...] If people settle more dispersed, if they stay in the villages, I think that would be better. But it is completely bound to economy, to whether the people there can earn money from the agriculture they do now. If the people there get richer, support themselves there, then schools will be made together with the state. If it was more modern there, a teacher would like to go there. Now, teachers do not want to go there. Doctors also do not want to go. Isn't it?[47] (Interview Alp, GK, 14.12.2010)

Again, financial profit is seen as the key factor for people remaining and investing or being able to remain and invest, in their villages. Once economic success is established, other improvements of their life conditions will follow. The answer to the question of concrete points of 'development' in the village, nevertheless, shows that the notion goes beyond sole financial aspects:

Development means to change their gardens to organic and to turn their products into power – instead of petroleum ensure their economy by the fuels that they produce themselves.[48] (Interview Namık. GK, 01.07.2010)

Development by this member is described as a change to organic production, a way that is acknowledged as being healthier for them as farmers and at the same time as consumers. Self-sustainability is a further point – providing possibilities for the farmers to produce their own energy to cover their needs, in order to become less dependent on buying from outside when actually they are in the possession of the necessary resources themselves. The same member then expands his illustration from technology development to provoking a change in thinking and behaviour:

Human relations, when tomorrow a Theresa, an Oya, a Maryam come. this will broaden their visions. If you are attentive [you will see that] they are conservative there. For example there is Mine's daughter whose husband is a practicing Muslim; I do not remember the name now. She does not shake my hand for example. [...] Why? Religious beliefs [...]. With time, this habit needs

---

[47] "Çocuklar biraz büyüyünce, ya yatılı okula gönderecekler, ya çocukları okutabilmek için şehirde yerleşecekler. İnsanlar işte böyle köylerini terk ediyorlar. O yüzden de sağlık ocağında doktor olmuyor. Ama o köyde yaşayan insanlar olsaydı, sağlık ocağında doktor de olurdu. […] Yani insanları köye çekmek lazım. Köyde kalmalarını sağlamak lazım insanların. […] İnsanlar orada para kazanıp, oraya yatırım yaparlarsa, orada kalkındırınlarsa, orada okul da olur, sağlık ocağı da olur, vesaire. Ve insanlar o köyde yaşarlar; biz de şehirde trafik problemi çekmeyiz. […] İnsanlar daha dağınlık yerleşseler, köylerde kalsalar, daha iyi olur diye düşünüyorum. Ama tamamen ekonomik şeylere bağlı, oradaki insanların şuanki yaptıkları tarımdan para kazanmalarına bağlı. Oradaki insanlar zenginleşirse, oraya kendileri destek olurlar; devletle beraber okul yapılır. Orası daha çağdaş olursa, oraya öğretmen de gitmek ister. Şimdi öğretmen gitmek istemiyor. Doktor da gitmek istemez. Değil mi?"
[48] "Kalkındırmak, onların bahçelerini organiğe dönüştürüp, bahçelerinin ürünlerini götürüp sonra "power"'a dönüştürün. İşte akar yakıt yerine kendi üretikleri yağ yakıt ile ekonomiklik sağlamak..."

to change, you have to send your daughters to school, you have to give them education ..."[49] (interview Namık, GK, 01.07.2010)

The view represented here is that social practices that are considered as conservative, discriminatory and backward should slowly be abandoned in favour of 'modern' ways of interaction, including in the mentioned statement not making a difference in the treatment of men and women, girls and boys. Women are seen as the ones who carry most of the work load and responsibilities in the village, and therefore they are also the ones, where change could start easiest:

> Because when you look at the social project in this community and maybe it's all around the world, more women are interested than men. So they are the people who may contribute more on those sustainability issues. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

"Being an example"

Once an environmental or social problem is pinned down as such, the best way to change people's approach and behaviour was described as showing an example by living oneself in accordance with the targeted ideals. As in the examples above, through seeing the actions of the group concerning organic agriculture or also the equal treatment of women and men, it is assumed that villagers will change by time. Besides villagers, the cooperative can also be an example for town dwellers:

> Now, people living in the city want to escape from the city, and for this they buy land at the borders of the city, in the suburbs, hundred thousands of people bought land. [...] Now, this started to be a fashion. But we found this wrong. Why did we find it wrong? Because escaping from the city, they go with their city-knowledge, with their city-mentality. They go and bring their food from the city, they pollute wider areas. They bring fuel, they bring their cars, they bring the things they eat and drink. They bring energy sources, they bring coal, they bring detergent ... and they pollute the soil there.[50] (Interview Hakan, GK, 04.07.2010)

---

[49] "İnsan ilişkileri ile, yarın bir Theresa, bir Oya, bir Maryam geldiği zaman, vizyonları genişleyecek. Dikkat edersen, orada muhafazakarlar. Mesela Mine'nin kızı var. [...] Benim elimi sıkmıyor mesela. [...] Neden? Dini inançları […] Bu adetin zaman içinde değişmesi lazım, kız çocuklarını okullara göndermen lazım, eğitim vermen lazım..."

[50] "Şimdi şehirde yaşayan insanlar şehirden kaçmak istiyorlar, ve bunun için şehirin kenarlarında, banliyölerde yer satın alıyorlar, yüzbinlerce insanlar yer satın alıyormuş. […] Şimdi bu bir moda olarak başladı. Fakat biz bunu yanlış bulduk. Yani neden yanlış bulduk? Çünkü şehirden kaçarken şehirdeki bilgileriyle şehirdeki mentaliteyle gidiyorlar, şehirden yiyecekler alıp getiriyorlar, daha geniş alanları kirletiyorlar, yani benzini götürüyorlar, arabaları götürüyorlar, yedikleri, içtikleri şeyleri götürüyorlar. Enerji türleri götürüyorlar, kömürü götürüyorlar, deterjan götürüyorlar… ve oradaki toprağı kirletiyorlar."

This statement, referring to the current situation in Turkey's big cities, suggests that there is not only a problem of mass migration from village to town, but also a problem of urban to rural migration, maybe less in number, but harmful concerning the effects on nature. As a solution they decided to *"develop an ecological residence model based on solar energy and live there in person; to be an example."*[51] (Interview Hakan, GK, 04.07.2010) 'Living' there is for the time being limited to one-day stays at the weekend but in regard to the treatment of nature during those stays and the way the land is cultivated Güneşköy can still be seen as a 'living example'.

A third group, for which the work of Güneşköy should be an impulse, is the government that one of the members explicitly named as the main responsible for ensuring environmental protection:

> Of course it is the work of the government; actually, it is its work [to ensure environmental protection]. But to make the government do something, it first needs groups like us to, to be an example. To find expressions that are heard.[52] (Interview Yağmur, GK, 25.09.2010)

The activities of Güneşköy thus should also be an example and at the same time a tool for policy makers, something that is for instance already the case for the agricultural department of the province, which uses the experiences of the cooperative in their presentations for advertising organic agriculture. Thus the project is not something done just for the sake of it, but it is expected to cause a wider repercussion, to give a living example of good practice.

> If we only did this, apply this for ourselves... we know anyways that we can accomplish something like this. We know that we can accomplish this there. But the important thing is to spread it. That is why this, these works need to be an example for the villagers.[53] (Interview Alp, GK, 14.12.2010)

---

[51] "Kentin çevresinde ekolojik güneş enerjili bir yerleşim modeli geliştirmek ve bizzat yaşamak, örnek olmak"
[52] "Hükümetin işi tabii, asıl iş onun. Ama hükümeti de harekete geçirmek için böyle bizim gibi grupların örnek olması lazım. Ses getirici ifadeleri bulunması lazım"
[53] "Biz bunu sadece kendi başımıza yapıp, uygularsak ... Biz zaten böyle bir şey başarabileceğimizi biliyoruz. Orada böyle bir şey başarabileceğimizi biliyoruz. Ama önemli olan bunu yaygınlaştırmak. Dolaysıyla bunun, bu çalışmaların köylüye örnek olması gerekiyor."

"I want to enjoy"

Not all aims are turned towards constructing or changing something, there are also aspects brought forth, where the motivation lies in enjoying being in nature, fulfilling a need of experiencing nature.

> I stay because I love natural life and staying in nature [...] Here we discard in some way our stress from the city by staying in nature.[54] (Interview Yağmur, GK, 25.09.2010)

> In the evening as the sun sets and the shadows get longer and then the temperature drops a bit and then there is some time when you can still see to do things and then the sounds start changing because the crickets... But you don't know that if you are in the town or even if you are in the village. And the stars come out. Wow they are powerful. And as 'the last Child in the Woods' book says: "When I'm in nature I realize that we are such an insignificant part of this whole nature and what is around us" (Interview Oya, GK, 31.08.2010)

The nature experience is described as relaxing. Güneşköy is a place, where the routine of the city can be left behind, where priorities change and where the own existence gets another dimension. The book referred to in the statement has these effects of nature experience as its core topic and emphasises the importance of nature for the development of personality (see Louv 2008).

Changes in aims – "the written aims and the needs of now"

Several members mentioned differences in the aims at the beginning and now; three of them explicitly distinguished between the written aims at the beginning and their aims-now.

> I think we were aware of ... that in the beginning ... that we were not able to actually describe what we wanted. (Interview Oya, GK, 31.08.2010)

Contrary to the citation above about no clear definition of aims in the beginning, for two members, now, the aim of Güneşköy is not clear anymore, i.e. at the moment, they do not have any specific aim they are working for.

> Now, I can't see any aim. I don't know what the aim is. (Interview Ayşen, GK, 21.09.2010)

---

[54] "Doğal yaşamı, doğa içinde yaşamı sevdiğim için kalıyorum. [...] Şehirdeki stresimizi atıyoruz burada bir şekilde, doğada kalarak."

For another two members it was the realization that social relationships are very important and now included the aim of building community as central to Güneşköy.

> Maybe in the beginning it was not my idea that community, building community was very important. It was not. But later on when we worked on these other technical projects we discovered the relations are very important because if there is resistance from the other people then you lose your enthusiasm and motivation. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

A similar adjustment influenced by practical experience on the land was reported concerning the aim of keeping Güneşköy free from electricity:

> So in the beginning we had the intention of not even bringing electricity to the land. But that was not possible; we needed electricity very soon, soon after we were there [for irrigation etc]. So it is difficult to do this. The ideas are nice but it is difficult to abide them. [...] They have to change a little bit because then you see and you go back "what did I want to do?" (Interview Bora, GK, 18.03.2011)

Aims and the way of implementing them had to change for one part because of the internal processes within the Güneşköy group and for another in consequence to the encounter with needs and facts of the lived reality of 'the field'; they (had to be) adjusted in the process of running the project.

Signs of continuity and permanence – land and membership

Several members stressed the importance of the land and its ownership. The land that is, depending on road, driver and weather conditions, between one and one and a half hour drive from the centre of Ankara on the one hand gives the project a permanent character – buying and owning land shows long-term plans and thus makes a different positioning within the village possible by giving the message that Güneşköy wants and is going to be a permanent project.

> Güneşköy, [...] because it has got the land, it has got a level of permanence that most projects don't have ... where you know, where a group will come and say "let's do something for the kids" and then walk away and leave them. (Interview Oya.. GK, 31.08.2010)

Ownership was very important also to prevent what happened to Hocamköy, an ecovillage-project started in the mid-1990s by METU students and graduates with an

academic advisory committee of METU staff, in which some of the members of Güneşköy were also involved and that can be seen as a predecessor of Güneşköy. One of the reasons of the breaking up of Hocamköy was that the land the project was based on, on which they built houses and planted trees was not owned by the group, but promised to them by the head of the municipality. When the land was claimed later on by its original owner, they had to leave the place they put years of energy in.

Providing for continuity is thus important for both the project itself and the relations with the villagers. Besides owning land, the membership also ensures permanence. However, the financial investment connected to the membership means that it is neither easy to join nor to leave the group. In the first years one member left the cooperative and another two members joined, but afterwards there were no more changes in the composition of the group, despite occasional interest.

This permanence has different effects: on the one hand the continuity allows a deeper relationship with the villagers, with villagers actually engaging in 'protecting' those coming by giving advice on security, as "don't sleep outside [on the land]" to one of the members and not letting me (as a person connected to the group) return to Ankara with the greenhouse workers, but making me wait for the "trustworthy hocas".

> The land shows the other – the people in the Hisarköy community – it shows them that we are not
> just there for one picnic. Now, that we have been there for so many years they really are starting to
> take at least some of us seriously. (Interview Oya, GK, 31.08.2010)

On the other hand, the fixedness of membership also means that if a member looses interest, he or she cannot leave easily.

> If you don't have it [ownership of the land] you cannot create some persistent ideas but if you have
> it and you are not interested in it then it may be a negative thing for the others. (Interview Cem,
> GK, 17.09.2010)

There is a consensus that permanence is important and the landownership is recognised as a prerequisite. At the same time, this permanence also poses the challenge of finding a way of working together effectively and respectfully, thus overcoming internal conflicts.

Internal Güneşköy communication

Within the group regular Wednesday meetings with the Güneşköy members and sometimes also other involved or just interested persons are held, where everything that is going on at the land is discussed and decisions for further steps and plans are taken as group decisions. My observation there was a very respectful discussion climate and well-organised structure with a schedule of the points to be talked about already prepared beforehand. One person heading and guiding the evening, makes sure that everyone can and is given the time to express his or her opinion. Nevertheless, as in most group-discussions, most of the contributions come from a few persons, whereas others are mostly quiet participants. The participation of some of the members in seminars in Non-Violent Communication, that taking out the negative term of the English expression, they call *yürekten iletişim* (communication from the heart), seems to show its effects in those meetings. Notwithstanding differences in aims and approaches, avoiding reproaches and emotional outbreaks leading to insults, but instead trying to understand each other's position and to find constructive solutions together are some of the principles that could be observed during the meetings.

Further channels of communication are the meetings of the Yönetim Kurulu, the management board and the internal mailing list of Güneşköy. I participated in neither of them, but the latter was where I first presented my topic and interests to the Güneşköy group via a member who forwarded a short abstract of my research to this mailing list.

Notwithstanding those extensive channels of communication some information that seemed very basic to me, as who goes when to the land, is less talked about. Thus, when arriving for example one day in the morning at Güneşköy and the workers asked who else will come that day, Oya replied that she didn't know, one of the worker replied with *"Don't you have any information about each other?"*[55] (Fieldnotes, 06.03.2011), leaving the impression that some information evades the extensive communication system.

---

[55] "Sizin başkalarından haberiniz yok mu?"

Conclusion: Ecovillage initiative – Aims and challenges of Güneşköy

Different persons put forth different aspects, combining social, educational, scientific, environmental and personal aims, the main arguments by the members being based on principles of ecovillages and fit the general description of ecovillages – that are by definition very heterogeneous, as Dawson (2008) explains – by the Global Ecovillage Network:

> Ecovillages are urban or rural communities of people, who strive to integrate a supportive social environment with a low-impact way of life. To achieve this, they integrate various aspects of ecological design, permaculture, ecological building, green production, alternative energy, community building practices, and much more.[56]

The use of local resources, as straw bales, stone, lime and wood for the buildings and their direction towards the sun shows ecological design and building, the way of growing different crops next to each other, of what plant best grows where and next to which other plant, shows the application of permaculture. Alternative energy is mentioned as one of the aims by all members. Güneşköy, although differing from other ecovillages by not having permanent residents, takes its places among them: Like the ecovillage Sieben Linden in Germany, it tries to create an example of a human settlement with very low impact on nature that "woven into the fabric of its own bioregion" (Dawson 2008, 28). With Auroville in India it shares the special concern for the development of technologies using renewable energy sources, with Faoune in Senegal the efforts concerning healthy food and financial autonomy and the context of a countryside that experiences migration of the young to the cities (ibid, 27). Like those bigger siblings, it is more or less independent from state support and tries to create a community alternative to mainstream consumer culture, which is integrated harmoniously in its natural and social environment. From environmental view, the group succeeded in ensuring an upgrading of the soil, buildings from local materials and an increase in biodiversity. An evaluation of the second aspect, the integration in the social environment, will be looked at in the following chapters.

Another widely used criterion for ecovillages, spirituality, nevertheless was not mentioned by any of the members and is also not put forth in any of the writings about Güneşköy. An explanation for such an absence of a spiritual discourse might be found in the

---

[56] http://gen.ecovillage.org/ecovillages/whatisanecovillage.html

in Chapter II presented understanding of spirituality/religion as inherently political, with many civil society explicitely avoiding being associated with a specific religious or spiritual conviction (see Dabağcı 2011).

Taking the distinction of anthropocentric and ecocentric as starting point (see Adem 2000), although nature plays an important role in almost all aims, the majority of them have the human being as starting point, but they differ in the target group - whereas some aims focus on the members of the group, others relate to the villagers and again other aims target people from the cities. An image of a future change towards a more sustainable life in the accounts of Güneşköy members meets the idea of limiting harmful current changes, of restoring an earlier situation (cf Strang and Powell 2009). Showing engagement in environmental and social issues and at the same time pointing out government responsibilities, Güneşköy combines both forms of participation described by Paley (2001): on the one hand they try to fill gaps in society or add extra services, on the other hand they appeal to state responsibilities (cf Paley 2001).

Aims and focus of the project are not unmovable and for most changed over time. An example for such a change is the community aspect. Whereas actually living together at the land is not considered as a close-future option anymore, if not completely put aside, community is an important issue and at the same time reflected very critically upon by Güneşköy members. Community building is described as a less successful part and at several occasions frustration about differences in understanding within the group as well as between the cooperative and the village were voiced. The three different levels of conflict, listed by Sargisson and Sargent (2004) that ecovillage-communities are likely to face (conflicts over principle, over relationship and over tasks and rules) can all be also observed in the example of Güneşköy: Although core principles are shared by all members, priorities and ideas about the realization of the plans differ; those different understandings and the way people express their ideas and criticism of others give way to interpersonal conflicts; and finally fixing responsibilities within the group and (non-)complying with them also affects the community feeling.

Such inner-group divergences are the reason why most ecovillage initiatives or actual ecovillages in Turkey are rather short-lived. This problem is not only encountered in Turkey,

69

Diane Christian in her years of research on eco-communities, found that 90% of such communities in the US fail (Christian 2003). Such data bolsters Olivier de Sardan's statement on conflict – it might lead to reinforcement and strengthening of group identity, but at the same time conflict also means a threat to communities (Olivier de Sardan 2005). Güneşköy, thanks to its perseverance, conviction and regular communication channels, but also the focus of some members on keeping good social relationships is at present one of the oldest groups of its kind in Turkey.

CHAPTER V

NEGOTIATING 'ORGANIC AGRICULTURE'

As the preceding chapter underlined, organic agriculture and the promotion of a lifestyle close to nature is an important aim of the Güneşköy group. The cooperative was the first one to obtain the certificate for organic agriculture in the Kırıkkale district and the change from conventional to certified organic agriculture of four farmers in Hisarköy is closely associated with the activities of the Güneşköy group, but their role as a leader in this regard also contested. The two questions of what is understood as a healthy lifestyle (an aim at the webpage) and what the arguments for organic agriculture are largely overlap as very similar answers to show.

5.1 Organic = healthy = natural? – Contested field of definitions

Looking closer at the use of 'organic' and 'natural' it becomes apparent, that different meanings are attached to these concepts and different lines of argumentations followed between members of Güneşköy and Hisarköy. The same is true for the understanding of 'a healthy lifestyle'. Asked for what a healthy lifestyle means the members of the cooperative provided quite elaborated answers referring to a lifestyle that does not hurt humans and nature and that guarantees leaving resources for later generations.

From persons from the village I got shorter answers that compared to the documentary character of the member's answers seem like five second health ministry slogans: no smoking, no alcohol, healthy food. The latter, healthy food was the most mentioned description of a healthy, natural and ecological lifestyle by both sides, specifying this food as being free of pesticides; an aspect that is considered important for their and their children's health.

Healthy, natural and organic were used synonymously, with reference to a traditional way of growing crop. Whether the food grown in such a traditional way is then certified as organic or not does not play a role concerning healthiness. Further aspects of a healthy lifestyle mentioned were abstinence from alcohol and cigarettes[57], as well as positive effects of exercise[58] and fresh air. The latter was especially emphasised in the village:

> For example when we go to Kırıkkale, we cannot stay there for one hour. [Our body] wants to go home, to the fresh air.[59] (Interview Hatice, 02.12.2010)

> The life in village is better [healthier] than in the cities. There is all the car noise in the city... [...] We certainly live a natural life, we are still in the village, on the farm; we are not in the city![60] (Interview Mine, 25.09.2010)

Life in the village being healthier than the life in the city is an aspect that the respondents in Hisarköy liked to underline, thus opposing their – healthy – lifestyle in the village to the – unhealthy – lifestyle in cities, putting a clear border between the two. Most of the members of the Güneşköy group also agree with the statement that village life is healthier than city life; only two persons add that with some more cleanliness and hygiene, the health standard could still be improved. An Afghan worker in the village commented on a healthy life from a different point of view: he put forth peace and the possibility for education, both aspects that he would like to see in his country for his children (Fieldnotes, 25.09.2010). He does not use the opposition of city and countryside to define borders between healthy and unhealthy but the one of peace and war, heaving the distinction at a national level.

The different life-realities the persons are in, living in a flat in the city and having a regularly paid job, living in the village with an income from agriculture or coming from Afghanistan for a temporary period, affects their prioritisation of what is important for a healthy life. As a short conclusion, 'a healthy, natural and ecological lifestyle' is – not surprisingly – considered as good by members of the cooperative and villagers alike but what exactly is considered as such varies.

---

[57] As far as observed during my time in Turkey, cigarettes and alcohol are both presented as harmful in the political discourse and especially alcohol is highly taxed. Since 2008, a general smoking ban exists in restaurants, bars, public transport, public buildings, etc. paralleling anti-smoking policies in the EU.
[58] Although I could never observe anyone in the village doing exercise in the meaning of doing sports, exercise was still mentioned as aspect of a healthy life.
[59] "Mesela Kırıkkale'ye gidiyoruz, 1 saat duramıyoruz. İstiyor yani; buraya, eve gelebilseydik, temiz havaya."
[60] "Köyün hayatı şehrinkinden daha iyi. Şehirde araba gürültüsü, ... [...] Zaten doğal bir hayat yaşıyoruz, işte köyde, çiftliğimizdeyiz, şehirde değiliz ya!"

About "organic stones" and "more organic villagers"

Organic in popular speech seems to have become a fashion word over the last years.

> Well, ok now organic became a word equal to natural. For example in Bodrum, I saw some people
> selling stones [...] And they said these are organic, but they are inorganic actually to be chemically
> correct. (Interview Bora, GK, 18.03.2011)

Besides the "organic stones" mentioned above, *'organik'* is a general adjective used for vegetables and fruits at conventional bazaars; when I asked for the origin of products labelled 'organic', even the vendors admitted that they might not be pesticide free, but still "healthy". In supermarket chains, price labels with "organic eggs" might at a closer look at the package turn out to be conventional vitamin-enriched eggs. Once, I even encountered a sign for an "organic TV-screen" in one of Ankara's shopping malls. Such examples show that the term as used in everyday speech is very blurred.

One of the workers gave another example of the confusions in the use of the term 'organic': two different waste bins are next to the small house at the entrance to the land – one for *organik çöp* (bio-waste) and one for other disposals, mainly plastic. After cutting a water melon that some Güneşköy members brought from Ankara, he threw the green peel next to the plastic and when asked why he did so his answer was that the melon was bought from a regular market and therefore with a very high probability not a product of organic agriculture. The use of *organik* in the word for bio-waste led him to assume that this bin is only for remnants of produces from certified organic agriculture.

Turning to 'certified organic agriculture', some persons implied an influence of the activities of Güneşköy in spreading knowledge and inciting persons to change their production, by providing information and offering help with obtaining the certificate. *"They encouraged us and we started [organic agriculture]."*[61] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011)

> They organised a meeting at the coffeehouse and talked and made announcements. They told that
> they do organic agriculture and invited people to join them and also change to organic. [...] "Apply
> and register, come to the bazaar and see how it is." [...] They asked how it was in the past, how we

---

[61] "Onlar teşvik etti, biz de başladık"

worked in the past, whether we used fertilizers or hormones then.[62] (Interview Hatice, HK, 02.12.2010)

At the same time the fact, that organic agriculture is nothing new to the farmers, but the traditional way of farming, was underlined: *"we are no novices. Our mothers, our fathers also did that way."*[63] At an earlier occasion, during one of my first stays a team from the *İlce tarım bakanlığı* (regional agriculture office) came to take some pictures and short movie-shots for a movie on organic agriculture in the district. Obviously enjoying the work done on the land (and the ripe, red strawberries), they emphasised the importance and influence of the project, praising the group's positive influence on the villagers: *"you were the first ones to start with organic agriculture here, now other farmers also started and there are several farmers in this village with organic-certificate this year"* (Fieldnotes, 03.06.2010). After they left, a villager who passed by for a small tea-break commented:

> We [villagers] are more organic than you. We do this already longer than you – we just did not have a certificate, we did not know how to name it. Now, there is an identity connected to it.[64] (Arif, fieldnotes, HK, 03.06.2010)

Arif clearly contests the view that it was the Güneşköy-group that brought organic agriculture to the village. He refers to the indigenous knowledge of the villagers and their years of experience. In his opinion, what changed is not the way of production but the awareness that there is a specific term for it. He refers to a power of defining terminology, which lies in the cities, in offices of academicians and bureaucrats. A power that is wrongly used, as Hakan finds:

> There is a law on organic agriculture. This law has 163 articles. It is not possible for a villager to learn and apply all those 163 articles. But what does organic agriculture mean? It is their main culture; their basic culture is organic... Changing its name, approaching it from a different side, you alienate it from them. You do not use the terminology they use; you impose from outside...[65] (Interview Hakan, GK, 04.07.2010)

---

[62] Kahvede toplantı yaptılar. Konuşma yaptılar vatandaşla, uyarı yaptılar. katılın, organik tarım yapın dediler. O zaman işte toplantıda, biz hepsini organik yapıyoruz, anlattılar. [...] Siz de başvurun, yazılın, siz de oraya gidin, pazara, görün, gezin, diye. [...] Eskiden nasıl yapardınız? O zaman da gübre var mıydı? Hormon var mıydı?

[63] "Acemi değiliz. Annemiz, babamız da öyle yapardı"

[64] "Biz sizden daha organiğiz. Bunu sizden zaten daha uzun zamandır yapıyoruz. Bizim sadece sertifikamız yoktu, nasıl söyleneceğini bilmedik. Şimdi kimlik var."

[65] "Bir yasa çıktı, organik tarım yasası. Bu yasada 163 tane madde var, bu 163 tane madde bir köylüyün öğrenmesi uygulanması mümkün değil, ama organik tarım ne demek? Zaten onların anakültürüdür bu, asıl

Farmers and also vendors might not have the possibility to pass a law, but as Arif's comment and the examples of uses of organic show above, they do encompass, adapt and change such terminology, or at least its meaning. Arif for example encompasses the term and attaches his interpretation as "the villagers' traditional way of producing" to it. He might not know the 163 articles of what organic means according to the law, but he very well knows how to use the term in marketing strategies.

"Let it be less, but clean and healthy"

What is encompassed by farmers in Hisarköy is not only the term, but also the concept of organic agriculture. Villagers express knowledge about environmental and health consequences of conventional agriculture. This latter, a consciousness for human health was especially emphasised in the interviews. A theme often repeated is that *"let it be less, but clean and healthy"*[66], with hormones being also mentioned as having negative effects on especially the health of children.

> If vegetables can also be grown without fertilizers, why do we use fertilizer? Why do we poison ourselves? How nice the cucumbers tasted [at the Güneşköy land]. We thought they won't grow.[67] (Interview Mine, HK, 25.09.2010)

Hatice told me about a personal experience she had with pesticides to illustrate her conviction that those chemicals are not good for humans:

> The family of my husband put pesticides on the field just below our house. I took one cucumber, a fresh one and I ate it […] I did not wash it as it was fresh. I just wiped the earth off and ate it. When I came home, my stomach hurt. I got such a stomachache; you can't imagine […][68] (Interview Hatice, HK, 02.12.2010)

Advantages of organic agriculture are not only seen in being healthier for humans, but also in regard to the production period: Kemal told me that the time of harvest is longer for those who do not use fertilizers: before the fertilizers made them get much more vegetables,

---

kültürü organik zaten... ama adını değiştirip başka bir şekilde, başka bir yönteme yaklaştığın zaman onları yabancılaştırıyorsunuz. Onların kullandığı terminoloji kullanmıyorsunuz, dışarıdan empozasyon yapıyorsunuz..."
[66] "Az olsun, sağlık olsun!"
[67] "Gübresiz de oluyormuş, niye biz gübreyi atıyoruz, kendimizi zehirliyoruz? Salatalık ne iyi oluyormuş, biz olmuyor sanıyorduk."
[68] "Eşimgiller ilaç atmışlar tarlaya. Bizim evim altındaydı. Ben de aldım bir tane salatalık. Eve geldim, karnım ağrıdı. Onlar sıkmış, ben taze acun aldım, yedim, eve geldim, yıkamadım yani, taze diye. O zaman sildim, yedim. Eve geldim, karnım ağrıdı. Yani, içim öyle bulandı ki, nasıl [...]"

but within three weeks they were all harvested and the season over. With organic, now the amount of vegetables is less, but the harvest longer, what at the end comes to the same amount of grown products. Most parts of Central Anatolia generally have a rather short harvest season of about four months. In those four months farmers need to harvest and sell enough to get one year's salary. This very short harvest season is one of the constraints that push farmers towards using fertilizers or any other method to increase the crop. But as the statement of the farmer says, the overall result is not always higher than without chemicals. The new model of a glasshouse by Güneşköy, if successful, could be a possibility to extend the harvest season and maybe to get crops all year round without harming the environment, by using only the energy of the sun.

5.2 Financial aspects and beyond

Obtaining the certificate makes the change to organic farming official. The certificate guarantees specific standards the farmers must meet to be allowed to sell their produce as 'organic'. Afterwards, the certificate needs to be extended every year with an annual extension fee. If this fee is not paid, the certificate is annulated, even if the farmer might fulfil all the requirements for organic farming.

During the time of the research, only one bazaar for certified organic products opening once a week existed in Ankara.[69] Every Sunday, farmers from all over Turkey come and offer their products at the bazaar in Ayrancı that was established in 2008. To get the permission to sell there, every farmer needs to be in possession of a valid certificate.

Officially, the first two years are considered as "transition period" where the soil recovers from previously used pesticides and fertilizers. At the bazaars, this period is not separately marked what one of the farmers criticised. He proposed a three-colour system, red for the new-comers in their first year, yellow for those in the second year and green for all those who passed the transition time. This way, the customers could see easily, whether the produce is already completely free of chemicals or whether there might still be some remains from before. At the same time, he considers this as a method to distinguish 'older' organic

---

[69] In November 2011 a second one opened in the Cayyolu neighbourhood of Ankara (http://www.haberler.com/ankara-ya-ikinci-organik-pazar-3098961-haberi/)

producers and thus provide some acknowledgement for their longer effort in pesticide-free production.

The satisfaction about organic agriculture expressed by farmers very much depends on the particular situation and on how much they were able to sell the preceding week. Arif for example complained one week that there are no customers at all and they cannot sell anything in Ankara and a week later I hear him praising his good customer network, how they respect him and how he could sell all his vegetables before the bazaar closed in the evening. Ahmet, another villager having the certificate and selling his products at the bazaar in Ankara, claimed in September to earn easily a thousand Liras per bazaar day[70] (Fieldnotes, 25.09.2011).

Müslüm, the farmer who got the certificate the longest time ago, told about his experience that in the first year they were very happy about their decision to change to certified organic agriculture. It was easy to find customers at the bazaar in Ankara and they could sell all their produce at a good price. In the second year they did not have the same success as in the first year anymore and in the third year it got worse. They could just sell enough to cover the costs but not make any profit and furthermore, the experience of having to bring back their vegetables from the bazaar and then throw them away, as they could not sell them, was very frustrating. *"We take them there, can't sell them, bring them back"*[71] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011). This also shows one of the risks of having to sell products at the bazaar, every week the success depends on whether enough products can be sold. Güneşköy members tried to find a solution to the problem of vegetables and fruits turning bad very fast as well as 'upgrading' vegetables to products that can be sold at higher price – they held workshops on conservation methods such as sun-drying or pickling, methods that are nevertheless quite time consuming.

Finding customers who buy their products is a challenge for all farmers selling at the organic bazaar. Especially in the summer months, when most of the crop is harvested, many families from the capital are out of town. To overcome the limitation of the locality – there is

---

[70] Minimum wage in this period was at 837 Lira/month
(http://www.turkhukuksitesi.com/hukuksayfa_asgari_ucret.htm)
[71] "Götürüyoruz, satamıyoruz, geri getiriyoruz"

only one place in all Ankara, meaning that for the majority of people it is just too far – farmers stated the need for more bazaar places to reach a larger public.

> I really like this project. If the conditions were given I would also do my own one. […] If it was a little bit more widespread, if [markets] were a little bit closer […] I would do it. Why shouldn't I?[72] (Interview Orhan, HK, 25.09.2010)

Difficulties in accessibility are a problem for farmers as well as potential buyers. The biggest obstacle in finding customers was stated as the people being not educated enough. The lack of consciousness about the negative effects chemicals can have in the food chain, makes many people just buy the cheapest products and only a very limited number of mostly educated and high or middle income persons come to the organic bazaar. Uninformed customers hindering innovations is not only criticised in connection with organic products, but an issue also known from the conventional bazaar in Elmadağ:

> During the first year for example, we didn't know broccoli here. They made us plant broccoli and we had a big harvest. The broccoli was just gorgeous! But find a place to sell them. We could not sell them. We took them to the bazaar. The people asked us "What is this?" – "Broccoli" – "What is it for?" Concluding then that they prefer other things they know as they are afraid that they would die or get poisoned.[73] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011)

Customers sceptical of anything they do not know effects the choice of crops, but also the presentation: very careful about not bringing 'dirty' vegetables to the market, beets are scrubbed, the outer layers of leek removed, parsley and other greenish washed and nicely bound to small bunches. In this way, farmers meet the demands of customers who do ask for organic, but also clean, shiny and colourful products.

Evaluations of the marketing possibilities of organic agriculture depend as stated above on the current situation the farmer is in and his/her abilities in networking and presentation. Such factors are able to change the discourse from appraisal to a questioning of the whole enterprise within a short time.

---

[72] "Benim çok hoşuma gidiyor bu proje konusu. Eğer şahsen, şartlar olsa, kendim de yapardım. (…) Yaygınlaşmış olsa, daha yakın yerler (pazarlar) olmuş olsa. (…) Yapılır, niye yapılmasın?"
[73] "İlk sene de mesela brokoli. Biz burada brokoli bilmezdik. Brokoli ektik, ektirdiler daha doğrusu. Çok güzel [..] aldık. Bir brokoli oldu, o kadar şahane oldu, yani. Hani gel pazar yeri bul. Satamadik; pazara götürüyorduk, bak. "Bu ne?" diyorlardi. "Brokoli". "Bu ne işe yarar?" İşte ya marul çorbası olsun; bilmediğimiz bir şey. Ya böyle ölür mölürüz, diyen çok insan duydum."

"You find me a market, I will not use fertilizers."[74]

Frustration about difficulties encountered in selling one's products changes the contention about healthier produce into demands. The responsibility of spreading more information is seen as being with the national media. Other actors who should be more active in promoting healthy and organic food are the state, the government and the ministries, who need to provide for the necessary framework and support that a more favourable system concerning agriculture in general and especially certified organic agriculture. With more information, the farmers claim, the demand would rise automatically too. At the same time, Güneşköy is also directly referred to as a partner expected to support the farmers in marketing aspects:

> Here in this village, we are farmers and agriculture is our only occupation. [...] Until now nobody asked whether or not we could sell our produce, whether we make any profit or deficit. We want a closer relationship. We want a better relationship among us, the ones who took the lead. "If you were not able to sell your vegetables here, let's find a market for you."[75] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011)

Providing an example and inciting farmers to change their production is not considered enough – the *hocas* from town are expected to continue their support and are in this citation by Müslim seen as insurance. If he is not able to sell his products, if there are any other problems in regard to his agricultural activities, then the group should provide support. When asked about why he thinks that it should be their job to find appropriate markets, Müslüm replied *"[b]ecause they started it; they took the lead. Who else could do it? We are not able to find a market in a place like Ankara."*[76] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011) He underlines their responsibility as the ones who convinced him to change to organic and at the same time their – compared to most villagers – advantageous position in regard to finding potential customers, putting their support as a condition of him not using fertilizers.

---

[74] "Sen bana pazar bulacağın, ben gübre atmayacağım" Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011
[75] "Biz de bu köyde çiftçiyiz. çiftcilik de başka bir şey yapmıyoruz. [...] Satılmış mı, satılmamış mı, siz bu işten zarar mı ediyorsunuz, kar mı ediyorsunuz diyen olmadı bu zamana kadar. Daha sık iletişim istiyoruz. Madem bu işe baş koyduk, daha güzel iletişim olsun. Bu sebzeyi burada satamadıysanız, bir pazar bulalım, size. "
[76] "Çünkü onlar ön ayak; onlar bize öncü oldu, mesela. Kim yapabilir başka? Biz […] pazar bulamayız Ankara gibi yerde."

"Müslüm became rich in a few years, [...] let's do the same"

Müslüm's complaints about the current situation might not be founded solely on the expressed lack of customers:

> I also invited people "Come, let's do this work [organic agriculture] together". Cem and the others said let's start this slowly, if we try to change it all at once, we won't succeed. Let's try to realize this by slowly adding more persons every year. Last year two persons joined; this year one more. […] If I had been more successful concerning financial aspects, they would have said "Müslüm became rich in a few years, there is a lot of money in this sector, let's do the same". But it didn't happen like this.[77] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011)

Putting forth an argument of convincing more farmers to change to organic production, the citation also hints at some bigger expectations when he obtained the certificate. He expresses that it is not enough reason to change if the economic result stays the same, there needs to be more profit that with conventional methods, it needs a perspective to "become rich". With implying that if he had become rich, others would also have joined, he firmly connects his own success or failure with that of Güneşköy's aim to change the valley to organic. Müslim seems to confirm Bora's statement about the motivations of farmers:

> But unfortunately if they have started to do this it is not because they have a belief in high ideals, ecology, environment, etc. but they think that they can make money out of this. So I must confess that the knowledge level of the village is not very high as usual in Turkey. So before environmental and ecological problems they are concerned about having their stomach full. That is the first step, then comes the education of kids, the first things first and then other things, then they can look at the world. (Interview Bora, GK, 18.03.2011)

The study by Çobanoğlu and Işın (2009) among dried fig farmers in Turkey that finds that economical criteria are more important than sustainability or environmental factors in the process of agricultural decision making also supports this sober statement by Bora. Asking the question differently, not whether economic or ecological concerns are more important but if and when environmental concern plays a role in the decision process, a study by Best (2010) among farmers in Western Germany finds a correlation between the individual's

---

[77] "Ben de teşvik ediyordum. Gelin hep beraber yapalım bu işi. Cem Beyler de biraz basamak basamak çıkalım dediler. Böyle bir şey [...] hep birden yapalım desek, bu işi başaramayız, gibisine yani böyle her sene birkaç kişi katarak bu işi yapalım. Gecen sene de iki kişi katıldı, bu sene bir kişi daha katıldı. […] Ben eğer böyle bir parlayıp çıksaydım konudan. "Müslüm Dayı zengin oldu birkaç senede. Bu işte para var, gelin biz de yapalım" derlerdi. Böyle bir şey olmadı.

environmental concern and the probability to change to organic agriculture (Best 2010; see also McLaughlin 2007).

> First, the decision to adopt organic agriculture is neither determined by economic considerations alone, nor is it merely a matter of values and ideology. In most cases, farmers are guided by both utility considerations and environmental concern. (Best 2010, 464)

Organic agriculture is not only an ideological construct, but in practice connected to different financial aspects. An advantage and thus a pull-factor for farmers to implement organic agriculture is that the prices for organic produce are higher than for those coming from conventional agriculture - in Turkey about twice as high. Additionally, costs for pesticides are eliminated. Thus, besides saving on chemicals, farmers can earn more money for less produce - following the motto "few, but clean", that was mentioned several times by villagers during my stay in Hisarköy. The higher price is also well-known and the amounts people coming to buy vegetables at the bazaar are paying for certified products are frequent topics of conversation, so for example that a bag of onions can be sold for thirty Liras, whereas most of the farmers with conventional production sell them for half the price.

But producing organic also has its costs and disadvantages. Taking the certificate for example is quite expensive and annually a fee for the extension of the certificate needs to be paid. With the bureaucratic work, persons from the Güneşköy-group helped in the past, but some aspects, as the obligation that the farmer needs to own the land-title are beyond their influence.

Statistically, in the first years after changing to organic, the harvest is smaller than before, due to disclaim of fertilizers and higher losses because of not using pesticides against insects and bad herbs. The consequences of the latter also mean an additional workload for farmers, as the war against bad herbs and insects is carried out in exhausting one-by-one fights that need to be repeated regularly.

Another costly disadvantage of organic agriculture is the undeveloped market in Turkey. Whereas Istanbul, the largest city in Turkey, has already three bazaars for organic produce, Ankara, as the capital had only one at the time of the research. Hisarköy is more than one hour drive from that bazaar, meaning that although compared to many other sellers there,

who come from Western Turkey, the Black Sea or the Mediterranean coast, they are some of the closer ones, it still takes a lot more time to go there than to the bazaar of Elmadağ that is at 15-minutes driving distance from Hisarköy. Furthermore, the bazaar-fee at the organic bazaar in Ankara is higher than the one in Elmadağ.

Putting all those factors together, changing to organic can but also might not bring more profit than conventional agriculture. In any case, being able to ask for a price twice as high per kilo of onions than the neighbours is connected to many other 'invisible' costs and none of the farmers will just earn twice as much by changing to organic.

Frustration about the lack of market that causes him to throw away parts of his production and on top of this earning less money than before, made one of the farmers state the intention to not extend his certificate. Although their way of farming would remain compliant to the rules of organic agriculture, without certificate, they will not be able to sell them at the organic bazaar anymore.

Those truths in mind, the difference between Güneşköy and Hisarköy becomes striking. Whereas Güneşköy members do have their job and income from outside the project and have the 'luxury' to not be dependent on Güneşköy making profit or even meeting its own expenses, most villagers live from the agricultural sector. The importance of earning a living is expressed in the following proverb that was given by Zeliha: *"[home] is not the place you were born but the place you find food."*[78]. Choices are more limited if the financial situation of a whole family relies on harvest and 'experimenting' with new methods becomes more risky. Güneşköy by showing an example, can take some of the risk, but again, although some of the visitors also buy produce and are regular customers at the organic bazaar, finally selling enough products is up to the farmers. If they find enough customers, they will have profit, if they do not, the contrary will be the case.

Contrary to the villagers, who sell every week at the bazaar, Güneşköy has a different system: Supporters that are found via talking or mailing lists, pay a fixed fee that was 600 Turkish Lira in the 2011 season and then get every week a box of what is grown at the moment at the land delivered to Ankara. The whole harvest is split up among the participating

---

[78] "Köyün doğduğun yer değil, doyduğun yerdir."

persons or households, meaning that at times the boxes might be nearly empty, at other times bursting full. This system is one form of community supported agriculture - with the annual fee the customers take over part of the risk of a bad harvest due to weather or other unfavourable conditions. At the same time with the fixed number of participants a continuous distribution of the products is secured and nothing needs to be thrown away. The advantages of this system are also seen in the village and one of the reason for demands like *"they should give us their customers"* or *"they should find us markets"* underlining at the same time, that the 'hocas from town' do have much more possibilities to find potential customers than they have in the village.

The group is well aware of these difficulties farmers in the village face.

> Giving education is one part, but making it economically sustainable is another aspect and this aspect is usually ignored in the city. Maybe it is the opportunity of the Güneşköy group. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

From time to time they also find some customers, as for example in October 2011, sending out a message to the Güneşköy mail-group asking whether anyone is interested in buying onions and then distributed the ordered bags together with the weekly vegetable boxes.

Another example for cooperation in the selling of produce was that Güneşköy offered the villagers its minibus for the vegetable transport to the bazaar. After some trips the group asked the respective villagers to take over the costs of transport. Seeing this opportunity of free transportation ended, villagers did not ask for the driver anymore but set up their own transport. This possibility besides showing that the farmers do not depend on the Güneşköy group had the positive side that instead of driving the minibus from Ankara to Hisarköy, bring the vegetables and sellers to Ankara and do another Hisarköy return trip, the Hisarköy organised transport is situated in the village, saving one Ankara-Hisarköy return trip.

5.3 Development alternatives and alternatives to development

Whether the change to organic agriculture was due to the activities by Güneşköy can be

discussed, that the group played a role in it is certain. Güneşköy is not the only one bringing information on organic agriculture: All the houses do have television and for example the TarımTV[79] (Agriculture TV) also reports frequently on tendencies in agriculture and thus also on organic. One of the villagers expressed it once: *"we are not isolated from the world"*. Nowadays media is everywhere, information goes everywhere". But Güneşköy with its years of giving an example with the cultivation of its land, with discussions and talks about their convictions, although not all of the messages actually reached the village, could definitely provoke some change regarding the attitude towards organic and environmentally sustainable agriculture, by making this kind of growing crops something close and touchable.

It also remains to be questioned whether the project actually led to people in the village now living healthier than before. Of course most farmers in the village use pesticides and this could still be a factor to work on, but all in all life in the village seems already very healthy and environmentally friendly: food, that was given as the main aspect of a healthy life, consists of much vegetable and fruit that is to a big part grown by themselves on their own fields, also implying that there is no need for plastic packaging; their workplace is in walking distance from their houses, meaning no need for motorized vehicles; their consumption is low compared to consumption in town; they work in nature and with the soil every day; etc.

So the whole argument of making the life in the village healthier seems questionable, as also one of the member expressed in a reflection on what improving the life might mean:

> But what we aim at in Güneşköy seems somehow better than what they do, doesn't it? We aim at showing that it is possible to improve their lifestyle. We do not live there now, but if we lived there, maybe we could make life there more effective, meaning that… in fact, right, it does not really seem like there would be a big contribution from our side. They already live more or less ecologically, at least relative to our own lifestyle. But we could improve their farming methods, improve the technologies used in agriculture, and ensure that they can increase their produce and that they can sell it.[80] (Interview Alp, GK, 14.12.2010)

---

[79] The channel run by the Department for Publications and Educational Broadcast of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs is dedicated to producing and broadcasting agricultural programs. The department published several short documentaries on organic agriculture, its meaning, criteria, application and effects. http://www.tarimtv.gov.tr/index.php; other examples are Bereket TV, Tarım TV, Çiftci TV and Köy TV.

[80] "Ama bizim Güneşköy'de yapmayı hedeflendiğimiz onlarınkinden daha da iyi, sanki, değil mi? Onların şu andaki ekolojik hayatlarından daha iyisi de yapılabiliri göstermeyi hedefliyoruz biz Güneşköy'de. Şu anda yaşamıyoruz ama biz Güneşköy'e gidip orada yerleşmiş olsak, orada yaşasak, belki onların şeyi daha verimli hale getirebiliriz. Yani şu anki... doğru, aslında çok fazla da katkımız olacak gibi gelmiyor. Onların bir şu anki

A focus in the descriptions above tries to show that defining good practice is a contested field with different actors having different interests. A study in 2006 on the perception of nature of farmers, scientists and NGOs "illustrates an underlying battle for the right to define nature and nature quality and essentially define what organic farmers should work towards" (Hansen, Noe, and Højring 2006, 1; see also McLaughlin 2007). Going beyond presenting an opposition, the examples also aim at pointing at "local agency in contesting, appropriating and reshaping – not just resisting – hegemonic development discourses" (Corson 2008, 19). The idea of developing villagers to make their lives healthier thus might have to be reconsidered. What can be said about Güneşköy is that with its example it helps what the state's development strategy also proposes: a diversification of production and first of all of ideas. The village is far from being isolated, or single-minded. Family and neighbour communication, television, agricultural advisors from the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, education, all bring in different perspectives. The Güneşköy members through their example provide additional perspectives.

The use of concepts of organic agriculture and a healthier lifestyle by villagers in Hisarköy might be considered as example of what Haenn concluded in her research: environmental projects "provide farmers with new rhetorical tools for appealing to people interested in environmental protection" (Haenn 2006, 233) rather than changing prevalent ideas of nature and the environment. At the same time, as the changing descriptions on the success of organic production in the village show, such changes are fragile and changeable. Taking the certificate once does not mean an unconditional encompassment of environmentalist thought and underlines the process-character of negotiations (Corson 2008, 28). Furthermore, what Alp described as improving farming methods, technologies, efficiency and market possibilities refers to changes making farmers more competitive within the economic mainstream system. Economic self sustainability is considered a way to provide villagers with alternatives to leaving the village to work in the cities, to provide them with a development alternative.

Among the Güneşköy group, not only alternative development but also tendencies of a search for alternatives to development are shown. An example is the community supported

---

yaşamları var, ekolojik yaşıyorlar neredeyse, bize göre. Ama işte, onların tarım şeyini geliştirebiliriz, tarım ile ilgili teknolojilerini geliştirebiliriz, daha çok ürün almalarını sağlayabiliriz, bunları satabilmelerini sağlabiliriz."

agriculture project, where the purchase of vegetables does not work within mainstream economy, but in a system, that is based on the customers maintaining the agriculture and taking over the risk in case of bad harvest. At the same time they agree to not be able to chose the amount and time of a certain produce, whatever available and ripe is shared among the supporters. Güneşköy is not only an experimental place in regard to the land and the agriculture there, but also concerning the interaction between persons, in finding new systems of living together. In contrast to a project with a specific target that needs to be reached, seeing it as an experimental place makes experiences whether described as positive or negative a valid outcome, which can serve as a lesson for more effective or conscious approaches in the future. To exemplify this, the construction of the glasshouse is a project – though as the first of its kind, also somehow an experiment – financed from outside following a detail plan that was prepared and calculated for a long time. As such it needs to report on the progress and it is under the constraint to show a finished solar glasshouse as a result. Güneşköy for its part does not have to prove the construction of a specific number of houses, the realization of an ecovillage with people living there in community or a harmonious relationship with the neighbours. Things that even though aimed at in the beginning, can and do have changed over the years, or at least, are now seen from a more close-to-practice perspective. As many expressed, working on the land, giving information, creating awareness, doing something together is the aim, meaning the important thing is not a fixed target, but the process and the willingness to do something. Plans are good as points of references, as orientation for those involved, but they can be changed and adapted to 'the needs of today'.

Conclusion – Negotiating 'Organic Agriculture'

With the example of how organic agriculture and a healthy lifestyle is presented in Hisarköy this chapter sheds some light on the role of organic production in the region and shows differences in the starting positions between Güneşköy members and villagers in regard to agricultural production. Financial aspects, meaning mainly marketing possibilities, are an important factor in the choice for organic, but other factors on different levels play an important role too (Hansen, Noe, and Højring 2006; McLaughlin 2007). A change to organic seems promising as the products can be sold at higher prices, but the accounts show that organic production also has its side costs as paying for the certificate and higher prices of transportation. Thus organic does not guarantee a higher income: Farmers need to be able to sell their products and thus, as they market their crops individually, need abilities of

advertisement and building good relations with customers. Having a regular paid job and the box-system for selling vegetables distinguishes Güneşköy members from villagers whose main income is from agriculture and who rely on customers at the bazaar, arguments used by villagers in appealing for ongoing support by the Güneşköy group in regard to finding markets for the products, support that is expected through the wide network of the group. Another distinguishing aspect is the academic background of the members of the cooperative, with a different access to scientific argumentation, reflected in the discourse on definitions of 'organic'. The different narrations presented give an impression of the villagers' perspectives on agricultural activity, development and their environment, as well as their attitudes towards and expectation in the Güneşköy project.

CHAPTER VI

GÜNEŞKÖY - HISARKÖY INTERACTION

> Those who go to the organic bazaar know what this place is about […] But the others, those outside, do not know about it. What is visible are the vegetables … Different persons have different perspectives, because every person's experience is different, everyone interprets differently. […] Someone might come but just see the visible things. He/she might see, but not know what it is, what they do.[81] (Interview GK-employee, 25.09.2010)

This chapter continues with negotiations and contestations, but this time shifting the focus to the "socio-cultural" claim of the Güneşköy project. As shown in chapter IV, environmental concern plays a fundamental role in the establishment of the cooperative. At the same time, central aims of Güneşköy are directed towards or involve the village. Thus, the view from the other side, the perception of the project by villagers and the actual interaction is the next point of interest I will look at. The citation chosen for the beginning of this chapter, already talks about a lack of visibility, or, more precisely, a partial visibility. For the ecovillage initiative to actually change something in the village, it first of all needs some knowledge, some awareness of the project and its aims. Thus the questions I try to answer here are the following: Could and if yes how far could Güneşköy communicate its aims to Hisarköy? How is Güneşköy presented by persons from Hisarköy? Do and how do villagers participate in the project? How are arguments contested and used in the village?

This chapter includes a retrospective to the past and an account of how Güneşköy came to Hisarköy, information that is necessary to better understand statements and attitudes by the villagers, as the main theme influencing their perception of Güneşköy is rooted in the very beginning of the project and even preceding their arrival to the village.

---

[81] Organik pazara gidenler, buranın amacının ne olduğunu biliyorlar. […] Ama diğerleri, dışarıdakiler, kimse bilmiyor. Gözle görünen bir sebze var. […] İnsanların bakış açıları farklıdır, çünkü her kişinin süreci ayrıdır, herkes ayrı değerlendirir. […] Geliyor ama sadece oradan görünen var. Görüyor ama ne olduğunu bilmiyorlar, ne yaptıklarını bilmiyorlar.

Yet; I will first turn to the question about how Güneşköy members depict Hisarköy and how important they consider a good relationship with the villagers, statements that reveal different starting points in regard to the attitude towards Hisarköy.

6.1 Depiction of Hisarköy and the village-urban relationship

In the description of villagers and persons from Hisarköy in specific, Güneşköy members use a "grammar of orientalization" (Baumann 2006), applying positive and negative attributes to villagers that stand in opposition to "the city" and their own lifestyle. On the one side, lack of education, of openness of thought, of hygiene and of gender equality and laziness are brought forth as problematic aspects in village reality. On the other side self-sufficiency, less resource use, local production, food from the own garden and village community are seen in a romantic way. The picture presented resembles what Baumann summarizes as "what is good in us is [still] bad in them, but what got twisted in us [still] remains straight in them." (Baumann 2006, 20)

Gender relations – the role of women

Different treatment and responsibilities of women and men in Hisarköy are pinned down by Güneşköy members as characteristics of villages and as a point for Güneşköy to focus on in providing support:

> The problem is with the young people especially the women, young women in the village. Maybe there is a little bit heavy work on women in village. They are doing most of the work. They are raising children. And they are responsible for the education, for the animals and the fields. They are heavy workers. Therefore, they really want some more comfortable life; they would prefer … they want to marry a man from the city. So the young population is lost to the city. The young men cannot find a girl from the village. Therefore they are losing their young population. This is sad. I want to see the quality of life improved in the village; that men help women and that they have a better balance concerning work load in the village. The burden should not only be on women but shared. Now, this may be possible if women earn money. Until now, men manage money and women are helping and they have more responsibility. If they earn money, I think they are more independent and the workload in the family will be better balanced. And then women may prefer to stay in the village. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

As Cem shows, women are identified as a group burdened with many responsibilities and hard work, but at the same time also as key figures in regard to changing something in the village, a conclusion also presented in a report on village development activities in the early 2000s by a charity foundation in Hisarköy (Gökmen et al. 2004, 6f). This perception was a reason for the group to employ two women as workers at the land three years ago. Both of them presented positive accounts of their experience at the land, but after obtaining their own certificate, stopped working for Güneşköy to produce certified organic crops on their own fields. Additionally, in the last two years, several women were employed on a daily basis to clean the Güneşköy fields from bad herbs.

The coffeehouse in the centre of the village is a male domain; meetings and talks in the village's coffeehouse might include women from the Güneşköy group or more general women associated with the city, but usually no village women. Presentations and negotiations in the very beginning of Güneşköy which took place in the coffeehouse thus were *"among men, [they talked] to our men, women do not enter the coffeehouse"*[82] (Interview Hatice, HK, 02.12.2010). To address women, different meeting places were chosen, as the houses of villagers, the school, or talks during everyday activities like at the bread-oven.

Education – a key to development?

Like in many development programs and initiatives, education is considered as an important factor for creating change in villages (see Aytemur 2007; Dabağcı 2011; MARA 2007). Güneşköy members try to encourage pupils to continue education and parents to support their children, girls and boys. More efficient education is – as reactions by Güneşköy members show – seen as a remedy against aspects criticised at the moment and bringing more perspectives, better knowledge of their rights and possibilities, increased hygienic standards and a more equal relationship between men and women, preventing for example early marriages of girls.

One of the Güneşköy members visited the local primary school where 1st to 5th grade are taught together in one room by one teacher[83] at several occasions and held classes on origami

---

[82] "Erkeklerin arasında, bizim adamların, kadınlar kahveye girmez."
[83] Village schools being not very popular choices among teachers, regular changes take place. In autumn 2011, the third teacher was assigned to the school within one and a half year. Such a frequent change, the high probability to get an inexperienced young teacher plus the challenge of teaching five grades at the same time in the same room cause many pupils problems when they change to boarding school for the following three years of compulsory education. Although some parents voiced concerns about the quality of education, the majority

(combined with geometry), mathematics and story writing. She also organised nature-magazines for kids and a game for playful repeating of multiplications. Extra coaching for pupils with learning difficulties is in the planning process, but not realized yet.

A desirable village-life

Whereas some members emphasise what should or needs to be changed in the village (see also previous chapter: aims of developing villagers and being an example), others underline in their description of the village that in fact some aspects of village life can be an example for the project and argue in line with what Rapport et al (2003) define under "rural idyll".

> So they [the population living in the rural areas] are more ecological, they do not produce as much waste, they do not use as much resources as we do. Plus, they used to be self-sufficient. So, if you look at … and there is a social thing there. So a lot of the villages in that respect are more sustainable. (Interview Filiz, GK, 22.09.2010)

> Hisarköy is still a village which didn't lose its population. 300 people still live there and there are maybe few houses empty but most of the people still live there. And the old people don't want to leave Hisarköy; they want to live there. We know many families, for instance our neighbour and his wife, they are 80 years old and they, each day early in the morning they come to the field and they work there until the evening. […] And they can produce enough for their life. It is not much income, but they live it that way for maybe tens of years or nearly hundred years. So they enjoy it. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

The understanding of village and city as completely different concepts, as seeing "countryside a way of life and a type of social organization diametrically opposed to that of city" (Rapport and Overing 2003, 320) goes as far as it made Nurgül, a former member of Güneşköy who now has her own land she works on say at one of her short visits to the Güneşköy land that *it is impossible for the people from the city to understand villagers and vice versa*[84] (Fieldnotes, 12.06.2011). The majority of the members nevertheless, even though acknowledging significant differences between the lifestyles in villages and cities, especially in regard to gender relations, want to go beyond such an assumption of an obstacle that cannot be overcome and try to find background and reasons for realities encountered in villages without attaching (de)valorizations in their descriptions.

---

prefers this local education to the alternative of sending their kids already from 1st grade on to boarding school, what was the case some years ago.

[84] "Şehirdeki kişilerin köylüleri, köylünün de şehirliyi anlaması mümkün değil."

The two perspectives, positive and negative sides of village life, also imply two different consequences: on the one hand the influence of Güneşköy is supposed to incite people in the village to abandon or reduce habits considered as negative or backwards, on the other hand, Güneşköy aims at preserving village life by creating perspectives to enable persons from Hisarköy to stay in their village and continue their 'environmentally and socially friendly' lifestyle.

Importance given to interaction and reciprocity

Different members of the Güneşköy group attach different importance to a good relationship between the project and the village. For some members, a good relationship is seen as one of the fundamental aims of the project and as a necessity. Others consider is as a positive extra as the project is legally bound to and part of the village, but not a requirement.

Reasons for why Güneşköy needs to have a good relationship with the village are connected to the already earlier mentioned, not only working the land conform to criteria of organic agriculture and developing more environmentally friendly ways of living and producing for the sake of it but also conveying it to a larger group, in short 'being an example' needs not only the 'example' but also an 'interact', someone who sees, evaluates and maybe follows the example.

> If we have a very good idea from ten thousand kilometres away, it doesn't work. […] If we realize the project at some place nobody can see, nobody can visit, nobody can criticise, nobody can envy, nobody can like or dislike, then it would not be very meaningful because we cannot be totally independent in that respect. So Hisarköy is our 'interact'. (Interview Bora, GK, 18.03.2011)

Ideally, this interaction would allow the project to get immediate responses, to include the villagers in the decision makings for further projects and to adapt them to the actual needs of village reality.

> To just ... But I guess it was important to see what kind of problems they have and it is not easy to just make guesses from distance. So instead of doing that, we are next to a village, a traditional village. (Interview Filiz, GK, 22.09.2010)

A discussion during one of the group meetings reveals some of the tensions caused by

different approaches towards the importance of the relationship between Güneşköy and the villagers. A point on the agenda of that meeting was who could work next to the two full-time workers in the following year. One of the members said that he would like a family. The jokingly proposed *"a Georgian family would be the easiest solution"*[85], met with sharp criticism by Oya "because they could not communicate with the village". Hakan countered that they do not have to communicate with the village. Before the discussion expands, Yağmur ends it by pointing out that a Georgian would legally be very difficult (Fieldnotes, GK meeting, 08.12.2010). The – though jokingly – proposed economical optimization of the project through the employment of a Georgian family that would work for a lower salary than a local one makes the division between a cost-effective product orientation and a more social process orientation visible, a divide that lies at the basis of most inner-group tensions.

It is worth noting here also that Hakan is among those who put most emphasis on 'village development' and 'doing something for the people living in the villages'. In the same meeting he also proposes to start holding village meetings again – like they did in the very beginning of Güneşköy. In the idea of meetings with the villagers there is nevertheless a need to distinguish between meetings to create social relationships with both sides as equal partners and 'information sessions', i.e. letting the village participate in decision making process or only in the application of a finished plan (cf Paley 2001).

The ideal is that the relationship should not be one-sided but reciprocal with both sides supporting and helping each other. Whereas the villagers would bring their knowledge about agriculture and the specific conditions of the area, Güneşköy members can in exchange help finding networks of selling the villagers' produce as well as being a provider of paid workforce. To a certain extent this collaboration also worked: information and seeds were exchanged, but the exchange remained below expectations and almost all members see potential for improvement in the relationship to its neighbours and Hisarköy.

---

[85] Turkey is among the main destination countries for labour migration from Georgia. Many Georgian labour migrants are underpaid, socially unprotected and do not have a legal employment status (CIPDD 2009, 10). According to İçduygu (2006:21) Georgia is among the top five source countries for labour migration (Atatimur 2008)

6.2 "The place over there" – villagers' descriptions of Güneşköy

The terms used by villagers are Güneşköy-Foundation and terms referring to the place under the name of members or the persons working there, or also just as *orayı* and *şurayı* (over there). When it comes to describing "over there", foundation working on organic agriculture, bahçe (garden), and şirket (company) are mentioned. The aspect that "they" do organic agriculture is well-known, but apart from this *"çok bilmiyoruz"* (we do not know much) appeared very often in the responses about a description of Güneşköy. Buran for example said that she doesn't know much, as they do not come to the village, but she knows Cem and also the other *hocas*; as well as that *"they do organic agriculture"* (Fieldnotes, HK, 01.12.2010). Mine described their interaction with Güneşköy very short with *"They come and go. Hoş geldin, hoş bulduk. Selam aleykum, aleykum selam"*[86] (Interview Mine, HK, 25.09.2010).

The "*köy*" (village) in the name of Güneşköy also causes some confusion: On one occasion a person questioned why it is called village, when nobody lives there, when it is only one piece of land and all in all definitely not a village, laughs and suggests that he will call his place from now on "starvillage" (Fieldnotes 25.09.2010). At another occasion, when a woman on the street asked me where I was going to and I replied "to Güneşköy", she looked startled and afterwards explained me that *"because there is the 'village' in the name, you know"* she thought I wanted to walk all the way to the neighbouring village, something that would be very exceptional as women usually do not walk alone, especially longer distances (Fieldnotes 12.06.2011).

"They did good things"

Considering the villagers' general rather harsh-seeming style of conversation where clear positive statements are voiced rarely and sparely, comments like *"eh, Güneşköy is good, there is no harm from it"* (Interview Mine, HK, 25.09.2010) or a sober *"I like Güneşköy"* (Bahar, Gülseren; 03.12.2010) seem like important compliments. Two persons even engaged in openly praising Güneşköy: İsmail stated with apparent support for the group's activities that they did a lot of good things. He emphasises that they could also have built a factory or

---

[86] "Geliyorlar gidiyorlar. Hoş geldin, hoş bulduk. Selamün Aleykum, Aleykum Selam" — "Hoş geldin" is the phrase used for "welcome", "hoş bulduk", the reply; "Aleykum Selam" in the same way is the reply to "Selam Aleykum" ("peace with you")

something else that harms nature, but they do organic agriculture and thus give an example of respectful treatment of the environment instead of focussing on profit. With all their engagement, they *"merit respect"*[87] (Interview İsmail, HK, 13.2.2011).

> Our neighbours are nice, thanks God. [...] Very good persons. There is nobody like them. They are very special persons, really very nice. Filiz, Cem, Hakan [...] Namık is also very nice. [...] Those persons added value there. They dug a well, they worked the soil, and they planted a vineyard. They grow vegetables. They do everything. It was not used [before].[88] (Interview Zeliha, HK, 02.12.2010)

Like İsmail, Zeliha expresses enthusiasm concerning friendship relations and recognition of their environmental activities upgrading the land until then used 'only' as grazing land.

Collaboration in some spheres of life was also mentioned: To solve water problems of the cooperative and its neighbours, Güneşköy dug a well on the land of the neighbours that is used to water both - the land of the project and of the neighbours. Güneşköy also plugged the fields of another neighbour with their tractor and he in return helped them with covering the wall of the straw bale building with clay.

Such activities, where both sides work together, where both sides spend time together seem to be more present in the memories than 'bigger' achievements like mediating the construction of a health centre (again an activity in the 'grey zone' between Güneşköy and Güneş Vakfı). The health centre was built as a project by architecture students from METU, but afterwards due to a change in legislation that gave more importance to hospitals in bigger settlements, a doctor was never appointed there. Notwithstanding the disappointment by Güneşköy members about the health centre remaining empty, on the social level, the activity itself created lasting memories as the emotionally told experience of one of the women at the bread oven shows. With shining eyes she explained me that she hosted 35 "university-kids" for two months and when saying goodbye at the end of the project, they wrote her a poem and all had tears in the eyes (Fieldnotes, 02.12.2010).

---

[87] "Değeri hak ediyor"
[88] "Komşularımız iyi, Allah'a şükür. [...] Çok iyi adamlar; Onlar gibi yok. Onlar çok ayrı insanlar. Vallahi çok iyiler. Filiz Hanım, Cem Hoca, Hakan Bey de öyle. [...] Namık Bey de çok iyi. [...] Adamlar orayı değerlendirdi. Kuyu kazdılar, toprağı işlediler, bağ diktiler, dal diktiler. Sebze yetiştiriyorlar. İşte herşeyi yapıyorlar. Boş duruyordu."

"Of course you are a company"

Apart from some scientific, environmental and personal aims mentioned by villagers as what the Güneşköy group actually wants to do at the land, some persons in Hisarköy also think of Güneşköy as a company ascribing it economical aims. When I asked about the legal status of Güneşköy, the mayor of Hisarköy for example immediately replied that they are registered as a company, what caused the following short discussion between him and the Güneşköy member who was next to me:

> Member: "No, we are not a company."
> Mayor: "Why? Of course, you are a company. Aren't you?"
> Member: "Are we a company?"
> Mayor: "Of course."[89] (Fieldnotes 25.09.2010)

As a company, Güneşköy would be expected by villagers to pay some regular 'support' to the village, in the form of donating a certain percentage of its profit or turnover. Such a share for the village in return for using its land, its resources, is considered as the right of the village and defended as such by the mayor.

Whereas differences in the description of the legal status of Güneşköy among its members might be seen as utilitarian, as administrative necessity and not actually influencing their perception of the project or the group (see Chap IV), the understanding of Güneşköy as a 'company' is more than just a legal concept and revealing in regard to the perception of the project by some villagers. It means that they think that at least part of the reason for the creation of Güneşköy is to get financial profit, something that Güneşköy members for their part strictly distance themselves from – at most, the project should be self-sustainable. None of the members earns any money from Güneşköy; the income from the vegetable-box project should cover the salaries and insurances of the employees and the costs of transport. This non-profit image is as the citation above shows contested in Hisarköy and at another time when I countered demands of two villagers by referring to Güneşköy's non-profit character, the reaction was one of *"do you really believe this?"* and letting me feel that my conviction sounded pretty naive to them.

---

[89] "Yo, şirket değiliz ki." - "Niye? Tabiki şirketsiniz, değil misiniz?" - "Şirket miyiz?" - "Tabi."

Employees as 'middlemen'?

Considering the very limited time Güneşköy members can spend on the land and even less time with villagers, some members see the employees as 'middlemen' between the project and the village. They hope that the workers would be the ones who talk with other villagers about Güneşköy and thus help spreading information and aims of the group.

In 2010, two persons were constantly employed by the cooperative, at times when more work- force is needed, as especially for fighting bad herbs, more persons are employed on a daily basis. In their descriptions of Güneşköy, the employees put an emphasis on organic agriculture and described the essence of the project as spreading this way of agriculture in the villages. It is interesting to see here that both of them put forth that the work in Güneşköy is directed towards villages and both also stress the non-profit character of the project.

> Güneşköy is a project directed towards villagers. It is on organic agriculture; to spread it in villages. They grow vegetables and fruit there following principles of organic agriculture.[90] (Interview GK-employee, 25.09.2010)

> Their work is not profit oriented, but aims at attracting all villagers in the whole valley to organic agriculture, to spread it in Turkey […] this project is not only valid for Hisarköy. It is valid for all the villages in this valley. […] It is not profit oriented; the aim is to spread the project.[91] (Interview GK-employee, 25.09.2010)

In their responses, the employees do show strong support and conviction for the project, complimenting the *hocas* for their work but they also refer to the lack of knowledge about the project by villagers. One of them further points at the subjectivity of what is observed and perceived from the outside and also implies in his statement, that Güneşköy is more than the visible vegetables, but difficult to explain:

> The villagers ask "What are they doing?" – We can only answer "They construct a greenhouse". We also do not [know] the details … Once the greenhouse is actually working, we can comment. But now, as it is not working, we cannot. […] Once it starts working, we will provide answers

---

[90] Güneşköy […] köylülere yönelik bir çalışmadır. Organik tarım üzerine; köylerde daha yaygınlaştırmak amaçlı, orada organik koşullarda sebze ve meyve yetiştiriyorlar.

[91] Yaptıkları çalışmalar kar amaçlı değil. Ama bu vadide bütün köylüleri organik tarımla geçindirmek. Türkiye'ye de daha yaygınlaştırılması, […] sadece bu proje Hisarköy için gecerli değil. Bütün vadide kaç tane köy var, o köylerin hepsi için gecerli. Bu organik tarımı yaygınlaştırmak (…) Karı yok. Bu projeyi yaygınlaştırmak, amaç o.

when they ask "what do they do here?" If we gave answers now, it would be misinformation. [92]

(Interview GK-employee, 25.09.2010)

The two employees do not see it as their responsibility to inform villagers about what is going on at the land. They both are willing to provide information to anyone interested in Güneşköy, but they also express the feeling that they do not have enough information themselves, or at least are not sure about the answers to the questions that villagers would ask.

6.3 Retrospective to the past

"Güneşköy-Vakfı"

Besides company, the second legal status widely linked to Güneşköy by villagers is the status of a foundation. Foundation (*vakıf*) is frequently used in talks by villagers about Güneşköy and points at events in the past. In the early 2000s, a charity organization called İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı[93] (or shortened: Güneş Vakfı/İGV) started regular activities in Hisarköy. One of the many projects of the foundation aimed at improving the life quality in villages and for this project members of İGV were looking for a suitable place. Hakan recounted the arrival of the Vakfı: After some research Hisarköy was their first choice, but when the foundation members presented their plans, to their surprise they were confronted with a rather reluctant group of villagers. According to the information given by Hakan, the foundation invited him to one of the first meetings at the village's coffeehouse and that his talk was decisive for the acceptance of the help of the foundation by breaking the ice through creating an analogy between the Vakfı and Charlie's Angels[94], describing their common motivation as helping people. When no reaction came to the proposal of the – all female –

---

[92] Organik pazara gidenler, buranın amacının ne olduğunu biliyorlar. […] Ama diğerleri, dışarıdakiler, kimse bilmiyor. Gözle görünen bir sebze var. […] İnsanların bakış açıları farklıdır, çünkü her kişinin süreci ayrıdır, herkes ayrı değerlendirir. […] Geliyor ama sadece oradan görünen var. Görüyor ama ne olduğunu bilmiyorlar, ne yaptıklarını bilmiyorlar. (…) Ne yapıyorlar? diyorlar. Sera yapıyorlar. Tamam, bizim diyeceğimiz bu. Ama sera da biz de tam detayları [bilmiyoruz] …Sera faaliyete geçse, yorumunu yaparız. Şimdi çalışır vaziyete olmadığı için biz de yorum yapamıyoruz. […] Onlar yorum yapsalar, ne yapıyor olduklarını? Ne? Cevabını veririz. Şimdi biz cevap versek yanlış bilgilendirme olur. (…)

[93] İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı (http://www.insanlikgunesi.org/) was founded in spring 1999 based on values such as peace, friendship, equality and democracy with a vision of creating a better society. Besides other projects like "Remembering and explaining Atatürk" or "World Dances", KÖYKAL (life quality in villages) is listed as one of the main projects and involved Hisarköy.

[94] Charlie's Angels is a US American serial launched in 1976, where - said in a very simplified way - in each part the boss Charlie gives an order/ wants something and the three "angels", three attractive women, do everything to fulfil this demand.

foundation members concerning whether the villagers would like them to work in the village, the now Güneşköy member intervened:

> I turned towards them, the villagers and said "Do you watch serials?" The answer was "Yes, we do". "Eh" I said "Did you watch the serial Charlie's Angels?" They said "Yes." So I said "What do they do? They help people in bad situations. Look," I said "these women" I said "Charlie's Angels, it is them. They are Charlie's Angels. Not taking anything in return, not expecting votes, [...].They came just like Charlie's Angels. [...] This is a big chance, good luck." "Don't you want to have this?" I said "These women want to help you." One of them came out "of course we want". After that, everyone said "we also want"[95] (Interview Hakan, GK, 04.07.2010)

This illustration shows a charity approach by the İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı towards villagers, where persons with higher education from the city go to the countryside to do projects there, to help improving life conditions in the name of a general strengthening of Turkish society without expecting anything in return. Such an approach is also observed in other examples of volunteer/education organizations and institutions in Turkey (see 2.2; see also Tonguç 1998; Aytemur 2007; Dabağcı 2011). The only thing the Güneş Vakfı demanded was the villagers' participation in their activities. Once the villagers accepted, the foundation organised medical care and legal support by bringing doctors and lawyers, offered trainings and brought the kids for a sightseeing-trip to Ankara. Besides the involvement of one Güneşköy-member in getting access to the village, some persons of the Güneşköy project were also active within the foundation. Consequently, their project was seen as another activity within the program of the charity foundation. With this intermingled history, some villagers until present do not make a difference between the charity foundation, which now does not work in Hisarköy anymore, and Güneşköy. A young man in the village for example told me about his experience with the foundation when I asked about Güneşköy.

> They took us for sightseeing to Ankara. With them, with the people from Güneşköy Vakfı it was the first and only time that I went to Anıtkabir [the mausoleum of Atatürk in Ankara].[96] (Interview İsmail, HK, 13.2.2011)

---

[95] "Ben de onlara, köylülere döndüm ve dedim ki "Dizileri seyrediyor musunuz?" "Evet, seyrediyoruz" Cevap vermişler. Eh, dedim ki, "Siz Çarli'nin melekleri dizisini seyrettiniz mi?" [...] "Evet" dediler. Dedim, "Onlar ne yapıyor? Kötü durumda olan insanlara yardım ediyorlar". "Bakın" dedim "bu bayanlar" dedim "Çarli'nin melekleri, bunlar. Bunlar Çarli'nin melekleri. Sizden hiçbir karşılık almadan, oy beklemeden, [...] Aynen de Çarli'nin melekleri geldi. Bu bir talih kuşu. [...] büyük bir firsat, büyük bir şans. "Ah, bunu istemez misiniz?" Dedim, "yani bayanlar size yardım etmek istiyor". Birisi çıktı "elbette isteriz" dedi. Ondan sonra, herkes "biz de isteriz" dediler."

[96] "Bizi Ankara'ya geziye götürdüler, ilk ve tek sefer onlarla Anıtkabir'e gittim; hani Güneşköy Vakfı'ndaki kişilerle."

I remarked that Güneşköy and Güneş Vakfı are two different organizations but he insisted that Güneşköy came as related to the Vakfı[97]. Although the two names do not draw back on a common origin and the similarity is explained as coincidence rather than intention[98], the similarities in regard to the name make such a confusion little surprising

One person actually – while still mixing up activities by Vakfı and cooperative in her narration – mentioned that the former left the village:

> How many years did they come, not to say anything wrong, they came for four years. Their time finished and they did not come anymore. They had some years, since completing them, they did not come anymore.[99] (Interview Zeliha, HK, 02.12.20 10)

This statement and the expressed consternation about their 'sudden' disappearance, supports the earlier mentioned importance given by some Güneşköy members to permanence in winning the trust of the persons in Hisarköy.

Buying the land in Hisarköy

Choosing the land was a process over several months. Lands in different parts around Ankara were visited. The position in the Valley, distance from Ankara, price, the land facing south, the structure of the land and existing contact through the İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı, were given among others as the reasons for the final decision for Hisarköy. How far the villagers had an impact on the decision-making is pictured differently:

> When we bought the land, the muhtar (village mayor) knew about it, but we didn't do anything with the muhtar. [...] It is possible, that they asked for the opinion of the mayor. I don't think so. Even if the mayor doesn't want, the state would sell there.[100] (Interview Alp, GK, 14.12.2010)

---

[97] "Aynı çatı altında geldiler"

[98] İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı draws on a citation by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk stating freely translated that "the forgotten abilities and characteristics of Turkishness will rise like a sun on the horizon of civilizations", thus referring to a symbolic "sun of humanity" or "sun of civilization"; Güneşköy on the contrary associates its name with the central role of the sun in environmental processes and as source of energy.

[99] "Kaç sene geldiler, yalan söylemeyim; dört sene geldiler. Günleri bitti bir daha gelmediler, Bir seneleri olmuş, onu dolduralı gelmediler."

[100] "Arazi alırken, muhtarın haberi vardı zaten de muhtarla bir şey yapmadık. [...] Muhtardan görüş alıyor olabilir. Ben sanmıyorum. Muhtar istemezse bile, devlet orayı satar. […] Eski muhtarla aramızı çok iyidi, bizim. Muhtemelen muhtara da şey sormuş olsa bile, muhtar olumlu yanıt vermiştir diye düşünüyorum."

Actually we bought the land from the state, from the government agencies. But the muhtar of Hisarköy gave permission. If they didn't want we couldn't buy the land. So they wanted. They actually invited us to join or buy the land. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

They asked the muhtar, they did not ask the villagers.[101] (Interview Arif, HK, 04.12.2010)

Did they also ask in the village to get the land? Of course, they asked and even if you do not ask, the treasure would sell it to you. The treasury does not include the villagers in decision making. *But they asked?* Of course they asked.[102] (Interview Zeliha, HK, 02.12.2010)

This selection of citations shows that different persons in the village as well as among the project group present different narrations of the village's involvement in the process of buying the land. Some persons of both sides claimed that the village was consulted and consented to the purchase, whereas some others reported the contrary that the decision was taken without taking into account the villagers' opinion. That a village meeting was held in fact was asserted by all, the contested question is whether this meeting had a serious intention to consider the opinions of the villagers or whether the decisions were already taken and the meeting more to inform and convince the villagers.

As the land belonged to the *hazine* (treasury), the rights on the land were within the responsibility of the state and the decision whether the land is sold or not is a decision by the central state office and not the local government. Therefore, from a legal perspective, the Güneşköy group did not need the permission of the villagers, but including them in the land buying process seemed important for most Güneşköy members in line with statements presented earlier about the role of Hisarköy as the cooperative's 'interact'.

The accounts of the meeting where male villagers gathered in the coffeehouse together with some Güneşköy group members report that the demand of Güneşköy was contested. One of the group members pointed out, that the specific land that the cooperative chose to buy was a very sensitive place and already caused a split in the village earlier:

There are two mahalle [neighbourhood] in the village, you know. There is the centre mahalle, on the other side of the river. And there is muhtar's mahalle here. Our land was plugged once. Now, in Turkey you can plug and plant on state-owned land. You don't even need to take the permission

---

[101] "Muhtara sormuşlar, köylülere sormamışlar."
[102] "*Köyde de sordular mı, Hisarköy'de, arazi alabilmek için?* Tabi. Onlar da sordular. Zaten sormasan bile, hazine satıyor. Hazine karıştırmıyor köylüyü. *Ama yine de sordular?* Tabi, sordular."

from the state. [...] As I understood, muhtar and his family plugged there, they wanted to plant. [...] And then the former muhtar complained. They couldn't plant. [...] That's why our land is a sensitive place. The other villagers had an eye on the land, at the same time muhtar wanted to plant on the land. Both do not go along well with each other, both sides can't do anything. So this became like a demilitarized zone. This was such a thing, a problematic land, and this is what we bought.[103] (Interview Alp, GK, 14.12.20 10)

When asking in the village for support for buying the "demilitarized land", this earlier divide between adherents of the *muhtar* in office then, and the group around the villager who is the current *muhtar* continued. Whereas the former supported the project's ideas, the latter opposed selling the land and even collected signatures against it. But at the end the *muhtar* at that time and the Güneşköy group could make their point and convince the majority of the villagers with their statements for the project.

Promises in the beginning

In this process of convincing villagers, different arguments were used to emphasise advantages of the project. Some of those arguments, things suggested or promised about the positive effects Güneşköy would have on Hisarköy, are what is remembered most from village side about the first encounters with the cooperative:

> They were looking for land. Nobody [...] gave anything. They liked that land in our village. They also talked very shiny, Yes, [we will open a factory] for the village. Nobody will stay unemployed. [We will provide for jobs ...] They were talking like this, shiny.[104] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011)

> When taking the land, they came to the coffeehouse and gave a speech. "We will not cause any harm for you. We will add value to all your things. We will buy the eggs of your chicken; we will buy milk; we will buy yogurt; we will employ workers. We will buy things from your village", they said when taking the land. [...] They said "we will employ workers", back then... they said,

---

[103] "Şimdi köyde iki mahalle var, biliyorsun. Merkez mahallesi var köyün, derenin öbür tarafı. Bir de burada muhtar'ın mahallesi var. Bizim arazimiz bir kere sürülmüş. Şimdi, Türkiye'de devlet arazisini sürüp ekebiliyorsun. Yani devletten izin almak bile gerekmiyor. [...] İşte sanırım, muhtarlar orayı bir sürmüşler, ekmek istemişler. [...] Eski muhtar da şikayet etmiş; ekememişler. [...] O yüzden bizim o arazi biraz hassas bir arazidir. O arazide hem öbür köylülerin de gözü vardı, ekmek istiyorlardı, hem de muhtar ekmek istiyordu araziyi. İki taraf da birbirleriyle anlaşmıyorlar. İki taraf da birşey yapamıyor, o böyle bir *demilitarized zone* gibi birşey olmuş. Askersiz bölge gibi bir yer haline gelmiş. Yani, o böyle bir şeydi, sorunlu bir araziydi, ve orayı biz aldık..."
[104] "Yer arıyorlarmış. Kimse [...] hiçbirşey vermemiş yani. Bizim köyde bu araziyi beğenmişler. Biraz da parlak konuştular, yani."

"we will employ guards", they said "houses will be constructed".[105] (Interview Zeliha, HK, 02.12.2010)

Those statements also reveal that the purpose of Güneşköy as perceived by the villagers differs significantly from the aims stated above by the members of the cooperative. It is also interesting to note, that whereas none of the members told about promises in the beginning, and if I asked about them, seemed to know little about what was told then, the villagers appear to recall them very well.

This subchapter tried to give an insight in the far from neutral space that the Güneşköy group chose for its project and emphasises the importance of the local context for the positioning of the cooperative. The presented existing power structures within Hisarköy and relationships between the village and the İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı, set the context of the cooperative's coming to Hisarköy. İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı and Güneşköy share a similar name, as well as some common aims and ideas in regard to village development, but although members of both were involved together in some projects, like a research on the needs and wishes in the village (see Gökmen et al. 2004), they also present significant differences. Whereas İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı, a foundation with numerous members, saw the involvement in Hisarköy a development project of a specified time period and had Hisarköy as its direct target, the Güneşköy cooperation with its nine members planned its project in Hisarköy without a time limitation and does not have Hisarköy as main target, but includes it more as a neighbour or *'interact'*. Being in the narrations in the village associated with the foundation brought Güneşköy advantages in regard to finding the land, but at the same time caused an image that is not in line with the group's aims and ideas and that was further enforced by presentations and promises made in this time.

6.4 Promises and expectations – the 'ghost of the past'

A lack of follow-up information of the ideas transmitted in the first meetings, as well as a clear distancing to the earlier charity foundation, caused many expectations, the presentation

---

[105] "Aldıklarında, dediler, bir kahveye gelmişler, konuşma yapmışlar. Bizim size zararımız olmaz. Sizin her şeyinizi degerlendiririz. Tavuğunuzun yumurtasını alırız, süt alırız, yoğurt alırız, işçi alırız. Yani köyünüzden bir şeyler alırız, demişler; aldıklarında [...] Hadi işçiler alırız demişlermişmiş. O zaman... Bekçi alırız demişler, ev yapılacak demişlermişmiş."

and handling of which are the topic of this subchapter. It is not the question of my research whether specific promises were actually made or not. That villagers see them as promises leads to in their opinion legitimate expectations and claims and thus impacts the perception of Güneşköy and with it the relationship between village and cooperative.

"We want bigger help" – Expectations over expectations in the 'omnipotent hocas'

As shown earlier, some of the activities of the Güneşköy members are well acknowledged in Hisarköy. At the same time, within the same conversation, further expectations, ideas and claims are put forth.

An example of a very direct and explicit demand was voiced during one of my first stays in the village: Ender, a young villager, invited Oya and me to drink tea in the coffeehouse. The teacher who also came first arranged two chairs next to a tree separate from the other men, but then those men called us to sit next to them. Shortly after we came over, one of the men confronted Oya with the question why they didn't build a road for them. Oya asked for pardon and he continued *"bring us ten trucks of sand!"*[106] It turned out that he was also using one part of the street going to Güneşköy and that he wanted his part to be renewed. Oya again explained that they were not there to distribute presents. In the following conversation it became apparent that not only he but also others sitting on the table had certain expectations in the project. The *hocas* coming from Ankara were supposed to be rich and to bring some profit to the village, expressed in direct claims: *"You came to our village – we are expecting your contribution"*[107], and in a generalized manner as *"those coming from outside have to bring some benefit"*[108]. Oya explained that the villagers imagined the Güneşköy group bigger and more influential than they actually were and that they were not a foundation but a cooperative with a very limited budget. When most of them left for prayer, Ender tried to explain, that there are those expectations and also put his critique that there is no cooperation between the village and the project. He complained for example that the water was closed when he came to the land, or that a machine came for works at Güneşköy and that in such cases, the Güneşköy-group could ask in the village whether someone else also needs the machine (Fieldnotes, HK, 04.06.2010).

---

[106] "Bize on kamyon kum gönderin!"
[107] "Köyümüze geldiniz, katkınızı bekliyoruz."
[108] "Dışarıdan gelenlerin bir faydası olsun."

Concrete demands voiced by villagers during my stays in Hisarköy concern a variety of different issues; some of them directly related to what was said in the first encounters but also in later years and the way the villagers understood or interpreted them, some of them rather farfetched. They constitute a sheer endless chain of demands reaching from presents at different occasions like a mother's demand for a hat for her daughter, to constructing a bread oven, providing work to villagers, finding customers and organizing markets in Ankara, taking care of the education of children, support for constructions or donating money to the village's budget.

Müslüm summarizes such demands:

> We want bigger help. We want that we are closer to each other, so that there is a profit for the villager, so he will like you. If there would be a love that does not ask for any advantage, that does not ask for anything in return, it would be better; but that is not the case, there needs to be some income for the villager. Therefore I say that the work needs to be more intense and better. [...] There might be meetings here, but they need to be to the benefit of the villagers; otherwise, what's the point in meetings?[109] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011)

He emphasises the importance of 'help' for an acceptance of the group by villagers and at the same time the facilitating role that Güneşköy members, the *hocas*, could play for Hisarköy with their large social network and also as mediator between village and key-actors concerning agricultural permissions and funding, as they are supposed to have an easier access to governmental offices. Some demands from Hisarköy side like the hat might seem a very small something, others like building a road or open another organic bazaar demand very different resources, but they all have in common this implied assumption of a virtually omnipotence of the *hocas*. They also stress that the current activities until now are not considered enough by persons living in Hisarköy; that there should be more engagement and support and closer collaboration to increase the benefit for the villagers. Put together, they also create the impression of an insatiable demand by the village, going beyond what might be justifiable by the events at the very beginning of and preceding Güneşköy.

---

[109] "Biz daha büyük yardım istiyoruz. Daha böyle içiçe olmak istiyoruz. Ki, köylünün de bir menfaati olacak. Seni sevecek, yani. Menfaatsiz, karşılıksız sevgi olsa daha güzel olur da, o da yok. ila menfaat, ila köylünü cebine beş on kuruş para gelecek. Onun için çalışmaların daha sıkı daha güzel olması lazım, diyorum ben. [...]Burada toplantı olabilir. Ama köyün yararına bir toplantı; bol bol toplantı yap, ne işe yarar. Köyün kalkınması için, köyün sebzesinin satılması için, köyün sorunlarının tartışılması için toplantılar olabilir, yapılabilir. Mesela, benim bir devlet memuruyla ilişkim başka olur, Cem Hoca gibi profesörün devlet memuruyla başka bir ilişkisi olur. Onların ilişkileri daha kuvvetli olur, daha iyi olur yani."

"We gave; and what did they do?"

The demands and the way they are presented also reveal a certain disillusion by villagers about the Güneşköy project. Zeliha for example told about what she thought, Güneşköy would create in Hisarköy:

> Teachers, rich persons, coming here to the village, from the city. That is what they did a lot in the neighbouring village to the treasury lands. Now, if they also came, they would employ guards for their houses, they would employ somebody to take care of their garden. Everybody would have a garden. They talked like this. Seventy houses were going to be built. The craftsman who made our house, he said "I migrated here for those houses there. I migrated from my own village to here". "It was said that there would be seventy houses" he said. He also made the house that is over there [at the Güneşköy land] "If there are seventy houses to be constructed", this craftsman said, "I will have a lot of work there. That is why I migrated here. Seventy houses were supposed to be constructed; I do not know what happened."[110] (Interview Zeliha, HK, 02.12.2010)

Not all persons adapted their own plans as much to the ideas they had about Güneşköy as this craftsman Zeliha tells about, but next to the big dreams that Güneş Vafkı and the cooperative generated, the employment of a worker, that was praised as benefit for Hisarköy a few minutes earlier in the same interview, now seems insufficient and the land described earlier as *"boş"* (empty) turns into a vital grazing land essential for the survival of villagers. It is interesting to note that when talking about the critiques in the villages, she does not talk in her own name, but emphasises that it is *'what is said in the village'*, *'what the majority says'*:

> The majority also says "what did they realize?" They say "we gave, but what did they do?" There are also people talking like that. [...] Our cows grazed there [at the land Güneşköy bought] before. It is a huge land, you know that, a huge space. Now, after they fenced it, the cows didn't have a grazing area anymore. That's why people say, we do not have any grazing land left. We are villagers, now we have to move our cows somewhere else again. What will we eat in the village if no grazing land is left? Where should our cows graze? [...] They say that they said "we will develop the village this way, we will do that way. We will employ workers". There are also people saying "they are not doing anything." […] They took the land, saying "there will be profit for you.

---

[110] "Öğretmenler, zengin adamlar, şehirden çıkıp buralara, köye, geliyorlar. Komşu köye çok yaptırdılar öyle, hazine arazilerine. Şimdi onlar da geltirseydi işleri, eve bekçi alsalardı, bahçelerine bakmaya birini alsalardı. Yani herkes bahçe alsaydı. Oyle konuşma yapmışlarmışmış. 70 ev yapılacakmışmış. Bizim bu evi yapan usta [...] Ben o ev inşaatı için göçmüştüm buraya, dedi o usta. [Kendi köyümden] bu köye göçtüm, dedi usta. Şimdi 70 ev yapılacaktı deniyordu ya dedi. O evi de o yaptı. Hani orada ev var ya. Tamam 70 ev yapılırsa, demişmiş o usta, ben orada çok iş yaparım. Buraya onun için göçtüm geldim, derdi o usta. Orada 70 ev yapılacaktı, ne oldu bilmiyorum, dedi."

You will profit from us. We will employ workers, we will do like that" There is no worker. Only one. There are also people in the village talking like that.[111] (Interview Zeliha, HK, 02.12.2010)

The statements of *'what is said in the village'* reflect a reproach from village side towards the Güneşköy group. Zeliha uses the term *kalkındırmak* (make developed) in her account, expressing an expectation of an active 'developer' role of the Güneşköy group and presents some ideas of what is understood as development in the village: creating a settlement for rich town-dwellers or some other enterprise with financial profit, where villagers are employed and get better marketing possibilities of their agricultural products and services. Müslim also uses development in his responses, in this latter meaning: to provide markets for their produce and emphasises that *"it needs efforts to develop the village"* (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011) They both use a development concept in line with the mainstream modernisation discourse in Turkey (see 2.2), understanding developing the village as following the example of 'developed' villages, villages closely connected to cities and income that allows for having in the village the same (perceived) comfort as in the city.

By stressing the importance of the land, villagers' narrations present a claim that as they gave a part of what is the basis for their existence, they expect the cooperative to propose them new forms of income. The land was traded for what the project promised to be, for not only what was actually said, but also what the villagers associated with it and the use of the term 'development' in this regard provided much space for interpretations. It is in such a context that Hatice's warning, *"If you can do it, good. But if you cannot do it, if you manipulate, that is bad."*[112] (Interview Hatice, HK, 02.12.2010) is understood. Not seeing their ideas realized causes deception for the villagers, but with bringing in the argument of the land, the failure of creating a high financial profit for the village is presented as a deal break.

---

[111] "Böyle lafladı. Çoğu da diyor, ne gün gördük? Verdik de ne yaptılar? diyor. Onu da diyen var, bak. [...] Orada çıktı tavamiz, ineklerimiz yayılıyordu. Koca arazi, kendin biliyorn, koca yer. Şimdi orada kapana vurunca, mallara, hayvanlara, yayla kalmadı. Onun için hani, millet, şey diyor, yaylamız kalmadı, diye. Biz de köylüyüz, mecbur o tavaları taşayacağız. Yine taşayacağın. Köyde ne yiyeceğin? Yayla mı kalmadı diye? Yani mallara yayla? [...] Köyü şöyle kalkındırırız, böyle yaparız, işçi alırız dediler, diyorlar. İşte bir şey yapmıyorlar, diyen de var. Bunu diyen de var. İşte bir şey yapmadılar. İşte arazi aldılar. Faydamız olur size, faydamız dokunur, işçi alırız, şöyle yaparız. İşte, işçi yok; birtek biri kişi aldılar. Köyün içinde onu diyen de var."

[112] "Yani hakkıyla yapana. Yapabilirsen. iyi, güzel, yani. Ama yapamazsan, hile yaparsan, o kötü."

Employer/worker or partners – perceptions of the relationship

Such differences, such layers in the formulation of claims can in short be shown in the example of comments in regard to the glasshouse, one of the most recent and visible projects at the Güneşköy-land:

> Look this year they make the greenhouse, heated from below, with solar energy. After that, tomorrow also workers, Allah, there will also be profit for our village […] Continuing, maybe they will expand well there.[113] (Interview Zeliha, HK, 02.12.2010)

> We will see how it works after it started producing. [...] Hopefully it is successful. But also if it is successful – what would be the benefit for the village? It is not a common property of the village. An individual would not be able to build such a greenhouse, even if he/she wants to. But constructing some of those greenhouses as common property of the villagers could be a possibility, for example, as a common property of the village.[114] (Interview Müslüm, HK, 07.03.2011)

> Now look, you construct a greenhouse, don't you? For 300 000[115] you construct a greenhouse. My village is in dept, pay it. I will come next to this contractor; there is some water dept that needs to be paid. He should pay it. Doesn't the contractor earn money from a top-land of my village?[116] (Muhtar, fieldnotes, 25.09.2010)

Zeliha expresses hope, that the glasshouse project will supply jobs for villagers, thus sees potential advantages of the glasshouse for Hisarköy in its capacity as workplace; Müslüm proposes to build such a greenhouse as a common property of the village, if the project turns out to be successful and the *muhtar* directly asks for an investment of the cooperative in line with above mentioned 'village-land' argumentation, financial means, that are then used wherever the needs of village demand it. In all three narrations, Güneşköy is assigned a different role and the relationship is depicted differently: Zeliha sees an employer/worker hierarchical relationship, Müslüm one of making the developments of the project also available as common property to the village, with both sides being somehow partners, and the

---

[113] "Bak bu yıl serayı yaptırıyorlar, altan ısıtmalı, güneş enerjili. Ondan sonra, yarın da işçi, Allah, köyümüze de faydası olur. (…) Geldikçe geldikçe belki de geliştirecekler iyice orayı."

[114] "O üretimi geçtikten sonra, nasıl olduğunu göreceğiz. […] İnşallah iyi olur. Hem olsa, köye ne faydası olacak? Köylün ortak malı değil ki. Zaten şahsen istese de öyle bir sera yaptıramaz. Kuvveti yetmez, yaptıramaz. Ama köyün ortak malı olarak birkaç sera yaptırılabilir mesela, köyün ortak mal olarak."

[115] Numbers in village talks usually refer to estimations or guesses rather than actual knowledge of the cost.

[116] "Şimdi bak serayı yapıyorsunuz, değil mi? 300 milyara? Sera yapıyorsunuz. Benim köyümün borcu var, öde o zaman. Geleceğim oraya, o müteahhit yanına geleceğim. Benim köyümün borcu var, su borcu var. Ödesin. Benim köyümün en iyi arazisinden para kazanıyor, müteahhit. Doğru mu?"

muhtar suggests a rather distanced symbiosis-relation, with Güneşköy sponsoring parts of Hisarköy's expenses in return for the land-rights.

Evaluations of the relationship by Güneşköy members

Güneşköy members are well aware of the various and ongoing expectations and rumours by the villagers.

> They expected us to give them all the time. They thought we are rich, powerful people. And they thought we are like the government, that we come, do things and they don't do anything they just get things. When we asked them to do something, they asked lots of money to do it. (Interview Ayşen, GK, 21.09.2010)

Reflecting on the reasons of expectations and imaginations in Hisarköy, Güneşköy members self-critically identify the interaction with Hisarköy as the weak point of the project, with regular interaction taking place only among a very limited number of persons. Namık points out that the interaction might be improved once a meeting place is created at the land but that at the moment, there is no possibility for more persons actually staying in the village for longer.

> [For the time being] as the relationship is not very close, the people in Hisarköy from time to time return to the classical thoughts they got used to. What are they? Ten persons from Ankara came, established a garden, they grow their vegetables and do this and that. They forget that our main aim is a socio-cultural project. And they are right: we can only come one day a week [...] Is our house old? [...] Hopefully, we will be more motivated later on and have a closer relationship with the villagers.[117] (Interview Namık, GK, 01.07.2010)

He points out that the few visible results of the project do not create a picture of the socio-cultural dimensions of Güneşköy. As he states, the aims of changing village life, of changing perspectives could not be reflected credibly enough yet. Notwithstanding the emphasis on the importance of time and permanence, it is also acknowledged by Filiz and

---

[117] "Biz haftada ancak bir gün gidebiliyoruz. Köyde kalamıyoruz. […] bizim projelerimizde on tane konut bitmeden, orada kalma şartları olamaz, fiziksel olarak. Yani bir iki kişi, Gülseren, bacımız, kardeşimiz idare ediyor belki ama on kişiye, çocuklarıyla, o zaman orada bir misafirhane açmak gerek. Tabi burada ileride belki sosyal kültür merkezleri kuracağız, Güneşköy'le. O zaman olabilir. Ama biraz zamana ihtiyacımız var. Hisarköylüler, tabii, bu iletişim çok fazla sıcak olmadığı için zaman zaman hep alıştıkları, klasik düşünceleri ortaya koyuyorlar. Nedir? On tane Ankaralı geldi, burada bir çiftlik kurdu, işte sebze üretiyorlar, şunu yapıyorlar. Asıl amacımızın sosyal kültür projesi olduğunu, köylüyü kalkındırmak olduğunu, onu unutuyorlar; hakları da var. Biz haftada bir gün gelebiliyoruz [...]. Evimiz eski mi? […] İnşallah daha sonra daha motive oluruz; daha fazla köylü ile kaynaşırız"

Bora that the contact with villagers decreased over the last years, especially with the start of the time consuming vegetable project.

A wish that all members share is that they would prefer seeing at least some of the expectations and illusions about Güneşköy that are spread in the village removed. At the same time several of them have further plans about what could be realized in cooperation with Hisarköy in the future.

> The management, the governors and the ruling persons they support many things. They give financial support to projects and the villagers expect the same from us. But we don't have this potential. […] If somebody comes and asks "Can I start organic farming? How can I do it?" or if he needs a project we can help writing the project, we can give this kind of support … but we cannot build a road, we cannot build a bridge. In fact, there was a bridge, a wooden bridge on the way to Güneşköy. The heavy vehicles could not pass this bridge, so we asked the government to build it and they came and built it. So we can do this kind of arrangements or we can arrange something in the city, marketing for instance, we can do it that way. […] They are used to ask something and get something. They are asking always "I need this, give us, give us" but it doesn't work that way. (Interview Cem, GK, 17.09.2010)

In Cem's account of how far the support could go, what kind of support they as Güneşköy group might provide shows that in fact, in the form of writing projects and applying for funding, the members can actually affect a lot and be the "mediator between village and government offices" that Müslüm asked for. Cem also confirms the possibility and willingness for another mediator role demanded in Hisarköy: the one between the village and people from Ankara interested in buying for example handcraft or in learning traditional ways of preparing food in seminars that village-women could give. The borders between what is feasible and what not seem in this account nevertheless very blurred. Considering the wide definition of what a 'project' can be, even demands considered earlier as exaggerated like the one for a new street or opening a new bazaar become more realistic.

Expectations do not only exist on village side. There are also expectations in the village such as a good cooperation for example by using tractors together, and getting workforce from the village. It is also explicitly expected by some members that villagers are open for activities by Güneşköy and change their own agricultural style to organic. Most of the expectations on both sides would be rather easy to fulfil or as a more sustainable solution,

considering what earlier realized projects entailed in further expectations, to dissolve if the necessary exchange of information took place.

6.5 Güneşköy-Hisarköy communication – strategy against misunderstandings?

(Lack of) Communication is identified as a very important aspect affecting the relationship between Güneşköy and Hisarköy, playing in any other phenomena treated in this chapter. Villagers in Hisarköy lack information about what the aims and concrete plans of Güneşköy are, and thus draw on piecemeal information obtained mainly through gossip or what they remember from the meetings in the early years of the cooperative, events that are often mixed up with the meetings organised by the Güneş Vakfı.

A small research to learn about the needs in the village also done in the very beginning with face-to-face interviews using questionnaires, gave insights in the situation of the village and made some concrete actions in response to the results as the construction of the health centre possible, but at the same time might have provided further fertile ground for the development of various expectations in the project. All those expectations and other demands, more connected to the earlier experience with the Güneş Vakfı, that were not and could not be fulfilled by the group, never were actually discussed with the villagers afterwards. In general, a lack of communication, of follow-up information and of a comprehensive presentation of the (changed?) aims and ongoing works in Güneşköy is observed. What villagers see from outside, combined with little information, lead to further gossip, that might but also might not represent an adequate picture of Güneşköy.

Some villagers actually tried to act as mediator between project and village, but with little or short lived success. İsmail, for example, used to go to work late on Sundays to be able to pass at Güneşköy and talk with the *hocas* and told me that he tried hard to explain the project to the villagers (İsmail, fieldnotes, HK, 04.12.2010). Müslüm also told about attempts of winning more people for the project and organic agriculture, but says he would have needed more financial success to convince others. A lot of support as facilitator between Güneşköy and Hisarköy was also reported from the former *muhtar*, with a deterioration of the relationship after his death. It should also be noted, that a lack of information on the long run

leads to a loss of interest in the project. The three main limitations distilled by Mahaffy in her study of ecovillage-neighbourhood relationship are also valid in the Güneşköy-Hisarköy case: a lack of current specific programmes aiming at the village, a lack of neutral spaces for interaction and that events of interaction are mainly short-term or past activities. Again, there are also "discrete points of interaction" that Mahaffy (2011, 73) mentions: talks when buying eggs or onion or chats when passing on the way to the Güneşköy land for example that over the years created some strong bonds with a few families in Hisarköy.

Two levels of communication patterns can be distinguished between Güneşköy members and villagers: the personal/individual level and the professional/institutional level. The first one means friendship relationships, like most of the members have with some of the villagers, especially the neighbours. This relationship includes occasional mutual visits on the fields, exchange on the well-being of their families, the weather, the growing of plants and every day work. The second one refers to relationships of information provider/receiver, employer/employee or seller/buyer and a hierarchical structure can be observed, with one side explaining and ordering, the other one listening and carrying out.

Along those two lines, many of the seemingly contradicting statements by villagers can be better understood: on the one side they express delight about and support for the Güneşköy-neighbours and friends, with whom they enjoy talking and tea; on the other side, they voice frustration that other expectations in 'the cooperative' (or more frequently from village side: foundation) of improvements on village level were not met. Whereas on the individual level, exchange is frequent and positively commented on, the second one is more problematic: here ideas about Güneşköy as something that should bring benefit to the village in a way to solve any problem are prevalent; benefits that the village sees itself entitled to as the cooperative bought village-land.

However strong those claims might seem when brought forth in the coffeehouse or among villagers, in front of the Güneşköy members who actually made some of the promises in the first meetings or who would be the first respondents to specific demands they are rarely expressed and even less insisted on. The *muhtar* for example at one occasion told that he will order the responsible member for the greenhouse to his office to ask for a share of the project's benefits for Hisarköy. At the following visit, I asked the *muhtar*, whether he could

talk with him. „*Tz*" [the click with the tongue is commonly used in Turkey for "no"]. Whether they talked while he was in Ankara? *"Fırsat olmadı"* (no opportunity) – But in fact I saw both of them talking and the *muhtar* tried to open the issue, but the member countered that the project is not about money but honour and prestige and that he should be proud that his village is the first one to have such a solar greenhouse. Whatever the reason was – whether the *muhtar* didn't remember this conversation or whether he perceived it differently – he did not want to talk to me about it (Fieldnotes, HK, 04.12.2010).

This account exemplifies two aspects concerning communication: Firstly, power hierarchies inherent in the Güneşköy - Hisarköy relationship do affect how and whether some issues are talked about. The *muhtar* has an authority in the village, but the academic and social background of the *hocas* brings them important "social capital" (Bourdieu 1986) as well and might equip them with more powerful argumentative tools than villagers. Secondly, it shows that an observed event might differ significantly from how it is described later on and reminds of the constructedness of what is presented as reality.

Conclusion: Güneşköy – Hisarköy Interaction

This chapter started with a depiction of the image of life in Hisarköy by Güneşköy members using the concept of a "grammar of orientalization" (Baumann 2006), followed by "mirroring" the question: how do villagers perceive the project. In the village, Güneşköy meets mainly with little knowledge, with mainly the environmentalist character of the project being well-known. Events of the past, of the first years of the project and the involvement of the İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı, a charity foundation back then, play an important role in villagers' perceptions of Güneşköy. The *"parlak konuşmalar"* (shiny talks), as they were described by interviewed villagers, at the very beginning of the project grew in the village to a "myth of Güneşköy" bringing about a variety of expectations. It pretty fast turned out that the cooperative will not be a holiday site for rich town-dwellers, but the expectation of Güneşköy bringing profit to Hisarköy remains, not only as a distanced hope but as something that many people in the village feel they have a right on, as it was promised to them in the beginning and remembered as a reason to agree to selling the land to the cooperative.

Expectations and demands, some more some less feasible, like roads, workplaces, finding markets and the education of children are based on the hope for an improvement of their current - mainly financial - situation. Lack of response and information concerning what the project is actually up to nowadays lead to a disillusion and to some disappointment in regard to Güneşköy.

In the same way as Güneşköy members have to be clear about their aims and what they can and want to realize (Chap. IV), there is a clear need to define what the role of Hisarköy is for the cooperative and how the group should react to the different expectations and demands from village side. Improving communication with the village would be beneficial for Güneşköy as well as Hisarköy and demands in this direction are voiced by both sides, but seem to fail on the limited time and energy allocated to it. It is nevertheless not only the amount of time spent together, i.e. spent talking with each other, that poses a problem, but also differences in prioritisation (environmental or economical aims for example) and hierarchical structures ('official' communication) inherent in the relationship between project members and villagers. With the trust built up through the personal relationships and the permanence of the project, the seemingly countless 'misunderstanding' concerning expectations are nevertheless far from being unchangeable and with some additional time and empathy (as trained in the Non-Violent Communication seminaries) a lot of frustration might be avoided on both sides.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION – "DEVELOPING A VILLAGE"
IDEAS, EXPECTATIONS, DISILLUSION AND BEYOND

I think in some ways it's a little bit like families. When a new child is born, you know, the previous children will say "oh, a baby". But this baby is going to grow up into an individual that will either play with you or damage your own toys. You know you'll be friends at times but can be jealous or fight at others. It is not going to stay as a baby.
(Interview Oya, GK, 31.08.2010)

Debates and concepts

Development is a much claimed and at the same time strongly contested concept used in different senses (see Küçükcan 2002, 102). An approach of "intentional development" (ibid), of doing or making development, in the meaning of inciting economic growth emerged especially in the restructuring of world politics after WWII. Not reaching targeted aims led to a change towards a more holistic understanding of development under the name of "sustainable development" (see ibid; Stockmann 2010). On theoretical level, two main counter-theories emerged: Dependency theories question an idea of linear development by correlating development with underdevelopment and thus making inequalities and exploitation responsible for different levels of development among countries and regions (Ferguson 1990; Edelman and Haugerud 2005). Post-development theories for their part question the whole idea of development (Esteva and Prakash 1998) reproaching it to impose a foreign idea and those working with development institutions to support a system reinforcing existing inequalities. The resulting debates show tensions between a felt need for change and being presented as 'coloniser', as well as between collaboration with development institutions and the reproach to support the system one wants to oppose. Statements that might be seen as kind of consensus on development are that it is a multidimensional process (Menzel 2010; Arce and Long 2000) and that it implies a vision of change (Strang and Powell 2009; Olivier de Sardan 2005; Guyer 2001). Among a variety of definitions, this thesis takes an actor-

centred perspective and looks at development as a social process aiming at change and the field of development as an 'arena' (see Olivier de Sardan 2005) where conditions, meanings and actions are negotiated by strategic groups. What 'development' then means in concrete is the result of ongoing tensions in interests, of compromises reached in these dialectical encounters (Friedman 2006).

Environmentalism is closely connected to development in a causal as well as aim-oriented way: Effects of radical agricultural intensification led to an increased environmental concern, presenting environmentalism as reaction to development. Furthermore, on the one side, economic targets in this area often clash with environmental ones, on the other side, increased importance is given to environmentally and socially 'sustainable development', trying to combine environmental, social and economic aspects. The points of critique raised in the debate on development (imposition, foreign idea, just another strategy to maintain existing hierarchies), are raised as well in regard to environmentalism (Argyrou 2005; Esteva and Prakash 1998; Horuş 2007). What is pointed out in regard to environmental activism is that it is strongly affected by the perspectives on and interests involved in regard to nature (Hansen, Noe, and Højring 2006; Haenn 2006; Ingold 1992). Broad categories in this regard are eco- and human-centred approaches and the differences between preservation and conservation (Argyrou 2005; May 2002; see also Küçükcan 2002). Knowledge and science are further influential aspects with an at times collaborative at times opposing relationship to the development enterprise.

The first part of the empirical part of this thesis showed narrations of the members about the Güneşköy group with the plurality and resulting tensions within as a point of focus. Environmental concerns are a core issue of the initiative, but next to it social, educational, scientific and recreational aims play an important role. With its aims and activities, Güneşköy is situated within the growing global ecovillage movement. For information exchange and to overcome inner-group differences specific communication channels are in place as regular meetings or mail groups, another common point with most ecovillages, helping them to persist and not dissolve as the large majority of such initiatives is said to do.

The second empirical chapter took a closer look at the environmentalist activities of

Güneşköy, taking it as an example of interaction with Hisarköy. Organic agriculture is considered as a step towards a healthier and more sustainable production in villages. The negotiations of both, organic agriculture and healthy lifestyle make different positions of Güneşköy members and villagers in Hisarköy apparent and show different levels of encompassment and contestation, with financial arguments being very present. These negotiations are then related to the concept of development alternatives, alternative perspectives offered to the villagers within the mainstream economy, as well as alternatives to development, where the Güneşköy group tries to find a way of living alternative to consumer society. The accounts also reveal difficulties of convincing villagers to join long-term perspectives of the Güneşköy cooperative without visible short-term (economical) results.

The third and last part then took the socio-cultural claim of the cooperative as its starting point and shed light on the interaction between Güneşköy and Hisarköy. The image about each other reveals an 'orientalist' (see Baumann 2006) perception of the village by Güneşköy members, whereas the project meets with little and piecemeal knowledge in Hisarköy. What is noticeable about villagers' accounts are a multitude of expectations and demands. A part of the explanation can be found in the intermingled history of Güneşköy and a charity foundation also active in Hisarköy, with some overlapping aims and ideas and persons active in both. Obtaining the land in Hisarköy is also a part of contested history: different portrayals exist in regard to the inclusion of villagers in this process and the land is depicted as an area that was already earlier the issue of tensions within the village. Power relations within Hisarköy as well as between villagers and project members continue to play an important role. Ongoing expectations play another important role in the relationship between Hisarköy and Güneşköy as images created through the mentioned existing context and further promises and suggestions during the first meetings, were never really encountered.

"Developing a village" – an 'arena' of bidding and gambling

The following analyses summarize main findings on what should and what did change and the dialectical process of development accompanying those changes in the example of Güneşköy and Hisarköy:

Multidimensional dynamics

The 'arena' is marked through dimensions. In social relations two different levels could be observed: on the one side, friendship relations connect Güneşköy members and villagers from Hisarköy, on the other side a more hierarchical employer/employee or hoca/villager level could also be observed, a distinction reflecting differences in group and individual interests. Past experiences; accounts of the first encounters with Güneşköy and the charity foundation also active for some years in Hisarköy and power struggles within the village as expressed in the debates on the acquisition of the land influence positions and representations in the arena. But it is not only long term tensions – the experiences of a particular day, whether selling at the bazaar was successful or not for example, constitute further dimensions of the arena.

Adaptation of discourses

Presentations of what they would like to change differ among Güneşköy members, but a vision of an alternative way of community, of interaction and of economy appears in most accounts, implying a critique of current consumption society. In regard to what Güneşköy wants to change in Hisarköy or in other villages through its example the ideas are formulated in a different way around a main concern of ensuring that villagers do have the possibility to stay in the village. Ensuring work opportunities and income in the meaning of farmers being able to make a living from their production, is one concrete point to start from; with innovation, finding niches and networking as interconnected factors. This aim is one followed by villagers themselves as well, the particularity of Güneşköy's vision is to include consciousness and concern for effects of conventional intensive farming on humans and nature and to direct this search for economical benefit to a sector considered worth being supported as the way of production is least harmful to humans and nature; i.e. to combine economical and environmental aims.

From a post-developmentalist perspective, the initiative might be criticised for an overbearing attitude towards villagers, for trying to spread a 'foreign discourse'. But such a critique has several shortcomings with the main arguments being, that on the one side Güneşköy does not try to impose the lifestyle they propagate, but to establish it as a possible alternative and on the other side, a perspective of imposition would ignore the active role of Hisarköy in the negotiation of meanings and activities. Villagers living in Hisarköy are part of

several discourses that might be considered as 'foreign'; governmental agencies prescribing rules of agriculture, TV channels presenting national and international policies and ideologies, technological inventions, academic perspectives as well as individual farmers' experiences; in short 'foreign discourse' are omnipresent (see also Ray 1998). What might be criticised though is when such concepts and the need to apply them are presented as a *fait accompli* without consideration of the others' view (cf Paley 2001).

The example of organic agriculture shows, that while the terminology is actually interpreted in different ways, as in the anecdotes of 'bio-waste' and 'organic stones', the idea that 'organic' is a new concept is contested in Hisarköy and rather understood as part of an official status given to the way they used to work their fields for decades anyways. A similar adaptation is observed in the example of 'village development': interviewees from Hisarköy use ideas of a need to develop villages as an argument to appeal for support, to base calls for investments to ensure job opportunities and income in Hisarköy upon (see the example of what the greenhouse should be). Ideas of change in Hisarköy follow an understanding of development as having access to more economic resources. It is not structural inequalities *per se* (as made responsible for 'development differences' in the post-development critique or in the observation of 'internal colonialism') which are criticised but rather a lack of access to the market and a lack of income opportunities. The pronounced aim is more an incorporation into than an alternative to consumption society. The terms 'organic agriculture' and 'development' might not be created in Hisarköy but rather be a reflection of global and national policy making, but villagers actively engage in defining, adapting and reproducing the discourse (see Corson 2008, 6). Using Bierschenk's definition of development as what people say it is (Bierschenk 2010, 2), it would mean in this analysis that for villagers in Hisarköy it is a flexible tool to appeal for support.

Effects of Güneşköy

Referring to Olivier de Sardan's definition, development is seen as the processes of change induced by the Güneşköy-initiative in Hisarköy. Benefits for Hisarköy can be summarised in the same way as those of internationalisation for Turkish environmentalism: the cooperation facilitates the exchange of know-how and provides access to an information and support network (cf Aydın 2005). A social dimension of what Güneşköy succeeded in is creating a network of friendship relations among members and villagers, especially

neighbours. They also overcame being seen as a short-term project having gained trust through their persistence. The vegetable project created two full-time employment opportunities and more seasonal daily jobs.

Another example of effects on Hisarköy is a sensibilisation concerning environmental and health issues with four farmers changing their production to organic agriculture being a change arguably initiated by the Güneşköy group through information campaigns and help in obtaining the certificate. In the talks and interviews with villagers support for organic agriculture as healthy and beneficial for humans and nature is expressed, but financial arguments are very present – this way of production has to convince not only through argument, but also through a concrete financial return. Did organic agriculture then bring profit to the farmers who obtained the certificate? The answers show that organic *per se* does not increase the income. To actually gain financial profit, the farmers need to be able to sell their products, meaning that as they individually market their products at the bazaar they need qualities of a successful vendor with an appealing presentation of the products and building up good relationships to the customers being essential. If they are not able to successfully sell the products, they might even be worse off than before, as Müslüm explained, due to extra costs of the certificate and the longer transport. In general the transition of farmers in Hisarköy from conventional to organic farming would not mean drastic changes in the production process, as many do not or sparely use pesticides anyways, but it means taking an additional risk.

To reduce such a risk, villagers and members from Hisarköy see a solution in the creation of more market possibilities. From time to time, the mail groups of Güneşköy are used to promote or directly offer for sale products from Hisarköy but more stable markets need yet to be created, whereby villagers put hope into Güneşköy and Güneşköy members rather refer to the responsibilities of national and local government institutions.

Self-sustainability of projects
Küçükcan (2002) mentioned three phases of a development intervention: an initial phase of experts introducing an idea, followed by a phase of collaboration and finally a retreat of the experts with the target population continuing the project. Organic agriculture as the 'parade example' of change in the village is continued by farmers in a way rather independent

from Güneşköy. For example, after the cooperative's minibus was not provided for free anymore, marketing continued in a way self-organised by villagers.

Some other project ideas especially by or in collaboration with the earlier charity foundation, like the creation of a library in the school or the introduction of broccoli passed the first two phases, but then remained unused after the foundation and Güneşköy retired from their involvement. Although the brokkoli grew very well, scepticism towards the unknown product and the lack of market made farmers continue as long as the seeds were provided for free but not continued afterwards. While scientific knowledge might be essential in the planning process of projects by Güneşköy members as well as in regard to applications for project-funds, the issue of change is more complex than the idea of "winning one's case simply through argument" (Yearley 2005, 21) might suggest.

These accounts reveal difficulties of convincing villagers to join long-term perspectives of the Güneşköy cooperative without visible short-term (economical) results and that an initial cooperation in projects does not mean that it would be continued afterwards. At the same time the example of the four farmers shows that change is possible and also does happen.

On 'respect', taboos and indirect communication

Important aspects of the empirical findings come together under the concept of communication, in the meaning of exchange of information between Güneşköy and Hisarköy and more precisely the lack of it. An unclear, wavy definition of what Güneşköy is and plans to do among its members might not have seriously affected the ongoing of the project, but it definitely does in regard to the relation with Hisarköy, where there is a need for clarification of what Güneşköy can and actually wants to do in the village, and what it cannot. To achieve this, members have to be clear about what they can promise and then ensure a follow-up of these promises.

This advice might seem to be rather easy put into practice, if it wasn't for the close interrelation of above mentioned expectation, lack of communication and hierarchies. Picking up the argument of Stirling about the divide between village and town, I do not share such a strict distinction, but I agree that there is a strong hierarchical structure in Turkey. Already small children learn to 'show respect' to elders and the age-distinction is only one among

many. When the *muhtar* emphasises his position as local representative of the state he implies hierarchy and the local authority he was elected to. Güneşköy members for their part, referred to as *hoca*, score on a different level. Universities do have a special reputation; being employed by one of the most renowned ones, as METU is, not to say being professor there, brings extra social capital.

These hierarchies – parallel to different knowledge, interests and the environment one is didactically used to – do affect communication. In line with gestures of respect, notions of what is inappropriate or taboo influence what is communicated and what not. It might for example be inappropriate to directly confront persons in positions perceived hierarchically higher than the own position. The reaction of the *muhtar* to turn his earlier expressed clear reproach and demand into a careful question and to not counter the argument that the honour of having the innovative solar greenhouse in Hisarköy should be appreciated, can be interpreted this way. An interviewee in Hisarköy asking me to ask the *hocas* for a copy of a earlier made written agreement, rather than bringing the issue up in conversations with Güneşköy members directly is another example. Said more generally, wishes and complaints are mainly voiced after longer conversations and usually with the addressed Güneşköy member(s) not being present.[118]

Using indirect channels of communication means gossip. What is not or cannot be said directly to the addressee of a critique or comment is shared with others in conversations where ideas are reproduced and changed without feedback from the primary person in question. The mass of expectations in Güneşköy present in Hisarköy can be drawn back to some sayings of plans and ideas, which then grew in time: a few houses to be built on the project land in the beginning turn into a whole settlement for rich families with private garden and regular need for workers, because the discourse is kept inside the village without seeking feedback or direct confirmation from Güneşköy members. 'What is said in the village' then sometimes reaches the group via third parties, as the gossip that there was a mine on the land that was told to visitors who then told a member. Receiving such indirect information makes it also difficult to respond as it deprives the addressee of critique of the possibility to directly answer. Awareness of the impact of these hierarchies and the expectations attached to them on the way wishes and critiques are communicated might be a first step towards overcoming

---

[118] As I was not excluded from these hierarchies either, this study is likely to be biased with the information I was communicated as young, female, foreign student.

such challenges. They at the same time could be the interest of further research on the implications of such social constructs on the 'development' and civil society sector.

In summary

To return to the 'family'-allegory: Oya's comparison of the Güneşköy group of a family and the project as its "baby" in my opinion brings the experience of the cooperative to the point: it is a growing, changing and challenging enterprise; a part of all the members' life, demanding different skills at different times and responsibilities of its 'parents' and the 'bigger family'. The enthusiasm at the very beginning about the 'Güneşköy-baby' soon was accompanied by some disillusion by the group when encountering internal and external difficulties. Those challenges helped the group to focus on methods of conflict resolution, as a result made tensions and different perspectives within the group clear and as whole forced the maturation of ideas into more realistic forms. In relation to the 'bigger family' or neighbours, negotiations about where to lead this child continue. To give the word to a Güneşköy member again: *"I believe we create change. Although it is not perfect, it is not what we have been imagining at the beginning. But it is something. It is still something."* (Interview Ayşen, GK, 21.09.2010)

The challenges and conflicts of 'developing a village' presented in this ethnography of one of the oldest projects of its kind in Turkey, do not aim at compromising Güneşköy's achievements and ideals, but try to point out tensions and possibilities within the Güneşköy-Hisarköy relationship. With the growing phenomenon of urban-minded people trying to realize environmental, recreational or social projects in the country side as growing phenomenon in Turkey and elsewhere in the world, I strongly believe that the awareness of such tensions is essential. The experience of the Güneşköy group and its members' strategies can provide important lessons for other similarly idealistic enterprises and actors in the overlapping fields of environmentalism and development.

Epilogue

The high speed train project by the National Railways trying to set up a system of fast public transport connections between Ankara and other Anatolian cities caused an unexpected turn for Güneşköy: the trail between Ankara and Sivas, for which the start of construction is anticipated for 2012, goes right across the land of the cooperative. When in autumn 2011 first engineers came to measure the area, the information was that they are measuring in a general way, at several different places and that afterwards possible plans will be made. No official information was given to the group, they learnt about the measurements through accounts by villagers when members asked about blue plastic ribbons that were fixed at bushes and trees all over the land, and in fact all over the valley. Those plastic ribbons were, as they learnt from the villagers used for the measurements by the railway company. When some members of Güneşköy actually were at the land when an engineering geology study was carried out at the neighbours' land, Oya went to talk to them. They informed that this track was chosen as one of the seven closer options for the railway. Unimpressed by explanations of years of efforts put into the land by the Güneşköy project, their comment was that having a cooperative own the land would make it even easier to disown them. The question whether there was any possibility for appeal, was negated *"no chance at all"*.

For a while, it looked like this railway project might be the opportunity for a common resistance of both villagers and the Güneşköy group, but the latter soon had to realize that from village side such a resistance was not existent, or at least not a main concern. As the *muhtar* expressed the attitude in the village towards the railway project in a Turkish proverb *"the snake that doesn't bite me, might live for thousand years"* [119] in the meaning that what does not directly hurt me, is none of my concerns.

In the beginning of 2012, the inquiry by an advocate of the group got the officially information, that the plan leading the rail-track right through the middle of Güneşköy will be realized and works will start in spring of the same year. Another railway-engineer visiting the land, told them not to be sad as they, the railway company, will construct a cute viaduct[120], having the train not pass on the land, but 90 metres above. Just one of the pillars will be planted on it. There is still no information about what this pillar and track actually means for

---

[119] "Bana dokunmayan yılan bin yıl yaşasın"
[120] "Çok hoş bir viadük yaptıracağız sizlere"

Güneşköy, whether and how much of the land they could continue to use and work on, how much the construction works will affect the area and whether a pursuit of the project would be possible at all.

REFERENCES

Adaman, Fikret, and Murat Arsel. 2005. 'Introduction'. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?*, ed. Fikret Adaman and Murat Arsel, 1–11. Ashgate Studies in Environmental Policy and Practice. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.

Adem, Çiğdem. 2000. 'The Development of Environmentalism in Turkey: A Sociological Case Study of Two Environmental Non Governmental Organizations'. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

———. 2005. 'Non-State Actors and Environmentalism'. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?*, ed. Fikret Adaman and Murat Arsel, 71–86. Ashgate Studies in Environmental Policy and Practice. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.

Arce, Alberto, and Norman Long. 2000. *Anthropology, Development, and Modernities: Exploring Discourses, Counter-tendencies, and Violence*. Routledge.

Argyrou, Vassos. 2005. *The Logic of Environmentalism: Anthropology, Ecology, and Postcoloniality*. Studies in Environmental Anthropology and Ethnobiology. New York: Berghahn Books.

Arsel, Murat. 2005. 'Reflexive Developmentalism? Toward an Environmental Critique of Modernization'. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?*, ed. Fikret Adaman and Murat Arsel, 15–34. Ashgate Studies in Environmental Policy and Practice. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.

Atatimur, Neslihan. 2008. 'Reasons and Consequences of International Labor Migration of Women intoTurkey: Ankara Case'. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Aydın, Zülküf. 1990. 'The Çorum-Çankırı Development in Turkey and the World Bank'. In *Anthropology and Development in the Middle East*, ed. M. Murdock and Horowitz, 208–233. Colo.: Westview Press.

———. 2005. 'The State, Civil Society, and Environmentalism'. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?*, ed. Fikret Adaman and Murat Arsel, 53–69. Ashgate Studies in Environmental Policy and Practice. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.

Aytemur, Nuran. 2007. 'The Populism of the Village Institutes: A Contradictory Expression of Kemalist Populism'. Ankara: METU.

Baloglu, Hande. 2009. 'Sustainable Development and Climate Change Policies: Situation of Turkey as an Accessing Country to the EU'. Vienna: Vienna University.

Barnard, Alan, and Jonathan Spencer, eds. 2006. *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. 2nd ed. London; New York: Routledge.

Baumann, Gerd. 2006. 'Grammars of Identity/Alterity: A Structural Approach'. In *Grammars of Identity/Alterity: A Structural Approach*, ed. Gerd Baumann and André Gingrich, 18–50. The EASA Series 3. Berghahn Books.

Berkes, Niyazi. 1998. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. London: Hurst & Co.

Bernard, Harvey Russell. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 4th ed. Lanham, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Altamira Press.

Berry, Sara S. 1980. 'Decision Making and Policymaking in Rural Development'. In

    Agricultural Decision Making: Anthropological Contributions to Rural Development, ed. Peggy F Barlett, 321–335. Studies in Anthropology. New York: Academic Press.

Best, Henning. 2010. 'Environmental Concern and the Adoption of Organic Agriculture.' *Society & Natural Resources* 23 (5) (May): 451–468.

Bierschenk, Thomas. 2010. 'Historiciser et localiser les approches. Anthropologie et développement'. *Bulletin de l'APAD [online]* (31-32).

Çarkoğlu, Ali, and Eder. 2005. 'Development Alla Turca: The Southeastern Anatolia Development Project (GAP)'. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?*, ed. Fikret Adaman and Murat Arsel, 167–183. Aldershot (UK), Burlington (USA): Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Centgraf, Salina. 2009. 'Ökodörfer Bauen!'' Regionale Effekte Nachhaltiger Modellsiedlungen - Eine Fallstudie Im ''Ökodorf Sieben Linden'. Universität Leipzig.

Charmaz, Kathy, and Antony Bryant. 2007. *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Christian, Diana Leafe. 2003. *Creating a Life Together. Practical Tools to Grow Ecovillages and Intentional Communities*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.

CIPDD (The Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development). 2009. *Labour migration from Georgia and bilateral migration agreements: Needs and prospects. Policy Review 2009*. Tbilisi: CIPDD.

Coffey, Amanda. 1999. *The Ethnographic Self. Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity*. London; Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Corbin, Juliet M, and Anselm L Strauss. 2008. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles, Calif: Sage Publications, Inc.

Corson, Catherine Anne. 2008. 'Mapping the Development Machine: The U.S. Agency for International Development's Biodiversity Conservation Agenda in Madagascar'. UC Berkeley.

DPT, (T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı). 1970. *Türk Köyünde Modernleşme Eğilimleri Araştırması Rapor 1*. T.C. Basbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı Yayın No: 860. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi.

———. 2006. *Ulusal Kırsal Kalkınma Stratejisi*. Ankara.

Dabağcı, Esra. 2011. '"Not to Criticize; but to Change": How a NGO in Turkey Constructs Boundaries Between Politics and Volunteerism'. Ankara: METU.

Davies, Charlotte Aull. 2008. *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. ASA Research Methods in Social Anthropology. London; New York: Routledge.

Dawson, Jonathan. 2008. *Ecovillages: New Frontiers for Sustainability*. Schumacher Briefing no. 12. White River Junction, Vt: Chelsea Green Pub. Co.

Edelman, Marc, and Angelique Haugerud. 2005. 'Introduction: The Anthropology of Development and Globalization'. In *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization*, ed. Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, 1–74. 2nd ed. Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 6. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.

Ergun, Ayça. 2010. 'Civil Society in Turkey and Local Dimensions of Europeanization'. *Journal of European Integration* 32 (5): 507–522.

Ergun, Ayça, and Aykan Erdemir. 2010. 'Negotiating Insider and Outsider Identities in the Field: "Insider" in a Foreign Land; "Outsider" in One's Own Land'. *Field Methods* 22 (1): 16–38.

Escobar, Arturo. 1997. 'Anthropology and Development'. *International Social Science Journal* 49 (154): 497–515.

———. 2006a. 'Post-development'. Ed. David Alexander Clark. *The Elgar Companion to Development Studies*. Cheltenham (UK), Northampton (MA/USA): Edward Elgar.

———. 2006b. 'Does Biodiversity Exist?' In *The Environment in Anthropology: A Reader in Ecology, Culture, and Sustainable Living*, ed. Nora Haenn and Richard R Wilk, 243–245. New York: New York University Press.

Esteva, Gustavo, and Madhu Suri Prakash. 1998. 'Beyond Development, What?' *Development in Practice* 8 (3): 280–296.

European Commission. 2010. *Turkey 2010 Progress Report*. Brussels.

Ferguson, James. 1990. *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development,' Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2005 [1997]. 'Anthropology and Its Evil Twin: "Development" in the Constitution of a Discipline'. In *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization*, ed. Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, 140–153. 2nd ed. Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 6. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.

———. 2006. 'Development'. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. Abington; New York: Routledge.

Friedman, John T. 2006. 'Beyond the Post-Structural Impasse in the Anthropology of Development'. *Dialectical Anthropology* 30 (3/4): 201–225.

———. 2009. 'Context and Contestation in the Development Process: Lessons from Kaokoland (Namibia)'. *European Journal of Development Research* 21 (3) (June): 325–343.

Guyer, Jane I. 2001. 'Development'. Ed. Thomas Barfield. *The Dictionary of Anthropology*. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Gökmen, Ali, Sinan Kalaylıgil, Gerhard-W. Weber, İnci Gökmen, Mehmet Ecevit, Aşkın Sürmeli, Taylan Bali, Yıldız Ecevit, Haluk Gökmen, and Dorien J. DeTombe. 2004. 'Balaban Valley Project: Improving the Quality of Life in Rural Area in Turkey'. *International Scientific Journal of Methods and Models of Complexity* 7 (1): 1–24.

Haenn, Nora. 2006. 'The Power of Environmental Knowledge. Ethnoecology and Environmental Conflicts in Mexican Conservation'. In *The Environment in Anthropology: A Reader in Ecology, Culture, and Sustainable Living*, ed. Nora Haenn and Richard R Wilk, 226–236. New York: New York University Press.

Haenn, Nora, and Richard R Wilk, eds. 2006. *The Environment in Anthropology: A Reader in Ecology, Culture, and Sustainable Living*. New York: New York University Press.

Hansen, Lene, Egon Noe, and Katrine Højring. 2006. 'Nature and Nature Values in Organic Agriculture. An Analysis of Contested Concepts and Values Among Different Actors in Organic Farming'. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 19 (2) (April 8): 147–168.

Harris, Wylie. 2005. 'Something Old, Something New. Turkey's Organic Farmers Try to Survive Their European Honeymoon'. *Rodale Institute*.

Hendry, Joy. 2008. *An Introduction to Social Anthropology: Sharing Our Worlds*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Horuş, Mehmet. 2007. 'Türkiye Çevre Hareketi Halklaşıyor'. In *TMMOB Çevre Sempozyumu, 8-9 Haziran 2007, Ankara*, 179–190. Ankara: TMMOB Çevre Mühendisleri Odası.

IMF. 2012. *World Economic Outlook, April 2012*. Washington, DC: IMF.

Ingold, Tim. 1992. 'Culture and the Perception of the Environment'. In *Bush Base, Forest Farm: Culture, Environment and Development*, ed. Elisabeth J. Croll and David J. Parkin, 39–56. London; New York: Routledge.

İstanbul Ticaret Odası. 2006. *Organik Tarım Analizi Ve AB Pazarı Fırsatı*. Vol. 2006-12. Istanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası.

Keleş, Ruşen. 2007. 'Çevre Politikaları'. In *TMMOB Çevre Sempozyumu, 8-9 Haziran 2007, Ankara*, 27–39. Ankara: TMMOB Çevre Mühendisleri Odası.

Keyman, E. Fuat. 2005. 'Modernity, Democracy, and Civil Society'. In *Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?*, ed. Fikret Adaman and Murat Arsel, 35–50. Ashgate Studies in Environmental Policy and Practice. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.

Küçükcan, E. Funda. 2002. 'The Possibility of Sustainable Development: Environmentalism Vs. Developmentalism', Ankara: METU.

Liamputtong, Pranee. 2010. *Performing Qualitative Cross-Cultural Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Louv, Richard. 2008. *Last Child in the Woods: Saving Our Children from Nature-Deficit Disorder*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Algonquin Books.

Lucas, Caroline. 2008. 'Foreword'. In *Ecovillages: New Frontiers for Sustainability*, 9–10. Schumacher Briefing no. 12. White River Junction, Vt: Chelsea Green Pub. Co.

MARA, (Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs). 2007. *Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance Rural Development (IPARD) Programme (2007-2013)*.

Mahaffy, Elizabeth. 2011. 'A Town and Its Ecovillage: A Case Study of Two Massachusetts Communities'. Medford/MA: Tufts University.

May, Elizabeth. 2002. 'Environmental Movement - The Rise of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs)'. Ed. Peter Timmerman. *Social and Economic Dimensions of Global Environmental Change*. Encyclopedia of Global Environmental Change. Chichester; New York: Wiley.

McLaughlin, Darrel. 2007. *Differing Developments of Organic Agriculture in Canada and Sweden. The Experience of the Farmers Themselves*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press.

Menzel, Ulrich. 2010. 'Entwicklungstheorie'. In *Entwicklungspolitik: Theorien- Probleme- Strategien*, ed. Reinhard Stockmann, Franz Nuscheler, and Ulrich Menzel, 11–159. Oldenbourg Verlag.

Nathan, Lisa P. 2009. 'Ecovillages, Sustainability, and Information Tools: An Ethnography of Values, Adaptation, and Tensions'. Washington: University of Washington.

Nolan, Riall W. 2002. *Development Anthropology: Encounters in the Real World*. Westview Press.

Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 2005. *Anthropology and Development: Understanding Contemporary Social Change / Jean-Pierre Olivier De Sardan; Translated by Antoinette Tidjani Alou*. London; New York: Zed Books.

Paley, Julia. 2001. 'The Paradox of Participation: Civil Society and Democracy in Chile'. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 24 (1): 1–12.

Rapport, Nigel, and Joanna Overing. 2003. *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts*. Routledge Key Guides. London; New York: Routledge.

Ray, Christopher. 1998. 'Book Reviews'. *Sociologia Ruralis* 38 (2): 243–245.

Roe, Emery M. 2005. 'Development Narratives, Or Making the Best of Blueprint Development'. In *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization*, ed. Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, 313–322. 2nd ed. Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 6. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.

Rossi, Benedetta. 2004. 'Order and Disjuncture: Theoretical Shifts in the Anthropology of Aid and Development'. *Current Anthropology* 45 (4): 556–560.

Şahin, Ümit. 2007. 'Renksiz Çevrecilikten, Yeşil Çeşitliliğe'. In *TMMOB Çevre Sempozyumu, 8-9 Haziran 2007, Ankara*, 191–194. Ankara: TMMOB Çevre Mühendisleri Odası.

Saka, Neslihan. 2010. 'Köy Enstitülerinin Türkiye'nin Kalkınma Sürecindeki Yeri'.

Masterthesis, Istanbul: Marmara University.

Sargisson, Lucy, and Lyman Tower Sargent. 2004. *Living in Utopia: New Zealand's Intentional Communities*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Stirling, Arthur Paul. 1965. *Turkish Village*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Stockmann, Reinhard. 2010. 'Einleitung: Entwicklung'. In *Entwicklungspolitik: Theorien- Probleme- Strategien*, ed. Franz Nuscheler, Ulrich Menzel, and Reinhard Stockmann, 1–9. Oldenbourg Verlag.

Strang, Veronica, and Blue Powell. 2009. *What Anthropologists Do*. Berg Publishers.

Taylor, Peter J, and Frederick H Buttel. 2006. 'How Do We Know We Have Global Environmental Problems? Science and the Globalization of Environmental Discourse'. In *The Environment in Anthropology: A Reader in Ecology, Culture, and Sustainable Living*, ed. Nora Haenn and Richard R Wilk, 407–417. New York: New York University Press.

TBMM. 2006. *Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı (2007-2013). Resmi Gazete 26215*. http://www.dpt.gov.tr/DocObjects/View/13744/plan9.pdf.

Tonguç, İsmail Hakkı. 1998. *Canlandırılacak Köy*. Köy enstitüleri Vakfı.

TÜİK. 2010. 'Seçilmiş Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Göstergeleri 2005-2008'. *Haber Bülteni* (169) (September 29).

United Nations. 1961. *United Nations Development Decade. A Programme for International Economic Co-operation (I)*.

Wight, R. Alan. 2008. '"We Are Nature": Exploring Ecovillagers' Perceptions of Nature and Uses of Technology'. Masters of Arts, Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati.

Yearley, Steven. 2005. *Cultures of Environmentalism: Empirical Studies in Environmental Sociology*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: PalgraveMacmillan.

Internet sources

(links checked as of 28.06.2012 unless specified differently)

Auroville ecovillage http://www.auroville.org/vision/background.htm
Auroville research http://www.auroville.org/research/academics.html
ÇEVKO http://www.cevko.org.tr/cevko/home.aspx?lang=fr-CA
Chamber of Environmental Engineers http://www.cmo.org.tr/
EKOYER http://ekoyer.org/
Findhorn ecovillage http://www.findhorn.org/aboutus/vision/history/
GAP http://www.gap.gov.tr/about-gap/what-is-gap
GEN, definition of ecovillage http://gen.ecovillage.org/ecovillages/whatisanecovillage.html
GEN, members http://gen.ecovillage.org/members.html
Global Ecovillage & Sustainable Community Network www.globalecovillages.org
GlobalGAP http://www.globalgap.org/cms/front_content.php?idcat=9
Güneşköy webpage http://www.guneskoy.org.tr/
HaberTürk, 26.05.2012, news article http://www.haberturk.com/yasam/haber/745511-rizede-ornek-davranis
Haberler, 01.11.2011, news article on 2nd Organic Bazaar in Ankara http://www.haberler.com/ankara-ya-ikinci-organik-pazar-3098961-haberi/
IFOAM http://www.ifoam.org/organic_world/directory/Countries/Turkey-Members.html
IMF, history http://www.imf.org/external/about/histcoop.htm
İnsanlık Güneşi Vakfı http://www.insanlikgunesi.org/

Intentional Communities http://www.ic.org/

Kardeş Bitkiler http://kardesbitkiler.blogspot.com/

Marmariç Permaculture http://marmaric.org/english/

Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Lifestock, Organic agriculture statistics Turkey
http://www.tarim.gov.tr/uretim/Organik_Tarim,Organik_Tarim_Statistikleri.html
(18.06.2012)

Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Lifestock, Principles of organic agriculture
http://www.tarimtv.gov.tr/VD139_organik-tarim-uretim-ilkeleri.html

Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Lifestock, Organic agriculture law
http://www.tarim.gov.tr/uretim/Organik_Tarim,Organik_Tarim_Kanunu.html

Organic Europe (European section of the Organic World website), addresses
http://www.organic-europe.net/997.html?&L=0

Organic Europe (European section of the Organic World website), Organic agriculture
statistics Europe http://www.organic-europe.net/europe-data-tables.html?&L=0

Organic Farming, Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development of the
European Commission http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/organic/organic-farming/true-
false_en

Pastoral Vadi http://www.pastoralvadi.com/pastoral_valley.aspx

ProQuest Thesis and Dissertations http://search.proquest.com/dissertations/ (15.06.2012)

Research in Community http://ecovillages.wordpress.com/gfg/

Sieben Linden ecovillage research http://www.siebenlinden.de/htmcontent9987.html

Solheimar ecovillage http://solheimar.is/index.php?msl=english

State Planning Institution, 9th Development Plan
http://www.dpt.gov.tr/DocObjects/View/13744/plan9.pdf:

Tarım TV http://www.tarimtv.gov.tr/index.php

Tarım TV, principles of organic agriculture http://www.tarimtv.gov.tr/VD139_organik-tarim-
uretim-ilkeleri.html

TEMA Foundation http://www.tema.org.tr/

TÜİK, population registry information system
http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/adnksdagitapp/adnks.zul; 18.06.2012

Türk Hukuk Sitesi, Minimum income
http://www.turkhukuksitesi.com/hukuksayfa_asgari_ucret.htm

US-AID, history http://www.usaid.gov/about_usaid/usaidhist.html

Victor Ananias http://victorananias.org/?p=127

Worldbank, history
http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/0,,contentMDK:20
653660~menuPK:72312~pagePK:51123644~piPK:329829~theSitePK:29708,00.html

APPENDIX

Abbreviations

CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ÇEVKO	Environmental Protection and Packaging Waste Recycling Foundation
DPT	T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı
GEN	Global Ecovillage Network
IFOAM	International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MARA	Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
METU	Middle East Technical University
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
TBMM	Parliament of the Republic of Turkey
TEMA	Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats
TNC	Trans-National Communities
TÜİK	National Statistic Institute of the Republic of Turkey
UN	United Nations

Pronunciation of Turkish letters used

ı	"I" in "cousin"
ö	Like German "ö" or French "eux"
ü	Like German "ü" or French "u"
ğ	"-" makes the preceding vowel slightly longer as well as a short break in between to vowels
ş	"sh" in "shut"
c	"j" in "Jack"
ç	"ch" in "chair"

Glossary

Güneşköy	Lit. "Sun-Village"; name of the ecovillage-initiative
Hazine	Treasury
Hisarköy	Name of the village Güneşköy is situated in
Hoca	Hodja, "Teacher"; besides for religious teachers the term is widely used in university context for professors, teaching stuff as well as among students and is suffixed to the name of a person
Interact	Neologism by an interviewee; someone who interacts
Köy	Village
Mahalle	Neighbourhood
Muhtar	Mayor, head of a village
Organik	Organic
Vakıf (Vakfı)	Foundation

Zusammenfassung

Das Ziel dieser Arbeit ist es Motivationen, angestrebten Veränderungen und Auswirkungen von Güneşköy, einer Ökodorf-Initiative nahe Ankara (Türkei), zu beleuchten. Vor dem Hintergrund von Debatten zu Entwicklung und Umweltaktivismus vor allem in Sozialwissenschaften und dem lokalen Kontext der Türkei werden Spannungsfelder einerseits innerhalb der Initiative andererseits im Verhältnis zu seinen Nachbarn im Dorf Hisarköy aufgezeigt. Biologische Landwirtschaft dient dabei als konkretes Beispiel von Wandel anhand dessen unterschiedliche Positionen zwischen Hisarköy und Güneşköy unterstrichen werden. Interviews mit Mitgliedern der Güneşköygruppe ergänzen teilnehmende Beobachtung dieser in 2010 und 2011 durchgeführten explorativen Forschung.

Die Ergebnisse betonen, dass sich die Initiative nicht in einem machtfreien Raum befindet und historischer Kontext sowie existierende Machtverhältnisse eine bedeutende Rolle spielen. Mehr als konkrete Aktivitäten prägen Interessen und Erwartungen wie die Initiative in Hisarköy dargestellt und evaluiert wird, wobei Kommunikation einen vitalen Faktor darstellt. Neue Wege der Zusammenarbeit und Vorbeugung sowie Verminderung von Missverständnissen stellen eine Herausforderung sowohl für Mitglieder von Güneşköy als auch Dorfbewohner dar, die es zu bewältigen gilt um Visionen von Veränderung in Richtung nachhaltiger Lebensweise gemeinsam zu verwirklichen.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore motivations, targeted changes and effects of Güneşköy, an ecovillage-initiative near Ankara. Debates on development and environmentalism especially in the social sciences and in the local context of Turkey set the context for showing tensions within the ecovillage initiative as well as in relation to its neighbours in the village of Hisarköy. The negotiations of organic agriculture, a concrete example of change, serve to underline different positions between Güneşköy and Hisarköy. Interviews with Güneşköy members and villagers added to participant observation in this explorative study in 2010 and 2011.

The findings emphasise the importance of the historical context and existing power struggles and interests a project is situated in. Interests and expectations shape the way the project is portrayed and evaluated by Hisarköy more than actual activities, with communication being a vital factor in these evaluations. Finding new ways of collaboration and the prevention and reduction of misunderstandings remains a challenge for both Hisarköy and Güneşköy that needs to be tackled to be able to together work on the realization of visions of a more environmentally sustainable lifestyle.

Curriculum Vitae

Theresa WEITZHOFER-YURTIŞIK

theresa@metu.edu.tr

Date of birth, 02.08.1985; Place of birth, Oberndorf bei Salzburg (Austria)

Education

2000 - 2004	BORG Bad Leonfelden (high school with focus on art; Austria)
	– 09/2002 - 06/2003 exchange student at Lycée Colbert de Torcy (Sablé sur Sarthe/France)
2005 – 2006	Ethnology and Translation Science (Arabic, French, German) at University of Graz (Austria)
2006 –	Cultural and Social Anthropology at Vienna University (Austria)
	– 2007/08 ERASMUS exchange student at Middle East Technical University, Ankara (Turkey)
	– 2009/10 ERASMUS internship at the Graduate School of Social Sciences at Middle East Technical University and Alevi Institute, Ankara (Turkey)

Publications

- Türkiye'de Alevi olmak (2010), Alevi Kültür Dernekleri, Ankara, Mattek Matbaacılık [together with Erdemir, Korkmaz, Karaçalı, Erdem and Beşpınar] (Being Alevi in Turkey)
- Alevi Bakış Açısıyla Türkiye'de Ayrımcılık (2010), Alevi Kültür Dernekleri, Ankara, Mattek Matbaacılık [together with Erdemir, Korkmaz, Karaçalı, Erdem and Beşpınar] (Discrimination in Turkey from Alevi Perspective)

Lectures

- „A healthy, natural and ecological lifestyle"
  International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) Inter-Congress, 3-6 October 2010, Antalya
- „Araştırma Sonucları" (Research Results)
  Ayrımcılıkla Mücadele ve Eşitlik Konferansı (Conference against discrimination and for equality), 10-11 July 2010, Ankara
- „Türkiye'de Alevi Olmak" Araştırmanın Çarpıcı Sonuçları
  Beşikten Mezara Yaşam Boyu Ayrımcılığın Farklı Biçimleri Paneli, 27 February 2011, Gaziantep

Experience

Sep 2009 - Aug 2010	Project assistance at the Alevi Institute in Ankara (Turkey) for the project "Ayrımcılıkla Mücadele ve Eşitlik İçin Hareketlenme" (Combating Discrimination and Moving Towards Equality).
Jan - Jun 2011	Internship at the Public Information department of the Branch-office of United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Ankara.
Oct 2011 –	Project assistance "RELIGARE. Religious Diversity and Secular Models in Europe. Innovative Approaches to Law and Policy" within the 7th framework programme of the European Commission; country team Turkey; METU, Ankara.