This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

BELONGING TO THE CITY: RURAL MIGRANTS IN MODERNIZING CHICAGO AND ISTANBUL

presented by

Pırıl H. Atabay

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D. degree in History

Maureen A. Flanagan
Major Professor's Signature

21 January 2008
Date

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
FEB 0 2 2010		

5/08 K:/Proj/Acc&Pres/CIRC/DateDue.indd

BELONGING TO THE CITY:
RURAL MIGRANTS IN MODERNIZING CHICAGO AND ISTANBUL

By

Pırıl H. Atabay

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

2008

ABSTRACT

BELONGING TO THE CITY:
RURAL MIGRANTS IN MODERNIZING CHICAGO AND ISTANBUL

By

Pırıl H. Atabay

Chicago in the early twentieth century (1910s) and Istanbul later in the century (1950s), each experienced an influx of rural migrants, a process that challenged the ability of the city and its residents to cope with the ensuing problems. Though separated by time and place, Chicago and Istanbul faced some of the same problems stemming from the migration of tens of thousands of rural people into these already large urban centers. An examination of the different ways Chicago and Istanbul initially dealt with some of the same problems such as housing shortage and health of the city reveals the significance, for urban development, of empowering newcomers with a sense of belonging in the city.

In welcoming rural newcomers into their communities through official and unofficial campaigns to "urbanize" newcomers, Chicago and Istanbul drew on the prevailing concepts of a shared urban culture and civic obligations. Chicago residents, whose active participation in social, economic, and political community matters shaped the city's future, set up institutions specifically aimed to address the needs of newcomers. Most community organizations at this time were segregated by race. Driven in part by the fear that migrants from the rural south would reflect badly on their standing in the city, and partly due to the racial uplift ideology, African American "old settlers," (the leaders of the African American community that was in Chicago prior to the Great

Migration) extended similar services to African American newcomers. At times these efforts brought future oriented groups of blacks and whites together. "Old settlers" imbued newcomers with a sense of belonging in Chicago by encouraging newcomers to invest in housing, to improve their health/living conditions, and to participate in local politics and organizations. African American Chicagoans facilitated this process also by educating newcomers about proper urban manners and by raising consciousness across the city about communal urban living. In this way "old settlers" illuminated for the newcomers the ways they could work towards belonging or fitting in their city.

The efforts of Chicago residents who organized collectively and worked with their city government to aid the adjustment of newcomers in the modernizing city was very different from what transpired in Istanbul. Because rural migration to Istanbul was brought on by the Turkish government's deliberate modernization project, directed from the capital in Ankara and aimed to showcase Istanbul, city residents' ability to influence the migrants' place in Istanbul was crippled. "Original" Istanbulites (Istanbulites who had been in the city for generations) were also still going through the process of becoming citizens after having been subjects of the Ottoman Empire for centuries. When faced with the problems that resulted from migration, they turned to the institutions of the central government and expected the local and national governments to take measures to help newcomers adjust. As a result, Turkish state's attempts to provide housing or increased and improved curative facilities may have satisfied the state's vision of modernization, but they did not necessarily create a sense of belonging to the city, nor raise consciousness about urban communal living.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Professor Maureen A. Flanagan, my advisor, without whom there is no telling how much longer this project would have taken. Professor Flanagan's dedication to her work is exemplary. Her commitment to helping me finish showed in countless meetings in various locations, email exchanges spanning continents (even when she was overseas, or when I was in Turkey), and her editing help with many, many drafts. I also benefited greatly from many conversations with my committee members: Dr. Leslie P. Moch, Dr. Richard Thomas, and Dr. Emine Evered. Each committee member, in his/her own expert approach to my topic, has touched this work. (Dr. Moch was the Graduate Chair when I first came to MSU History Department, and she has watched over my academic progress and me since then.)

I would like to thank the History Department for their generous research funding in summer semesters 2005 and 2006 and the Graduate School for the Dissertation Completion Fellowship that freed me from teaching responsibilities during summer 2007 so that I could dedicate three uninterrupted months to writing. But most doctoral students' research also benefits from the generosity of friends and family. I would like to thank those who opened their homes to me while I conducted my research: Ayşegül Şenarslan in Ankara, Egemen Yağlıkçı and his family, Nüket and Süheyla Ergin, and Ülkü Tunçok in Istanbul, and Prof. Susan Sleeper-Smith in Chicago.

I could not have completed this project so sanely without the friendship of Nilüfer Kafesçioğlu, Elif Taşlıoğlu Dastori, Emine Halil, Selcan Noyan, Stuart Willis, Jill Huerta (and family), Amy M. Hay, L. Rain Cranford (and family), and Fumiko Sakashita. Other

colleagues and friends' support also helped tremendously towards the end: Mary Clingerman, Marcie Cowley, Bethany Nufer-Hicks, and Jason Friedman. Thank you!

I met Kirk S. Kidwell, now my husband, right at the beginning of this project so the length of this project has spanned our time together so far. Having gone through the process himself Kirk understood the energy and concentration that went towards finishing such an undertaking (even when it meant we spent our honeymoon at the archives in Chicago.) His support at times of self-doubt and despair, and there were many, and his love have all meant the world to me. Without the help of my brother, S. Sercan Atabay, my research in Turkey would have taken twice as long. Sercan took time off from his life and spent three weeks in the archives with me. He quite honestly thinks that Ph.D. work is "crazy-work," but I know he will help me even when it gets crazier. My mother G. Mehtap Yağlıkçı Mueller's support at the most critical moments gave me the courage to continue. Finally, I would like to thank my father Professor M. Gürhun Atabay, to whose memory I dedicate this project and whom I miss tremendously, for lessons on setting academic goals, discipline, hard work and so much more.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Belonging to the City: Rural Migrants in Modernizing Chicago and Istanbul

> "Doğal olarak eğer kendimizi yaşadığımız şehre mensup hisseder, onun da bize ait olduğunu içimizde duyarsak, hem ona yapılan hizmetleri daha iyi takdir eder, hem de onu en iyi biçimde korumaya çalışırız."

In English the above quote reads: "If (when) one feels as if one belongs to the city, and feels that the city belongs to him/herself and feels its deep down inside, one appreciates the services provided to a larger degree and attempts to protect them." This was an opening statement of the then Mayor of Istanbul, Ali Müfit Gürtuna, in his introduction to the *Kentim Istanbul* Campaign in April 2003.[1] Having studied "similar experiences of other world metropolises," municipal officials projected that the campaign would deepen city affiliation/attachment in Istanbul residents.[2] The first of its kind in its scope and publicity in the history of the city, the projected success of the campaign remains to be assessed. However, it is at once revealing of contemporary conditions in Istanbul and symbolic of the missing ingredient in the evolution of those conditions. To those familiar with the history of the largest and rapidly growing industrial cities in the U.S. Progressive Era, the intentions and activities of the Istanbul campaign are reminiscent of similar efforts undertaken by the reform minded residents in their efforts to "Americanize" foreign immigrants and "urbanize" internal migrants from rural areas. Yet the campaign undertaken by the Istanbul municipality is also very different from the activities of Chicago reformers: it was after all, initiated by the municipality, not by Istanbul residents, many decades after the waves of rural-to-urban migrations had left their mark upon the city.

---

[1] Ali Müfit Gürtuna, "Biz Istanbulluyuz ve Istanbul'u Seviyoruz," in *Istanbul Bülteni*, April 2003, No. 167, p. 2

[2] http://www.ibb.gov.tr/minisite/kentimistanbul/bolum02/index.htm Last accessed 04/30/2004.

My dissertation examines the effects of rural to urban migration in two cities—Chicago and Istanbul—separated by time and place, but undergoing similar transformative modernizing experiences. Chicago in the early twentieth century (1910s) and Istanbul later in the century (1950s), each experienced an influx of rural migrants, a process that challenged the ability of the city and its residents to cope with the ensuing problems. The migration of tens of thousands of rural people into already large urban areas raised serious questions about the conditions of the built environment, most especially over housing for the newcomers and providing for health and sanitation. In focusing on the problems accompanying these migration movements, my dissertation has three objectives. It explores the role played by the community organizations and the city governments in each city to provide solutions to problems such as housing and health services. Second, it also considers how both official and unofficial campaigns to "urbanize" the migrants were rooted in prevailing concepts of a shared urban culture and civic obligations. Third, by comparing how the Turkish state's modernization process affected Istanbul with the efforts of Chicago residents who organized to aid newcomers to the city to adjust, and thereby make the city more modern, my dissertation contributes to the literature that examines the differences in urbanization processes in the so-called dichotomous industrialized and industrializing, developed and developing, modernized and modernizing nations. This dissertation's focus on the role played by a centralized state, prevailing conceptions of the appropriate use of municipal power, and the presence or absence of an urban civic consciousness investigates the processes of urbanization and modernization in order to understand how the city is conceptualized as a community, who

is taught to belong to this community, and the significance of "belonging" in the lasting success of cities.

At first glance, Chicago and Istanbul may seem like an unlikely pair for comparison, especially given the comparison also comprises different time periods. After all, in the 1910s, Chicago had only been a city for less than a century, whereas Istanbul had been an imperial capital for about sixteen centuries. During Chicago's infancy, driven by the belief that "empire moved west" Chicago's future-oriented boosters aspired to create a city in the image of classical sites such as "Babylon, Thebes, Athens, Alexandria, Carthage, Constantinople, and Rome."[3] Constantinople, the imperial image to which Chicago boosters encouraged city builders to aspire, has had its share of admirers who glorified it and made it appear to be an ageless and effortless gem. Accounts of Chicago, historical and current, accentuate Chicagoans' civic consciousness while celebrating the technological, financial and political innovations that built Chicago. For their part, accounts of Istanbul, especially in more recent memory, emphasize the lack of a civic consciousness while mourning something lost in what Istanbul has become.

Once established/ set in motion, Chicago grew rapidly and successfully, and became modernized while it grew, which may again cause some hesitation for a comparison to be made with a metropolis of the developing world that became modernized a long time after it had been in existence. A swampy gathering place through which a series of American Indian tribes passed in the 17th and 18th centuries, Chigagou, "the wild garlic place," became a remote fur trading post in the frontier of the 1700s-

[3] William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and The Great West* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Ltd., 1991), 42.

1800s, and slowly took shape as Chicago the city, incorporated as such in 1834.[4] Following the efforts of the boosters who drew Eastern capital and immigrant labor to the city, Chicago grew steadily through the next half century and became an industrial center with a reputation that reflected the economic conditions memorialized in the famous Carl Sandburg poem.[5] Chicago became the city of big shoulders, a city of extremes, a city that lacked culture and sophistication. In their determination to catch up with the imperial visions they had set for their city, Chicagoans had, by the late 1910s, succeeded in changing their 1850s' reputation as the "contempt of American East," to one as the "most civilized city in America."[6] By then, as H. L. Mencken drew everyone's attention to the advances made in Chicago's artistic and cultural scene, the city had reached its "maximum potential as a center of power and culture" having gone from "desolate trading post" to "skyscraper city" in little over half a century.[7] Chicago also became the "most typically American of the nation's big cities, a scene of boiling economic activity and technological ingenuity, American industrialism's supreme urban creation."[8] This is not to say that the fruits of all this growth and progress were distributed evenly, but Chicago's reputation, or the idea of Chicago, had improved significantly.

---

[4] Robert G. Spinney, *City of Big Shoulders: A History of Chicago* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 2000). See pp. 5-12 for more detailed information about American Indian tribes and French missionaries; and pp. 13-30 for more detailed information on passing from French control to British authority to American control between 1754-1784. See also Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis*, 23-31; Donald L. Miller, *City of the Century: The Epic of Chicago and the Making Of America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 24-47; John C. Hudson, *Chicago: A Geography of the City and Its Region* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006), 71-101.

[5] Carl Sandburg, "Chicago," in *Chicago Poems* (New York: 1916); See also *As Others See Chicago: Impressions of Visitors, 1673-1933*, Bessie Louise Pierce, ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933, 2004), 207-365.

[6] William Cronon, "To Be the Central City: Chicago, 1848-57" in *A Wild Kind of Boldness: The Chicago History Reader*, Rosemary K. Adams, ed., (Chicago: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 21.

[7] Miller, *City of the Century*, 16.

[8] Miller, *City of the Century*, 17. For the contrasts that Chicago presented to the eyes of observers see Arthur Meier Schlesinger, *A History of American Life* Volume X, *The Rise of the City 1878-1898* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933), 86.

In contrast, Istanbul had been seen, experienced, and ranked as an imperial city for centuries. From its nearly thousand-year-long existence as Byzantium through its imperial capital status as Constantinople to its becoming Istanbul, the city's history is as varied as the titles of the books on it.[9] Throughout the Middle Ages Constantinople was the "biggest, richest, and most sophisticated city in the world."[10] Constantinople continued to be a symbol of "culture" and of "civilization," and increasingly of the "modern" in the last century of the Ottoman Empire. In the 1850s, Istanbul was the "political, cultural, and educational capital of a multiethnic empire."[11] Throughout the last century of the empire, sultans of the Ottoman Empire undertook a purposeful modernization project for which they turned to the West for guidance. The empire's push for modernization entailed borrowing from the institutions and cultures of the West, which the empire identified as superior in military technology and structure. Judging Istanbul through the eyes of the West, the imperial Porte attempted to structurally modernize the city by Western standards even while it attempted to increase its control over the city and its subjects.[12] The first attempts at establishing a municipality in Istanbul date back to this period and are a good example of the deliberate turn to Western institutions.[13]

---

[9] John Freely, *Istanbul: The Imperial City* (London: Viking, 1996); Philip Mansel, *Constantinople: City of World's Desire*, 1453-1924 (London: John Murray, 1995). A quick library catalogue search would yield about 500 titles with the word Constantinople, and about 300 with the word Istanbul in various different languages encompassing scholarly studies as well as novels and travel narratives, etc.

[10] Mark Girouard, *Cities and People* (London: Yale University Press, 1985), 3.

[11] Çağlar Keyder, ed., *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999)

[12] Stefan Yerasimos, Tanzimat'ın Kent Reformları Üzerine, in *Modernleşme Sürecinde Osmanlı Kentleri*, Paul Dumont and François Georgeon, eds. (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999), 2-7.

[13] For the first few attempts at a modern local government in Istanbul see Bilal Eryılmaz, "Osmanlı Yerel Yönetiminde Istanbul Şehremaneti," 331-333, and Ilber Ortaylı, "Osmanlı Belediyeleri ve Kent Hizmetleri," 396 in *Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehremaneti ve Yerel Yönetim* (Istanbul: Ilke Yayınları, 1996).

Following the founding of the modern Republic of Turkey, Istanbul's association with this imperial past briefly tainted the city's chances for future national significance.[14] Republic-minded officials swiftly turned their attention and national funds towards the new Turkish capital, Ankara. Over time, Istanbul regained its status as a cultural center, but the state's modernization project was by then being directed not from Istanbul but from the capital. The early contrast with Ankara, though short-lived, haunted Istanbul, resulting in an endless cycle of tensions and oversights in the ways Istanbul has been able to deal with its problems and become a modern city.

As recognized by political scientist Dankwart Rustow, "modernization" as a term has been used by social scientists "to designate a cluster of historic changes, including industrialization, rationalization, secularization, bureaucratization, and many others." Rustow found "modernization" useful as a term because it could be used to "look at change throughout the tapestry."[15] Unlike many social scientists, I am using the term "modernization" as a historian who is brought to the term strictly by her sources and evidence. "Modernization," thus, provides a framework through which to compare Chicago and Istanbul despite differences of time and place. From this historian's perspective then, "modernization" is a time and place specific process to which Chicago and Istanbul responded in very different ways. As mentioned earlier, Chicago was

[14] Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernizm ve Ulusun Inşaası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiyesinde Mimari Kültür* (Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2002), 17; Freely, *Istanbul: The Imperial City*, 299-300; Doğan Kuban, *Kent ve Mimarlık Üzerine Istanbul Yazıları* (Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 1998), 231; Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 260-261; Ilbeyi Özer, *Avrupa Yolunda Batılaşma ya da Batılılaşma: Istanbul'da Sosyal Değişimler* (Istanbul: Truva Yayınları, 2005), 100-103; Michael Pereira, *Istanbul: Aspects of a City* (London: Geoffrey Bles, Ltd., 1968), xvii.

[15] Dankwart A. Rustow, "The Modernization of Turkey in Historical and Comparative Perspective," in *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Analysis*, Kemal Karpat, ed. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), 93.

considered "American industrialism's supreme urban creation."[16] Industrialization preceded large-scale population increase or immigration in Chicago. Even though there were Germans and Irish in the city in the 1850s, these groups had come during the construction boom. Industrialization initiated a new wave of immigration to Chicago. In the 1880s Chicago was also a transportation hub, where commerce met. Boosters' efforts to attract capital and investment created conditions for industrial greatness which fueled immigration, an increase in the city's population, and rising problems. When city institutions could not keep up with the speed of change and rising problems, Chicago residents stepped in to help create some sense of urban social equilibrium.[17] In the process of Americanization, the earlier settlers themselves modernized the immigrants. In the process of solving political and social problems, these reform minded Chicagoans also forced their city government to modernize. The push to modernize also coincided with the time period in U. S. history known as the Progressive Era. In Chicago, it came about as a result of reform minded Chicagoans' efforts to deal with the problems brought about by industrialization, immigration, and urbanization.[18]

In this process, Chicago's modernization fits the model of European modernization, which Rustow defined as "a process of discovery and invention rather than of response and adaptation," and one that "spread to other continents in the wake of European expansion, as a result of colonial rule and overseas settlement." On the other hand, as a part of a "comprehensive and deliberate" Turkish project, Istanbul's

---

[16] Miller, *City of the Century*, 17. See Schlesinger, *The Rise of the City 1878-1898*, 86.
[17] Dana F. White, *The Urbanists, 1865-1915* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), 207.
[18] Maureen Flanagan, *Seeing With Their Hearts: Chicago Women And the Vision of the Good City: 1871-1933* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002); Flanagan, *Charter Reform in Chicago* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987); Louise de Koven Bowen, *Growing Up With A City* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002); Charles Edward Merriam, *Chicago: A More Intimate View Of Urban Politics* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929).

modernization was state initiated and directed.[19] While Paul Hohenberg and Lynn Hollen Lees cautioned against too general an application of the concept modernization to this process, more recent work on European urbanization situates its analysis within this concept. Helen Meller, for example, uses modernization to examine how "specific changes, commonly experienced across Europe, influenced particular places" as she explores what modernization meant in a variety of European cities in the period 1890-1930.[20] Turkey was not colonized by Europe but it was impacted by the West towards the end of the 18th century and Ottoman military reform paved the way for modernization throughout the 19th century. Military reform eventually expanded into cultural transformation.[21] Under the initiation and direction of the Turkish state, modernization which began in the 19th century Ottoman Army reforms continued through the early republican and post World War II eras. From its earliest stages it connoted a desire to be more like the West, and its people more like Westerners.[22] From manners to dress, from education to secularization, from industrialization to rationalization, Atatürk's reforms swept the nation. Atatürk has been criticized because of the "undemocratic" and "authoritative" fashion in which some of his reforms were conducted and enforced, but he aimed to "modernize" the new Turkish nation by leaps and bounds as quickly as possible. He believed in the modernizing power of the bureaucrats of his time.

---

[19]Rustow, "The Modernization of Turkey," in *Social Change and Politics in Turkey*, 94.

[20] Paul Hohenberg and Lynn Hollen Lees, *Making Of Urban Europe, 1000-1950* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 178; and Helen Meller, ed., *European Cities, 1890-1930s: History, Culture, and the Built Environment* (Chicester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2001), 1. See also Robert Colls and Richard Rodger, eds., *Cities of Ideas: Civil Society and Urban Governance in Britain, 1800-2000* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004).

[21] Rustow, "The Modernization of Turkey" in *Social Change and Politics in Turkey*, 94-97.

[22] Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba, eds., *Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1998); Michael N. Danielson and Ruşen Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization: Government and Growth in Modern Turkey* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1985), 10; Levent Köker, *Modernleşme Kemalizm ve Demokrasi* (Istanbul: Iletişim, 1990); Jacop M. Landau, *Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Modernleşmesi* (Istanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi, 1999); Özer, *Batılaşma ya da Batılılaşma*; Muharrem Sevil, *Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Modernleştiriciler* (Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 1999).

In Turkey, urbanization became "widely equated with modernization," and cities were "seen as the economic and social vanguard of a modernized society."[23] But if urbanization was equated with modernization, it was not "an explicit development objective." That objective was industrialization. Atatürk and his allies regarded industrialization as "the key to modernization."[24] As part of the economic goal of modernization plans initiated by Atatürk and carried on by his followers after his death, it was expected that rapid industrialization would draw rural migrants to the cities and lead to urbanization. In the 1930s, Atatürk's "nationalistic economic policies named etatism" grew in parallel with the growing troubles created by the world wide economic crisis. From the 1930s until the end of World War II, the Turkish state encouraged the growth of private undertakings while it established some state economic enterprises such as cement, glass works, iron and steel, sugar, food, and textile industries. Scholars have argued that most of the state funds were spent toward the construction of roads and railroads, so the state's contribution to industrialization actually remained modest. But the construction of these roads facilitated travel by tying Anatolia, hence future migrants, to urban areas. Meanwhile the state continued to enable the growth of small private undertakings.[25] In

[23] Richard D. Brown, *Modernization: The Transformation of American Life 1600-1865* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), 21. Brown argued that the parts that constitute the modernization process (such as industrialization, urbanization, political transformations) may advance at different times. Sometimes the same period may include some modern parts and some traditional ones. Brown shows how this was the case in colonial America: Even though initially the colonies became modern due to economic conditions, soon upon settlement they converted back to their old country political ways until the Revolution.
[24] Danielson and Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization*, 10.
[25] Erol Tümertekin, *Istanbul Insan ve Mekan* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997); and see also the *Istanbul Ansiklopedisi*; Zülküf Aydın, *The Political Economy of Turkey* (London: Pluto Press, 2005), 83-89; and Roger Owen and Şevket Pamuk, *A History of Middle East Economies in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 18-20.

the post World War II era, Turkish government adopted a liberal development model, Keynesian in nature, and affected by international plans, policies, and aid.[26]

What constitutes the basis of a comparative study of these two cities is that for all their differences, Chicago and Istanbul suffered similar transformative modernizing experiences, albeit at different times, due to population increases over short periods of time. My comparison takes a moment in each city's history when the preexisting order of each was disrupted by the entry of rural newcomers. In Chicago, the particular group under the lens is the African American citizens who arrived in the late 1910s. They entered the city over a short period of time, well announced and expected, even welcomed by some. They were not the first group that crowded into Chicago. Immigrants from Europe had preceded them by decades. I focus on African American rural-urban migrants to Chicago for comparison with the rural newcomers to Istanbul because, like their counterparts in Istanbul, they were citizens; their adaptation and assimilation in Chicago did not require language acquisition; they did not come to Chicago to create a minority religious community; and they could (and did) participate in the political processes. White American migrants to Chicago from rural areas would have been another likely group, but resources on this group of rural newcomers for the time period under study is scarce. A recent study pointed out that historians have fragmented the subject of southern migration to Chicago along "lines of race and time period," but it is also the case that, until after World War II, so did city residents.[27] In Istanbul, I focus on

[26] Tansı Şenyapılı, "Charting the 'Voyage' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial 'Quadruped'", European Journal of Turkish Studies, Thematic Issue No 1- Gecekondu, http://www.ejts.org/documet142.html Last accessed 10/17/2007.

[27] James N. Gregory, *The Southern Diaspora: How the Great Migrations of Black and White Southerners Transformed America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 6.

the rural Turkish migrants. They entered the city in increasingly large numbers, over a longer period of time--unannounced, unexpected, and increasingly unwelcome.

Based on their unexpected entry into the city, coupled with the steeper rise in actual numbers of people, one might expect that rural newcomers to Istanbul were more visible, hence more problematic for Istanbul residents than African American newcomers were for Chicagoans. This was not the case. In terms of percentage, the increase in Chicago's African American population was almost twice that of Istanbul. In twenty years (1910-1930) Chicago's African American population increased over 200 percent, as did Istanbul's population (1950-1970). Yet actual numbers tell a different story: in twenty years Chicago's African American population increased by a little over 65,000 newcomers. Istanbul's population, on the other hand, increased by about 700,000 people in just ten years.[28] Yet compared to the reception of African Americans in Chicago, newcomers' arrival in Istanbul was silent, uneventful, and hardly made the newspapers.

Once these newcomers entered each city, however, their presence posed a series of problems. These rural migrants arrived at a time when each city was undergoing modernization, yet the modernization project of the central state in Turkey and that of the city-centered residents in Chicago created different communal ideals in these two cities. The devastating fire of late 1871 had nearly destroyed the city of Chicago. Once the city's political and economic leaders recovered from their initial shock, they set out not just to rebuild the city's structures, but its essence of community. Economic and social

[28] Chicago's African American population was 46,226 in 1910 and 112,536 in 1930. For Chicago figures see, *Statistical Abstract of The United States, 1924* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1925), 45. Istanbul's population was 1,077,000- 1,166,477 in 1950; 1,368,000 in 1955; 1,882,092 in 1960 and 3,019,032 in 1970. For Istanbul figures see, Aslı Duru, "Apartmentalization and MiddleClassness: Urban Socio-Spatial Change in the Period 1950s-1970s," (Unpublished MA Thesis Submitted to the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History, Boğaziçi Unniversity, 2006), 18.

order, they believed, could not be applied to a city that had grown without such order in the previous four decades of settlement. Within two decades, the city showcased its progress in the World's Fair in 1893. In the following decades, attention turned to reorganizing the municipal governing system so as to create a more orderly, healthy, and economically prosperous city—all hallmarks of urban modernization. Newcomers would be instructed as to how to fit themselves into such a city.

The two groups of rural migrants differed in the social contexts that pushed them out of their original places. Racial, social, and political violence lay behind African American migration out of the American South. In comparison, the initial group of Turkish villagers that came to Istanbul in the 1950s had faced no such violence. On the other hand these two groups were very similar in their expectations from their future residences. Both groups expected the opportunity for a better life in the cities to which they were headed. For all of their differences in the historical record and the scale of their rural-urban migrations, Istanbul and Chicago drew rural-urban migrants for the same reasons, and they underwent similar transformative experiences.

On the other hand, who was in charge of the modernization process affected each city in very different ways. Chicago's modernization process was directed from the heart of the city, which meant that its residents felt that they were in control of the future of their city, that they could shape Chicago's future and their place in it. The fact that modernization was a state initiated and directed project in Turkey took local power and control out of Istanbul residents' hands. Since Istanbul's projects were directed from the

center, this practice continued the process of dependency on the center.[29] In order to explain the effects of who directed the modernization process I will examine some specific problems such as housing, health, political participation, and voluntary organizations in each city. The ability of older/original residents already in each city to transform newcomers into Chicagoans and Istanbulites in the fashion that they desired was reflected in the different ways each city faced these problems.

Chapter One shows that the economic conditions in these two cities differed in ways that demonstrate they were at different stages in their industrialization processes. Chicago was a heavily industrialized city, and it is true that racial hiring practices limited employment opportunities for African American newcomers. On the other hand, following the decrease in European immigration due to World War I, African American southerners were recruited to fill positions in certain Chicago industries.[30] Recruitment efforts and processes gave Chicago's old settlers a chance to prepare for the newcomers and plan for their incorporation into the city. This type of awareness led to community organization and creation of a new institution specifically aimed to help newcomers to

---

[29] For Ottoman tradition of subjects' dependence on the Empire and the transition of subjects into citizens see Dankwart A. Rustow, "Turkey: The Modernity of Tradition," in *Political Culture and Political Development*, Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba, eds. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965).

[30] Chicago Commission on Race Relations, *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and A Race Riot* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1922), 95. St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*, Vol. 1 (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1945), 24-57, and 58 for discussion of labor agents. "Occupational Changes Among Negroes in Chicago" in Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History and Literature, 122 at Chicago Public Library. "Servant class" classification for men meant elevator tenders, janitors and sextons, servants, waiters, and porters; for women it meant charwomen and cleaners, janitors and sextons, laundresses (not in laundry), servants, and waitresses. On stockyards see Gareth Canaan, "Part of the Loaf: Economic Conditions of Chicago's African American Working Class During the 1920s," *Journal of Social History*, 35: 1 (Autumn 2001): 149-150; Paul Street, "The Logic and Limits of Plant Loyalty: Black Workers, White Labor, and Corporate Racial Paternalism," *Journal of Southern History*, 29:3 (Spring 1996), 600; and James R. Barrett, "Unity and Fragmentation: Class, Race, and Ethnicity on Chicago's South Side, 1900-1922" *Journal of Social History*, 18: 1 (Autumn 1984): 37-55. On recruitment see Allan H. Spear, *Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 140. Paul Street, "The Logic and Limits of 'Plant Loyalty': black Workers, White Labor, and Corporate Racial Paternalism in Chicago's Stockyards, 1916-1940" Journal of Social History, 29:3 (Spring 1996), 661.

the city: the Chicago Urban League.[31] Istanbul's economy was undergoing some radical changes that paralleled the national trends when rural migrants began flocking into the city. The nation was switching from an étatist period into a more liberal economy that supported the increase in private establishments. Istanbul's industries would grow through the subsequent decades, but newcomers in the 1950s found mainly small-scale manufacturing and industrial jobs, or entered the marginal sector as peddlers.[32] And they entered Istanbul like unexpected guests.

One could eventually move up the employment scale, but possibility of good housing was a different matter. Chapters Two and Three each deal with a pressing problem caused by drastic population increase over a short period of time. In both cities housing was a significant problem, which both reflected the existing urban culture and affected newcomers' lives. As dwelling, housing provided a roof over newcomers' heads in Chicago, even if that roof was decrepit and overcharged. Housing also was property,

---

[31] This is not to suggest that all African American leaders in Chicago agreed with the method with which to proceed; Chicago's old settlers, or African American community leaders who were in Chicago prior to the Great Migration, were initially divided over this issue. Some believed that opening separate institutions such as the African American YMCA would further segregate and alienate the African American community, and instead desired a more integrated community. However, as Spear has shown "by 1915, most Negro leaders in Chicago were committed to the idea of separate Negro community with civic institutions, businesses, and political organizations of its own." See Spear, *Black Chicago,* 1-8, 167-179.

[32] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 279-281 for the early failure of opposition, and 303-309 for "the coming of democracy." Aydın, *The Political Economy of Turkey*, 25-29. See also Osman Okyar, "Development Background Of the Turkish Economy, 1923-1973," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 10: 3 (August 1979): 325-344. Okyar discusses what he sees as the rise of an "economic consciousness" and the public discussions of this during the 1930s. Alec P. Alexander, "Industrial Entrepreneurship in Turkey: Origins and Growth," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 8: 4 (July 1960): 350 in footnote. Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün ~ Bugün ~ Yarın* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968), 333. Andrew Mango, *The Turks Today* (New York: The Overlook Press, 2004), 47. Ayşe Buğra, Türk Işadamları ve Liberalizm, in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce 7: Liberalizm* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınlari, 2005), 386. See also Okyar for an earlier discussion of this. Kemal H. Karpat, *The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 20-22; Danielson and Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization*, 6; Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, *Istanbul'u Bekleyen Sosyal Riskler Araştırması- 2: Istanbul'a Muhtemel Göç Dalgaları* (Istanbul: 2004), 144. Alan Dubetsky, "Kinship, Primordial Ties, and Factory Organization in Turkey: An Anthropological View," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7: 3 (July 1976). Dubetsky looked at Güzelbahçe in 1970.

though, and private property was also an investment. By being restricted to Chicago's Black Belt, newcomers not only paid more rent for bad housing, they were excluded from owning better property elsewhere in the city. So they were denied the central tenet of Chicago, which had driven people to Chicago in the first place since its inception: promise of property, real estate and booming returns. Old settlers knew about the increasingly common ideas and fears among the rest of Chicago's homeowners that having African Americans move into one's neighborhood depreciated property values. To mitigate this handicap, the old settlers instructed newcomers in ways that would show the rest of Chicago that they did not depreciate property.[33] In Istanbul, the "illegality" of the gecekondu made it a political concern, which involved the hand of the state. The state met the housing shortage by passing a series of laws that legalized the gecekondu settlements. A local problem handled by the central government divided the issue of housing by legal and illegal statuses.[34] Chapter Two then shows residents old and new, original or not, further divided. As living space, the black belt could be tolerated by newcomers as a temporary dwelling, but when African Americans could not leave this area, problems followed. The gecekondu was tolerated by original Istanbulites as a

[33] Chicago Commission on Race Relations, *The Negro in Chicago;* Drake and Cayton, *Black Metropolis;* Spear, *Black Chicago;* Thomas Lee Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto: Neighborhood Deterioration and Middle Class Reform, Chicago 1880-1930* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978). Alzada P. Comstock, "Chicago Housing Conditions, VI: The Problem of the Negro," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 18:2 (September 1912); Sophonisba B. Breckinridge, "The Color Line in the Housing Problem," *Survey*, Feb. 1, 1913 in Illinois Writers Project Box 37, Folder 4.

[34] *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1950-1958; and *Hürriyet* 1950-1955. Mehmet Öztürk, "Türk Sinemasında Gecekondular" in *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue No. 1- Gecekondu, http://www.ejts.org/document94.html last accessed on 10/17/2007. Sema Erder, *Istanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 1996); Oğuz Işık, and M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu, *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneği* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2001); Karpat, *The Gecekondu*; Gülten Kazgan, ed., *Kuştepe Gençlik Araştırması 2002* (Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2002); Orhan Türkdoğan, *Istanbul Gecekondu Kimliği* (Istanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2006); *75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999); *Istanbul ve Göç: Bir Şehrin Karakter Değişimi Konferans Bildirileri* (Istanbul: 1995).

temporary measure, but when gecekondu dwellers or contractors began building gecekondus for the purpose of renting them out, and then moving into apartment buildings in the city, measures taken by the central government led to hostilities in approach and commentary.

Chapter Three deals with health. In Chicago, working classes and the poor mainly lived in tenements by the 1910s and this meant congestion and worsening living conditions, both of which facilitated the spread of diseases. Chicago's reform-minded residents organized around the issue of tenement conditions and pushed their local government to take measures. Along with the association of congested living conditions with spread of disease, germ theory of disease led to new understandings of how to live healthily which required changes in people's daily lives. Chicagoans' efforts, coupled with the city's Department of Health campaigns emphasized preventive measures, but since African Americans were separated from the rest of the city by racial segregation, the old settlers again instructed them in ways that would lead newcomers to change certain practices that they brought with them from the south and adopt new ones—hence modernize.[35] In Istanbul on the other hand, the central state had taken over health provision as well by the time newcomers came in such large numbers, so they met rising need by opening more curative facilities in areas within the reach of gecekondu dwellers.[36]

---

[35] Thomas R. Pegram, "Public Health and Progressive Dairying in Illinois," *Agricultural History*, 65:1 (Winter, 1991): 36-50. On Americanizing the immigrant mother see Lynne Curry, *Modern Mothers in the Heartland: Gender, Health, and Progress in Illinois, 1900-1930* (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1999). On efforts to improve milk quality and educate mothers see Jacqueline H. Wolf, *Don't Kill Your Baby: Public Health and the Decline of Breastfeeding in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2001).

[36] Ceren Gülser Ilikan, "Tuberculosis, Medicine, and Politics: Public Health in the Early Republican Turkey" (Unpublished MA Thesis submitted to the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History, Boğaziçi

Chapter Four looks at political participation in each city. For a long time leading up to Progressive Era political reforms, city government meant patronage relations between political bosses and their constituents in Chicago. In the Progressive Era, there was a turn towards reforming this practice and instituting expertise-based civil service reforms. Residents' political participation revolved around mobilization for local elections. They held their city officials accountable and in the event that they did not like what a city official did, Chicagoans had the power to mobilize and vote him out of office in the next election. Local politics divided Chicagoans as much as they brought them together, but in the end, ever-changing issues and frequent local elections facilitated interaction among Chicagoans. Further, the political culture among Chicagoans again led to old settlers' taking charge of the newcomers' politicization process.[37] Whereas municipalities in Turkey were initially conceptualized as entities responsible for carrying out local communal needs and some democratic measures were instituted to ensure local power, such as elected positions in the City Council, citizens were discouraged from becoming too politicized. Istanbulites then missed yet another chance to band or disband

---

University, Istanbul, 2006). On the state's vision to modernize and Westernize higher learning institutions and the contributions of émigré professors see, Arnold Reisman, "German Jewish intellectuals' diaspora in Turkey: 1933-55 " *The Historian* 69:3 (Fall 2007): 450. Christopher Dole, "In the Shadows of Medicine and Modernity: Medical Integration and Secular Histories of Religious Healing in Turkey," *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, 28:3 (September 2004): 255-280.

[37] Eric H. Monkkonen, *America Becomes Urban: The Development of U.S. cities and towns, 1780-1980* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 90-93; Flanagan, *Charter Reform*, 21-23; Ernest S. Griffith, *A History of American City Government: The Conspicuous Failure, 1870-1900* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974); and Griffith, *A History of American City Government: The Progressive Years and Their Aftermath 1900-1920* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974). For reform movements in the US society see Maureen A. Flanagan, *America Reformed: Progressives and Progressivisms 1890s-1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), vi. For women's increased involvement in city politics see Maureen A. Flanagan, *Seeing With Their Hearts*. See Brown on elections: "...elections were major engines for the integration of localities into the larger state and national organizations. They demanded a larger measure of cosmopolitanism, of awareness of supralocal concerns during the colonial period," 97. Here he is referring to nationwide elections and increasing election rights of the people in America as opposed to their political rights and importance in Europe. But elections were very important in the local too: in Chicago during the 1900s-1910s.

over their local politics.[38] Chapter Four demonstrates how having a local government that was really "local" helped newcomers acquire a sense of belonging to Chicago by making them actively participate in their local issues. Because of the central government's distrust of its citizens and fear of local politics, Istanbul residents were again denied a potential for interaction that would have strengthened newcomers' feelings of belonging to Istanbul as Istanbulites.

Finally, Chapter Five examines the differences between how old settler Chicagoans and original Istanbulites considered themselves as those who belonged to each city. Local control over issues such as housing, health, and municipal politics, gave Chicagoans the ability to direct newcomers into being urban, modern Chicagoans.[39] In the case of the African American community, even though newcomers remained generally marginalized by race from the rest of Chicago, following the social uplift ideal in the African American community, old settlers undertook the process of directing newcomers' social and cultural urbanization and modernization processes.[40] Because local control over housing, health, and local politics had been taken out of their hands, original Istanbulites remained aloof and newcomers remained marginalized economically, socially, and culturally.[41]

---

[38] S. Ulaş Bayraktar, "Turkish Municipalities: Reconsidering Local Democracy beyond administrative autonomy," http://www.ejts.org/document1103.html paragraphs 7-17, Last accessed 10/18/2007. Davut Dursun, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Yerel Yönetim Anlayışı," in Vecdi Akyüz and Seyfettin Ünlü, eds., *Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir ve Yerel Yönetimler*, 18. Hamza Al, "Cumhuriyet Donemi Belediyeciliğinin Tarihsel Gelişimi, in Vecdi Akyüz and Seyfettin Ünlü, eds., *Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir ve Yerel Yönetimler*, 25.

[39] Daphne Spain, *How Women Saved the City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), xii, 3, and 222.

[40] Anne Meis Knupfer, *Toward A Tenderer Humanity and a nobler womanhood: African American women's clubs in turn-of-the-century Chicago* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 2 and 34.

[41] Sema Erder, "Where Do You Hail From? Localism and Networks in Istanbul," in *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local,* Çağlar Keyder, ed. (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.,

My dissertation draws heavily on two daily newspapers, *The Chicago Defender* and *Istanbul Ekspres*. Although it may appear that scholars of African American migration to Chicago have exhausted the use of the *Chicago Defender*, I approached the stories it published from a comparative angle which interrogated the method underlying the strength of community building efforts. These community-building methods reflected old settlers' ownership of Chicago and their place in it, and showed the direction provided newcomers' in terms of fashioning them into Chicagoans. *Istanbul Ekspres* was literally in its infancy, having been established in 1951 with the precise aim of notifying Istanbulites about what was transpiring in their city. Even though Istanbul lacked an informal organized group that received newcomers, the way *Istanbul Ekspres* depicted the city's issues provided important insights into how newcomers were conceptually received into the city.

The evidence for this dissertation also derives heavily from a range of archival and published materials in both cities. For Chicago, these include the Edith Abbott and Charles Merriam Papers at the University of Chicago Special Collections; publications of the Chicago Commission on Race; the Department of Health Bulletins; as well as the Proceedings of the City Council of Chicago. For Istanbul, *Akbaba*, a satirical Turkish

---

1999), 166. Some examples include: Mehmet Cem Akaş, "Collective Political Action in the Turkish Press (1950-1980)" (Unpublished PhD Dissertation submitted to the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 2004); Ayça Kurtoğlu, 'Mekansal Bir Olgu Olarak Hemşehrilik ve Bir Hemşehrilik Mekanı Olarak Dernekler', *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue N°2, Hometown Organisations in Turkey, 2005 URL: http://www.ejts.org/document375.html last accessed 11/01/2007; Birol Çaymaz, 'İstanbul'da Niğdeli Hemşehri Dernekleri', *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue N°2 , Hometown Organisations in Turkey, 2005 URL: http://www.ejts.org/document410.html last accessed 11/01/2007; Jeanne Hersant, and Alexandre Toumarkine, 'Hometown organisations in Turkey: an overview', *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue N°2 , Hometown Organisations in Turkey, 2005, URL: http://www.ejts.org/document397.html last accessed 11/01/2007; Duru, "Apartmentalization and Middle Classness," and Ilıkan, "Tuberculosis, Medicine, and Politics: Public Health in the Early Republican Turkey."

magazine at the Museum of Caricature in Istanbul; Kızılay Dergisi located at the University Hospital; *Encümen Karar Defterleri* in Istanbul Municipal Headquarters; Women's Journals at the Kadın Kütüphanesi in Istanbul; and articles at the Merkez Kütüphanesi in Ankara were crucial sources for understanding the city's reception of rural migrants.

Chapter 1

Coming to the City

An idyllic Istanbul is memorialized in poet Orhan Veli Kanık's words. Over half a century after the publication of *Istanbul'u Dinliyorum/I Am Listening to Istanbul*, public memory no longer remembers the poem for its literary/stylistic innovations. It is an Istanbul of gentle breezes and softly fluttering leaves, of fishing nets and flocks of birds. This is the Istanbul school age children are taught to miss.[1] Meanwhile, Chicago remains a "stormy, husky, brawling" city of big shoulders, in Carl Sandburg's words.[2] The significance of these two poems exceeds the frequency with which they are cited in relation to each city. For the historian, they capture a time in each city's past when the two groups of migrants under study here entered the city. It is easy to imagine the bareheaded "shoveling, wrecking, planning" going on in Chicago's meatpacking industries, plants, mills, steel manufacturers, and railroad car works in the late 1800s. It is also easy to see the draw of such jobs for underpaid, overworked southern African American workers, never mind that their choice of employment in Chicago would be restricted to the worst sections of such industrial jobs or that within one or more years after their move to the city they would have moved down the occupational ladder.[3] The *possibility* of a job—a *better paying* job—was often the final/ultimate motivation migrants needed to leave their places of origin. Rural migrants to Istanbul shared this belief or hope in achieving "a higher standard of living and social status" through better

---

[1] http://www.istanbullife.org/poetry_istanbul.htm downloaded on February 3,2007 Translated by Murat Nemet Nejat. Orhan Veli Kanık, one of the most prominent Turkish poets, was born in Istanbul in 1914. He is famous for using "new themes, new feelings in his poems," and using everyday language.

[2] Carl Sandburg, *Chicago Poems*

[3] Chicago Commission on Race Relations (CCRR), *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and A Race Riot*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922), 95.

opportunities for work in the city, being attracted to Istanbul "by expectations of future benefits" driven by the perception that prosperity existed in the city.[4]

In at least two very specific ways these two groups of migrants differed. African American migrants were recruited into Chicago by labor agents and the *Chicago Defender*. Although the historical record fails to specify which labor agents recruited for which industrial companies, or their success and efficiency in placing newcomers in jobs, it does reveal a conscious effort by a group of Chicago residents who wanted and expected these newcomers. This meant that there were already civic-minded individual leaders and/or groups in Chicago to receive migrants when they arrived.[5] Furthermore, because of racial segregation, the types of jobs newcomers could get were predetermined as much by race as by skill in Chicago. In the long run, the conscious recruitment efforts played into a larger community building effort by "old settlers," a group of African American Chicagoans who had been in Chicago prior to the great migration of the late 1910s. The recruitment methods that brought migrants to Istanbul were much smaller in scale. Initially, migrants were at best recruited by family members. Recruitment by family members generally meant that there would be a job waiting for the migrant in Istanbul in a small manufacturing establishment. However, once in the city, in the event that the job in the small manufacturing establishment did not work out, migrants were free to take up any jobs they could—which generally meant construction or peddling. The lack of large scale industrial recruitment also meant that the

[4] Kemal H. Karpat, *The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976),106-107; see also Mümtaz Peker, "Türkiye'de Içgöçün Değişen Yapısı," in *75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999), 295-304. Peker called this a "culture of hope," or a "relative welfare" concept. See also Belgin Tekçe, "Urbanization and Migration in Turkey 1955-1965," (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Princeton University 1974); Mehmet T. Arıtan, "Distribution and Characteristics of In-migrant Neighborhoods Within Selected Gecekondu areas in Istanbul, Turkey," (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Geography Department, Lexington Kentucky 1983).

[5] St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*, Vol. 1 (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1945), 24-57. See page 58 for discussion of labor agents.

feeling of responsibility for the migrant group as a whole was absent. In the end, this type of recruitment did not necessarily facilitate newcomers' process of becoming "Istanbulites."

The recruitment patterns that brought rural migrants to Chicago and Istanbul reflected the industrial conditions of each city and indicated where newcomers fit in the economic scheme of things. So did each city's reputation. While Chicago was already very much industrialized by the time African American migrants began to flock in large numbers to the city, migration to Istanbul preceded large scale industrialization. Having very publicly recruited African Americans from the South, the *Chicago Defender* took responsibility in their arrival, settlement, and 'urbanization' in Chicago. Having arrived in a city that offered mainly employment in small-scale manufactories, migrants in Istanbul were helped by their kinsmen through informal means. Looking at these very different employment patterns in Chicago and Istanbul reveals the significant role of economic opportunity in the cities. Also, because of the existing reputations and identities of these two cities, newcomers would be expected to adjust in different ways. In Chicago, the initial emphasis would be on work; whereas in Istanbul, the initial emphasis would be on cultural adjustment.

The Case of Chicago

As many scholars have noted, Chicago was a logical destination for many European immigrants in search of wages in the middle of the 1800s precisely because of the presence and abundance of such opportunity.[6] In the later part of the 1800s, the expanding industrial and manufacturing sectors continued to draw immigrants. Industrial opportunities were often reason enough to draw those rural African Americans preparing to leave the South in the 1910s, but these soon-to-be-migrant African Americans also knew that Chicago offered

[6] William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and The Great West* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991); Donald L. Miller, *City of the Century: The Epic of Chicago And the Making of America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

many additional opportunities such as sports, places of entertainment, and other wonders. Sports, the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, and other events were widely reported in the *Chicago Defender,* along with the fact that the city was directly accessible via railroad. The intersection of many such factors added to the logic and magnetism of Chicago as a destination.[7]

The Chicago Commission on Race Relations' Report (CCRR), published in 1922, provided one of the earliest official accounts of the Great Migration. It divided the reasons for the Great Migration into two main categories: economic and sentimental, which were then further subcategorized. The economic reasons that pushed migrants out of the South were low wages and high rents in the South, as dictated by sharecropping conditions, along with the crop destruction caused by the boll weevil. Economic realities that pulled migrants to the North included the decrease in the numbers of the immigrants due to World War I and high wages. The North also promised better living conditions and better schools.[8] The Commission also addressed what it termed the sentimental reasons, which it defined as "those which have reference to the feelings of Negroes concerning their surroundings in the South, and their reactions to the social systems and practices of certain sections of the South." Among these were mob violence in the South and lack of protection from it, further worsened by persecution by the law and the press, inferior segregated facilities, and inability to participate in the voting process.[9] For many African Americans, the sentimental, or social

[7] CCRR, *The Negro in Chicago*, 87; William M. Tuttle, Jr., *Race Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919* (New York: Atheneum, 1970), 75-76; James R. Grossman, *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 4. Maureen A. Flanagan, *America Reformed: Progressives and Progressivisms 1890s-1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 4.
[8] This report was published in the aftermath of the 1919 Riot Chicago, otherwise referred to as the Race Riot. CCRR, *The Negro in Chicago*, 80-84.
[9] CCRR, *The Negro in Chicago*, 84-86. See also Tuttle, *Race Riot*, Allan H. Spear, *Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967).

reasons, might have been the primary factor that pushed them out of the South.[10] However, as some scholars have later pointed out, migrants had many such social grievances for many years prior to the Great Migration, and they began leaving the South in larger numbers when industrial job opportunities became a reality so it was the economic pull of the North that created a snowball effect.[11]

The Commission Report resulted from requests of residents who wanted a better understanding of black-white relations, a better understanding of "the psychological, social and economic causes underlying the conditions resulting" in the 1919 race riot, and a way to prevent future recurrence. But the reasons identified by the Commission were not news to the African American community. The *Chicago Defender* had already covered many of the CCRR findings on its pages throughout the 1910s. Robert Abbott founded the *Chicago Defender* in 1905. In style and content, the publication meant many things to many different people. The Commission recognized the *Defender* as the "herald of glad tidings" to southern African Americans.[12] On the other hand, it was considered "militant" and its circulation provoked "violent reactions" among white Southerners.[13] However they classified this African American weekly, contemporaries and scholars alike recognized its significant role in the Great Migration. Thanks to Robert Abbott's adoption of the magazine-style publishing

---

[10] Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 14-19 provides a very good overview of these discussions; Stewart E. Tolnay, and E. M. Beck, "Black Flight: Lethal Violence and the Great Migration, 1900-1930" in *Social Science History*, 14:3. (Autumn, 1990), 365 emphasize the significance of violence as a factor. For an overview of the studies on African American migration see Arvarh E. Strickland and Robert E. Weems, Jr., "African American Migration and Urbanization," in *The African American Experience: An Historiographical and Bibliographical Guide*, Strickland and Weems, eds. (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001), 1-22.

[11] Sam Marullo, "The Migration of Blacks to the North: 1911-1918," in *Journal of Black Studies*, 15:3 (March, 1985), 298-299 places economic reasons as the primary, and social reasons as the secondary motivator. William J. Collins, "When the Tide Turned: Immigration and the Delay of the Great Black Migration," *The Journal of Economic History*, 57:3 (Sep., 1997) discusses the role of immigrant labor in delaying the Great Migration.

[12] CCRR, *The Negro in Chicago*, 87.

[13] Tuttle, *Race Riot*, 74, and 89-92 More recently Doreski called its style "yellow journalism for blacks." C. K. Doreski, "From News to History: Robert Abbott and Carl Sandburg Read the 1919 Chicago Riot," in *African American Review*, 26:4 (Winter, 1992), 639.

technique to "build rural and small town subscriptions," this Chicago publication made it to little known places in the South, telling stories of an inviting north.[14] The *Defender* was key in informing southern African Americans that there were jobs to be had in the north, more specifically in Chicago, hence influencing masses of Southern African Americans to move North, encouraging them "with such headlines as 'More Positions Open Than Men For Them.'"[15] Editorials publicized the availability of the jobs and the profitability of being gainfully employed in the North, as well as signaled how things were about to change.

The *Chicago Defender* writers framed job availability in terms of World War I. "The world's war has proved a blessing to us," began one writer in July 1916, as the war shut down immigration, reduced immigrant labor, and created a "demand for" African American labor. There were jobs for girls as domestics, and "those who took advantage of their school training" could demand a good salary.[16] As a matter of fact, the "continuous trickle of migrants from the South" had already raised the rate of servant labor of African Americans in Chicago from 15 to 20 percent by 1910. In actual numbers, this meant 14,548 persons were employed in a servant capacity, 8,628 of whom were male and 5,920 female. Some of the newcomers arrived as servants and domestic laborers, but some of the migrant men had been skilled craftsmen in the South and were forced to settle for servant labor once in Chicago.[17]

But there was more to the Chicago labor market than domestic labor. "Since the war there has been a demand for all kinds of skilled and unskilled labor," the same author continued. Men could be found "working on the streets, laying car tracks, working for the

---

[14] James N. Gregory, *The Southern Diaspora: How the Great Migrations of Black and White Southerners Transformed America*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 50-51.
[15] Homer C. Hawkins, "Trends in Black Migration from 1863 to 1960" *Phylon*, 34:2 (2nd Qtr, 1973), 142-143.
[16] "World's Great War a Mighty Blessing," *Chicago Defender*, July 29, 1916.
[17] "Occupational Changes Among Negroes in Chicago" in Chicago Public Library, Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History and Literature, 122. "Servant class" classification: elevator tenders; janitors and sextons; servants; waiters; and porters for men. For women it meant: charwoman and cleaners; janitors and sextons; laundresses (not in laundry); servants; and waitresses.

city Railway and doing all kinds of public work." The author promisingly reported that the opportunities were so great that the employment agencies could not meet the demand. African American workers were replacing foreign laborers. The radical decrease in the number of immigrants due to World War I, who were the labor supply of many of the industries in Chicago, opened up jobs for African Americans—an opportunity that was not there before. After underlining the fact that these jobs were now open to African American laborers the article continued, "Men and women, you are welcome in the north; here they do not burn you nor work you on the chain gang. Schools are open to your children ten months in a year, while many southern states deny them an education."[18]

According to the *Chicago Defender*, not only were jobs more readily available in the north, they were more profitable as well. The same author who saw World War I as a blessing for African American southerners pointed out that the North paid more "for its labor in manufacturing, mining, and commerce," and these better wages would drive millions of people from the South. The South was the birthplace of "slavery, lynching, segregation, prejudice, ostracism, concubinage, disfranchisement, and Jim Crow cars." Going north would ensure "more freedom and greater opportunities to work, lie, rear a family and become a citizen respected and honored because he has spilled blood in all its wars for the protection of its flags and its people."[19] The weekly used cartoons in addition to bold headlines and clear invitations to reinforce its message. In one powerful cartoon an African American male farmer-- with the word "labor" spelled across his back-- was depicted as running towards a convertible car with the words "northern industries" written across its side. He had clearly "broken his chains" and was being chased by three hounds labeled "lynchers" barking up

[18] "World's Great War a Mighty Blessing," in *Chicago Defender*, July 29, 1916.
[19] Ibid.

behind him and a white man with a rifle to the right of the dogs. The caption read: "Southern labor is rising from the southland, where prejudice, peonage and lynchings reign as King. They are taking advantage of the opportunities offered in the north by northern industries, where children can get a fair education and where their wives and daughters are free from being ravished."[20] Opportunities such as "better wages in 'Northern Industries,'" and "High School/ North" were depicted as within reach in another cartoon in which one African American farmer sat on his plow daydreaming about going north.[21] Coupled with violent conditions, inferior segregated facilities, and scarcity of profits in the South, the move to the North sounded very logical indeed.

Add to more availability of jobs and better wages in the north the scarcity of jobs in the south, and who could advise against going north? An August 1916 article, written in opposition to the race leaders who advised against going north by someone who was "thoroughly convinced that this advice is wrong," spelled it out very clearly: there was little work to be had in the south except "growing cotton," and cotton growing did not bring an end to near starvation conditions. Overproduction of cotton had reduced prices. "Why then keep our people raising cotton for which there is no profitable market when he is needed in the mines and factories and farms of the north and west, producing the things which the world most needs?" this author asked. "If it is profitable for the Chinamen, the Japanese, the Italian, the Pole, the Scandinavian and other foreigners to come to America for work, why should it be not profitable for the Negro to go to the same field for employment?"[22]

Scholars have given detailed accounts of which jobs were actually available for newcomers and how much they made in the North. Working up north did not always

---

[20] "Desertion (With Apologies to Uncle Tom's Cabin)" Cartoon, in *Chicago Defender* September 2, 1916.
[21] "Thinking" Ibid., December 16, 1916.
[22] W. J. Latham, "Migration," Ibid., August 26, 1916.

translate into better jobs, yet moving up north to work did open up newcomers lives' to more opportunities. Moving up north in large numbers changed the course of African American and urban history. For example, as already mentioned, in 1910 the majority of workers (14,548 out of 18,571) gainfully employed in unskilled trades in Chicago were servants. This was followed by a total of 3,442 semi-skilled workers, 1,123 skilled workers and foremen, 1,293 clerks, 962 professional persons, and 665 proprietors, managers, and officials. By 1920, the "rapid expansion of the Negro working population produced significant changes in the job configuration of the group." This translated as an inversion in the percentage of African Americans employed in servant and unskilled classes. Whereas male servants had constituted 47 percent of black workers in 1910, ten years later they constituted 26 percent. Inversely, whereas unskilled classes were 22 percent of the African American workforce in 1910, ten years later they constituted 41 percent. In the case of women, while domestic service still claimed one half of women workers, the ratio of African American workers in semi-skilled positions had risen to one third. The most prominent constant in the twenty year period was that "the social economic distribution of Negro workers still showed heavy concentrations in the lower occupational levels."[23]

The way black people were recruited calls for a closer examination here. As subsequent chapters will also reveal, the act of recruiting led to a sense of responsibility among the old settlers in Chicago--something that did not exist in Istanbul. As Gregory argued, the *Chicago Defender*'s "promises affected northerners as well as southerners with their come north invitations and information about services to be expected." In the North,

[23] "Occupational Changes Among Negroes in Chicago" in Chicago Public Library, Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History and Literature, 113-173. Chapter VI (pages 176-216) of this study provides a breakdown of all the occupations under unskilled, semi skilled, skilled, clerks, proprietors, managers and officials and professional workers in 1910. Chapter VII provides the same for 1920.

"newspapers helped shape a process of community building that would remake northern cities and northern politics in the years after World War I."[24] Like other papers throughout the United States and across time, the *Chicago Defender* "played a critical role in creating and maintaining" a collective consciousness,[25] because along with the "come north invitations," the *Defender* published "they are coming," and "they are here" stories.

In the summer of 1916, editorials and other commentaries recognized things were about to change radically in the near future, gave due warning, and outlined a vision for success.

> It is true when large numbers of not only colored people, but of any one distinctive class, migrate to a certain section, friction is bound to occur. Within certain limits a racial minority is unpopular directly in proportion to its numbers. Only as it increases to the point where politics and economic power makes it formidable does it overcome opposition. Our competition for jobs and homes would probably further strain the relations. But as we increase in number our power along all lines would increase and we would be better able to meet the antagonism of white workers found in the skilled trades. If in a few years to come our population in the North has become three millions, instead of the fraction over one million which it is today, and if these three millions live better and save more and spend more per capita than today, we will profit more than we will lose by our greater numbers. For the nation as a whole it will be beneficial to have the Colored people more evenly sprinkled throughout the different states. For one thing, it would end the South's fear of being dominated by us, and closer contact means that we would be better understood. Our problem today is to widen our economic opportunities, to find more openings, and more kinds of openings in the industrial world. Our chance is right now; we must succeed; we must accurately fill the new positions offered us; by so doing we will secure a stable position in the world's work.[26]

Editorial writers expected friction, but were hopeful that rising numbers and economic and political power would help the African American community overcome it. There was much to be gained in this moment, but securing these positions also put newcomers and the African

---

[24] Gregory, *The Southern Diaspora*, 53.
[25] Stephanie J. Shaw, *What a Woman Ought to Be and to Do: Black Professional Women Workers During the Jim Crow Era* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 56-57.
[26] "The Eternal Question," *Chicago Defender*, August 12, 1916.

American community in the middle of the public eye. There were two ways events might unfold due to increasing numbers of African Americans. One was that the move up north might nationalize prejudice and further strain relations between races. The other was that by succeeding in the opportunities this moment presented and by establishing closer contacts with the Northerners the influx of migrants would secure a new position. Old settlers of Chicago understood that newcomers' actions would reflect on the entire African American community. Grossman argued that "as the first generation of black Americans to secure a foothold in the northern industrial economy," these newcomers represented "a crucial transition in the history of African Americans, American cities, and the American working class."[27] African American community leaders were aware of this, concerned about it, and hence were asking themselves "will the great mass of toilers take advantage of this golden opportunity? Will they appreciate the fact that they are on trial, and give the very best service possible that they may make good?"[28]

Old settlers suspected that with the end of the war immigration would revive or those who had left for the war would return and reclaim their jobs. They hoped that the newcomers from the South would do so well that there would be no need for rehiring immigrant labor. They argued that "if he [African American migrant] makes good this opportunity he will keep his place against all foreign labor."[29] Incidentally, the African American migrant laborer would be guided in how to "make good this opportunity" by the college educated leaders, and ministers "with the best interest of" the African American community at heart.[30]

[27] Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 5.
[28] "The Eternal Question," *Chicago Defender*, August 12, 1916.
[29] W. J. Latham, "Migration," Ibid., August 26, 1916.
[30] "World's Great War a Mighty Blessing," Ibid., July 29, 1916.

Old settlers knew and understood urban labor conditions and wanted to make sure that newcomers from the south did not take their jobs for granted and that they worked hard enough. Newcomers would have to learn to adjust to new, industrial working conditions. They would have to go to work every day. They would have to be on time. These were significant adjustments to make in the transition from rural farm labor to urban industrial labor. This was a new disciplinary regimen.

As scholars have shown, industrial jobs open to newcomers were largely unskilled positions in packing and slaughterhouses. It was revealed that while there were about a thousand African American workers in the Union Stockyards in 1915, their numbers had exceeded ten thousand by 1918. Packing houses, steel mills, and foundries actively recruited African American laborers.[31] The prevailing stereotype was that "blacks poorly adapted to machine tasks but possessed rare endurance for simple, exhausting, labor intensive toil amidst high temperatures, wetness and filth." To add insult to injury, they were not likely to move up the hierarchy.[32]

Newcomers would have access to these industrial jobs more than ever before, and this also meant new experiences in learning to handle money made from industrial employment, in learning to resist temptations "thrown in their way." They would be making more money, but they would also be facing more temptations to spend it; so it was realistic to expect that many newcomers would fall by the wayside. The danger was, however, in that "good and bad

[31] On stockyards see Gareth Canaan, "Part of the Loaf: Economic Conditions of Chicago's African American Working Class During the 1920s," *Journal of Social History*, 35:1 (Autumn, 2001), 149-150; Paul Street, "The Logic and Limits of Plant Loyalty: Black Workers, White Labor, and Corporate Racial Paternalism," *Journal of Southern History*, 29:3 (Spring 1996), 600; and James R. Barrett, "Unity and Fragmentation: Class, Race, and Ethnicity on Chicago's South Side, 1900-1922" *Journal of Social History*, 18:1 (Autumn, 1984). On recruitment see Spear, *Black Chicago*, 140.

[32] Street, "The Logic and Limits of Plant Loyalty," 661.

are to be found in every race, but unfortunately, there are great many narrow people, who on finding a bad Colored person, condemn the whole race."[33]

It was the recognition that African American migration would place these newcomers permanently in major cities that led to formal efforts that initially centered around aiding the newcomers' adjustment process. Recognizing "the permanency of an urban" African American population "ill-prepared to meet the strains of northern city life," key figures in the National Urban League argued that it would be up to black and white leaders "to ease the adjustment migrants had to make." In this undertaking, leaders could use methods similar to those that helped "other elements of the population."[34] Shortly after three existing organizations in New York consolidated to form the National Urban League in 1911, efforts were underway to open a branch in Chicago. [35] Chicago had its share of increasing African American migration from the South; industrial problems and other tensions were similar to those African American migrants faced in New York. So New York League officials had every reason to believe that "their program would be well received" in Chicago.[36]

---

[33] "Our Industrial Opportunity," in *Chicago Defender*, August 12, 1916.

[34] Nancy J. Weiss, *The National Urban League: 1910-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 33.

[35] Weiss, *The National Urban League*, 29 and 9. The Committee on Urban Conditions joined with the National League for the Protection of Colored Women and the Committee for Improving the Industrial Conditions in New York in 1911 to form the Urban League. Arvarh E. Strickland, *History of the Chicago Urban League* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966), 29-30.

[36] Strickland, *History of the Chicago Urban League*, 25. The first president of the Chicago Urban League, Dr. Robert E. Park, shared the National League's vision that the situation in Chicago required helping the "adjustment of an essentially rural population to the conditions of a city environment" by meeting immediate concerns with "work and wages, health and housing." (40). The Chicago Urban League encouraged the existing African American organizations to co-operate and brought together agencies, clubs, settlements, social workers and their friends, and "others who were in touch with social problems." (50-52, 36, and 27-32). Investigation played a big part in the program of the Chicago Urban League. "Fact finding, research, persuasion, negotiation, public education, and community organization" were key tools of the Chicago Urban League. Whitney M. Young, Jr., "The Urban League and Its Strategy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 357 (January, 1965), 103. In addition to meeting newcomers at railroad stations, and distributing cards to encourage newcomers to attend their offices, the League sent club women into the homes of newcomers, and community workers into their churches "with verbal advice as to things migrants should do and know. Strickland, *History of the Chicago Urban League*, 44-45. The Urban League also functioned as an institution through which white and black leaders could communicate more effectively. Young, "The Urban League and Its Strategy," 106, and 103.

By the end of 1916, "Mr. Jones," the associate director of the National League on Urban Conditions, had visited cities such as "Chicago, Detroit, Minneapolis and others" and reported to having observed that many of the migrants out of the South were securing good positions. "Those that are sober and responsible and know how to give an honest day's toil are holding good positions," *the Defender* reported. "The indolent, inefficient men however, are soon discouraged, become a burden… and bring reproach and humiliation to the thrifty citizens in communities." Through the *Chicago Defender*, Mr. Jones and the League wished to "discourage the wholesale migration of shiftless people between any two points, be north or south." Newcomers were urged to use the fact that labor was in demand "to improve the efficiency of that labor by demanding" better wages, better working conditions, and better living conditions. Newcomers were advised that both races would benefit from improved conditions.[37]

The Chicago branch of the National League on Urban Conditions held its first official meeting in January 1917.[38] Two months later the Chicago Urban League (CUL) opened headquarters at 3719 S. State Street with Mr. T. Arnold Hill from New York in charge. It was reported that the League would interest itself "in the housing and working conditions of the newcomers" and it would also "help to teach men and women to be on time at the work." Robert E. Park (white) of the University of Chicago was to be president.[39] Members planned to enlist railroads' help "to secure addresses of newcomers at stations and what kind of work they can do."[40] In this way they could keep records of newcomers and place them in jobs. By the end of 1917, the executive secretary, T. Arnold Hill, reported "that during eight months

[37] "Conditions Good in the North," *The Chicago Defender*, December 2, 1916.
[38] Strickland, *History of the Chicago Urban League*, 29-30.
[39] "Urban League Opens Headquarters," *The Chicago Defender*, March 10, 1917.
[40] No Title, Ibid., March 31, 1917.

the league had placed a total of 1,381 people; assisted 7,000 persons, and expended $3,100."[41] With the help of the Department of Labor, the Industrial Department of the League was able to place newcomers in white firms through 1918.[42]

As it reported on the Chicago Urban League's activities, The *Chicago Defender* addressed the work habits newcomers were expected to learn. Migrants first had to make the transition from nonindustrial to industrial labor.[43] As far as the work ethic went, through the *Chicago Defender* self-appointed community leaders, or in George C. Hall's words "proper people," instructed African American migrants in the importance of being industrious. Hall had pointed out, "The Colored man from the South does not need to be in the north very long before he learns that Saturday is not a national holiday and that he must be industrious and thrifty if he wants to get along." He argued that when "proper people" reached the new arrivals and gave them right tips, they rapidly adjusted themselves "to their changed surroundings."[44] This transition to urban industrial labor also comprised being able to manage wages wisely. These new industrial workers were encouraged to invest their money in the bank: "What the *Chicago Defender* would like to see among our people is a 'Go To Bank Day.' It would like to see the ministers of the churches urge its members to have a day each week or month, the time your salary is received to go to a bank, start a savings account, no matter how small."[45]

By 1918, the idea that what affected one, affected all, came to hold a more prominent and more specific meaning for the *Defender's* writers "working with" the CUL. The League sent letters to pastors and to other business and professional men, "calling their attention to

---

[41] "First Annual Meeting Chicago Urban League," Ibid., November 24, 1917.
[42] "Urban League Has Federal Employment Bureau," Ibid., Mar 16, 1918.
[43] Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 7.
[44] "Southerner Soon Readjusted" *The Chicago Defender*, April 7, 1917.
[45] "Go to Bank Day Urged" Ibid., January 20, 1917.

the many causes which contribute to the inefficiency of the Race in employment." The letter was also mailed to "men and women who have accepted positions in business houses which, until recently, did not employ Race members…". The letter stated,

> as an applicant for work in the present great area of reconstruction, it is your duty to remember that in accepting new lines of employment under these conditions, you are not merely a servant and employee for hire, but one of a Race whose members cannot afford to be careless and indifferent. You must always remember that upon your general behavior, good manners, good conduct, and attention to dress and cleanliness, as well as efficient service, will the opportunity to continue in this work remain open to you, and the members of your Race. Remember that the race in this new work is on trial in you, and if you do well you will serve not only yourself but the entire race.[46]

As already mentioned, the effects of this level of race consciousness, as it related to employment opportunity and work performance, in terms of community building will be discussed in detail in subsequent chapters.[47] The old settlers' recognition that the Great Migration of Southerners would place all African American citizens of Chicago on trial has been criticized as "class hierarchy."[48] What it meant for the newcomers, is a difficult question to answer. So difficult that one might be tempted not to ask it for the answer cannot be documented by traditional materials. Yet one can put it in comparative perspective: no such receiving committee existed in Istanbul. The jobs migrants found in Istanbul reflected

---

[46] "Urban League Makes Appeal For Greater Efficiency," Ibid., Nov 23, 1918.

[47] This and the lack of it in Turkey. See Önder Şenyapılı, *Kentleşemeyen Ülke, Kentlileşen Köylüler* (Ankara: Odtü Mim. Fak. Ara Yayınları, 1981), 67-68 for a discussion of Turkey's social classes after the War of Independence: "Coming out of the Ottoman Empire… (1930s) Turkey lacked the bourgeoisie like that of Europe. There was a weak trading bourgeoisie… but then the bureaucrats took on the functions of the bourgeoisie… Then in the 1940s… transition into democracy… migration began, farmers flocked to the cities with the expectation of gainful employment but the cities were not ready… there was no industrial bourgeoisie…"

[48] Authors classified the African American community in Chicago as "the Refined, the Respectables and the Riff Raff" in Drake and Cayton, *Black Metropolis*. Spear discussed the role of "the large scale migration of poorly educated, unskilled Negroes from the most backward areas of the Deep South" in the formation of the ghetto, race consciousness and leadership class. Spear, *Black Chicago*, viii, ix.

the economic shortcomings of the city. Their presence in the city was conceptualized as ruining the "appearance" and the "feel" of Istanbul.

The Case of Istanbul

Scholars generally overlook the significance of conditions in Istanbul of the 1950s. Broadly speaking those who are interested in the 1950s political conditions emphasize the changing national political system and mention Istanbul hurriedly in passing. They are generally interested in the transition from the single party rule to the two party political system. Whereas in the early days of the republic attempts to oppose Atatürk's party had failed to take root, it was only in the late 1940s that a working opposition party, the Democratic Party, finally stuck.[49]

Economically, the decade marked the end of the etatist ideology and practices, and the transition from a heavily central government subsidized practice to allowing foreign investments in. Up to this point, leaders had used the Turkish state as "an instrument to create a local bourgeoisie under a strict authoritarian bureaucratic rule." Having to reconstruct the economy after World War I and the founding of the republic led the central state to undertake substantial measures "to commercialize agriculture and increase its productivity." The etatist period, during the world wide economic crisis of the 1930s, brought the state's efforts "to industrialize the country through joint investment with foreign capital as well as through establishing of State Economic Enterprises," by establishing large scale "import substituting industrialization type production units (in textiles, sugar, cement, paper, mining)" to complement private undertakings.[50] The state increased its economic activity but did not ban

---

[49] Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 279-281 for the early failure of opposition, and 303-309 for "the coming of democracy."

[50] Zülküf Aydın, *The Political Economy of Turkey*, (London: Pluto Press, 2005), 25-29. See also Osman Okyar, Development Background Of the Turkish Economy, 1923-1973, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*,

or discourage private undertakings. So that the state's increased economic activity would not be understood as socialism, leaders took pains to explain their intentions. Atatürk addressed this issue in his public speeches.

> Although considering private work and activity as a basic idea, it is one of our main principles to interest the State actively in matters where the general and vital interests of the nation are in question, especially in the economic field, in order to lead the nation and the country to prosperity in as short a time as possible.[51]

With the First Five Year Plan (1934-1939), the state did just that. Then, following the end of World War II the Democratic Party, which now headed the new multiparty government, at the insistence of the United States and the World Bank, shelved the Five Year Development Plan and made agriculture its priority. Also at the insistence of the United States and the World Bank, although state protectionism continued until the 1970s, the state scaled back its role in the economy and took measures "to lure foreign capital into the country." [52]

Scholars agree that the decision to end etatism put the state in a position to encourage private undertakings, yet there is some disagreement when it comes to how much this position actually established. Most scholars make sweeping generalizations concerning the economic conditions in Turkey in the 1950s, but over and over again it is stated that this time period was chaotic, full of ups and downs, and that the intentions of the central government and what actually took place did not always coincide. Furthermore, leaders are generally criticized for their ineptness, confusion, misdirection, wastefulness and inefficiency.[53] There is also some inconsistency of the available numbers. One early study reflects that there were

---

10:3, (August 1979), 325-344. Okyar discusses what he sees as the rise of an "economic consciousness" and the public discussions of this during the 1930s.

[51] Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 286.

[52] Zülküf Aydın, *The Political Economy of Turkey*, 25-29.

[53] Lewis, *The Emergency of Modern Turkey*, 287-288.

"2,515 private manufacturing establishments" employing more than 10 persons in 1950 and that by 1955 there were 4,106.[54] Another states that the number of private enterprises, which was 712 between 1940-1949, had reached 2,775 by 1963.[55] Notwithstanding the inconsistency in numbers, private undertakings did increase significantly. It is also argued that in the 1950s, while private enterprises were encouraged, "far from being reduced, the public sector grew in size." The Menderes government became a sort of employment agency, which increased its popularity with its supporters.[56] Over time, it became clear that government encouragement benefited *some* business leaders, those who did not oppose government involvement in the economy but who wanted their own piece of the pie, a sort of a patronage system.[57]

When scholars concentrate on the 1950s in relation to rural-urban migration, the era's significance lies in that it was the beginnings of the gecekonduzation process in big cities such as Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir. It is also generally recognized that the migration movement in Turkey differed from those in the West in that, as with other developing nations, Turkey's rural migration to urban centers did not depend on industrialization to the same degree.[58] Following World War II, population in Turkey increased significantly, most of the natural increase taking place in the rural areas. In this circumstance, many farmers were pushed out of their farms because of diminishing profits due to sharecropping and,

---

[54] Alec P. Alexander, "Industrial Entrepreneurship in Turkey: Origins and Growth," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 8:4, Part I (July 1960), 350 in footnote.
[55] Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün ~ Bugün ~ Yarın* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968), 333.
[56] Andrew Mango, *The Turks Today* (New York: The Overlook Press, 2004), 47.
[57] Ayşe Buğra, "Türk Işadamları ve Liberalizm," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce 7: Liberalizm* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2005), 386. See also Okyar, "Development Background Of the Turkish Economy" for an earlier discussion of this.
[58] Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 20-22; Michael N. Danielson and Ruşen Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization: Government and Growth in Modern Turkey* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), 6; Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, *Istanbul'u Bekleyen Sosyal Riskler Araştırması- 2: Istanbul'a Muhtemel Göç Dalgaları* (Istanbul: 2004), 144.

more specifically, because the state modernization project had provided ever increasing amounts of credit and numbers of tractors, releasing surplus labor and at the same time mechanizing agriculture. Furthermore, the Marshall Plan helped the Turkish state invest in new roads and highways, opening up the world for the rural areas.[59] While it happened to varying degrees in rural farming areas, credit availability and the mechanization of agriculture mainly benefited the old "toprak ağaları" (Turkish feudal lords) and turned them into capitalist producers, while further impoverishing sharecroppers and small land owners. Considering one tractor displaced ten farm laborers and that the number of tractors increased from about 2,000 in the end of 1940s to about 44,000 by the end of the 1950s, hundreds of thousands of laborers found themselves unemployed in the farming areas.[60]

This is not to say that there was little industry or other employment opportunities in Istanbul to warrant such a movement of rural migrants to the city. Compared to other parts of Turkey, Istanbul had been the center of industry in the days of the Ottoman Empire. Starting with the middle of the nineteenth century, "the iron and steel plants, tanneries, gasworks, and textile plants" had drawn to the city "peasants from the countryside," as well as foreign businessmen and investors.[61] One of the best examples of the early industries is in the Zeytinburnu district. With geographic characteristics that ensured the success of tanneries,

---

[59] Karpat, *The Gecekondu*; Önder Şenyapılı, *Kentleşemeyen Ülke, Kentlileşen Köylüler* (Ankara: Odtü Mim. Fak. Ara Yayınları, 1981), 4; Ercan Tatlıdil, "Göç ve Kentleşmenin Sosyal Boyutu," in *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, No. 3 Yıl 1992; Gülten Kazgan, ed., *Kuştepe Araştırması 1999* (Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1999), 10.

[60] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni*, 284-291; and Sina Akşin, *Siyasal Tarih (1950-1960) in Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908 ~ 1980* (Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 2002), 215. See also Ahmet Içduygu, Ibrahim Sirkeci and Ismail Aydıngün, "Türkiye'de Içgöç ve Içgöçün Işçi Hareketine Etkisi," in *Türkiye'de Içgöç* Conference Proceedings (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998), 221-225; Richard D. Robinson, "Turkey's Agrarian Revolution and the Problem of Urbanization," *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 22:3, Special Issue on Attitude Research in Modernizing Areas, (Autumn 1958), 398; and Alexander, Industrial Entrepreneurship, 357.

[61] Ian Manners and Abraham Marcus, "Istanbul: From Imperial City to Modern Metropolis" essay for the humanities exhibit organized by Center for Middle Eastern Studies, University of Texas at Austin and Department of International Relations, Marmara University, Istanbul- made available by Texas Humanities Resource Center, Austin.

Zeytinburnu district drew workers and other business establishments to its environs starting a century and a half before the 1950s.[62] As far as other employment opportunities went, Istanbul, as one of the major ports, offered many loading and unloading jobs. In 1927, there were 3,000 dockworkers in Istanbul. Also in 1927, there were 3,000 tobacco workers in the city. A year later, there were 500 more tobacco, 300 textile, and 70 iron and steel workers in various establishments.[63]

Following the founding of the republic of Turkey, in line with the state's rapid industrialization policy, Istanbul had "attracted most private industrial and commercial investment during the initial decades," and continued to be the center for private economic development through the decades of the 1950s onwards.[64] Almost fifty percent of Turkey's private industrial undertakings were concentrated in Istanbul.[65] It was no coincidence, one scholar argued, that until the end of the 1960s industrialization and urbanization were seen as identical. Migration to cities in Turkey was seen as a marker of industrial development. It was expected that the transfer of surplus labor from rural areas would increase industrial production. Accordingly, even though the state did not openly or actively pursue this sort of politics, by being passive in the face of it, they actually encouraged it.[66]

On the other hand, scholars who have studied smaller pockets of Istanbul's economic life have found that Turkish industry was "predominantly organized in small units" and an

---

[62] See the official site for the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality http://www.istanbul.gov.tr/ for more detailed information on Zeytinburnu. Istanbul'u Tanıyalım, Her Semtin Öyküsü, Zeytinburnu. Last accessed September 28, 2007. See also M. Şehmus Güzel, *Türkiye'de Işçi Hareketi: 1908-1984* (Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1996), 144-145.

[63] Güzel, *Türkiye'de Işçi Hareketi*, 173.

[64] Danielson and Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization*, 56-57.

[65] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni*, 334 and Alexander, "Industrial Entrepreneurship in Turkey: Origins and Growth," 354 agree on this point.

[66] Ercan Tatlıdil, *Göç ve Kentleşmenin Sosyal Boyutu*, 1992, 46.

"overwhelming majority of companies had twenty-five or fewer workers."[67] There were 321 private establishments in Istanbul in 1950 that employed ten or more persons. By 1963 private enterprises had quadrupled.[68] Following the end of World War II mobilization for opening up more factories, plants, mills, workshops, ateliers, and other manufacturing concerns transformed parts of Istanbul such as Zeytinburnu, Bağcılar, Bayrampaşa, Gaziosmanpaşa, and Kartal into industrial complexes as population increased. Kağıthane was likewise transformed. By 1965, along the Kağıthane Creek there were 102 workshops and factories, places where finished products are made, which made various goods such as vegetable oil, iron works, textiles, and copper.[69]

These smaller establishments employed anywhere from five to three hundred workers.[70] For example, a cement factory employed 18 workers who worked two 11-hour shifts in 1948. Another one in Zeytinburnu was documented as having 130 workers in 1959.[71] Furthermore, the owners of these smaller establishments recruited workers from their own villages. This made the recruitment, organization, and authority patterns very personal, unlike the recruitment pattern in Chicago for African Americans.[72] Even though some found jobs through the Iş ve Işçi Bulma Kurumu (Government Employment Agency), most migrants found out about jobs through kinship or communal networks usually at the kahvehane (kahve for short). The kahve served as an employment bureau. It was also an important communication center where problems were discussed and informal decisions

---

[67] Alan Dubetsky, "Kinship, Primordial Ties, and Factory Organization in Turkey: An Anthropological View," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7:3 (July 1976). Dubetsky looked at Güzelbahçe in 1970.
[68] Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni*, 333-334.
[69] Mahmut Kemalettin Gürlük, "Gecekondu Meselesi ve Kağıthane," *Iller Ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, No. 239, (September 1965), 469-470.
[70] Güzel, *Türkiye'de Işçi Hareketi*, 175-181.
[71] Ibid., 179, and 175.
[72] Dubetsky, "Kinship, Primordial Ties, and Factory Organization in Turkey," 434.

were made. Every hemşehri (communal) group had its own major coffee house.[73] Smaller work places and the recruitment pattern affected migrants' adjustment trajectory directly: familiar relationships in the city helped adjustment in informal ways, while they did not necessarily make newcomers "of" the city.

As keepers of the very public record of the public sphere, newspapers reflected the chaos of the era. Between 1952 and 1953, *Istanbul Ekspres* announced that one new oil factory was opened, extolling it on the virtue of being a joint effort by businessmen from Turkey and Holland. It further announced that three pharmaceutical and seventeen cement factories would open.[74] These celebratory stories aside, opening factories took a long time. In May 1954, the satirical *Akbaba* reported on the delay in the construction process:

> Readers will remember the soda factory. The opening ceremonies for the soda factory were held four years ago, and its foundation was laid three years ago, followed by the ribbon cutting ceremony celebrating the completion of its first floor last year. Eight months ago we joyfully celebrated the retiling ceremonies, and yesterday we celebrated the installation of the windows. In the next few weeks we are looking forward to celebrating the installment of the door latches. Plans for the celebrations of the next few years are underway.[75]

Progress was slow and painstaking even if factories were being encouraged and people were investing in them.

Otherwise, *Istanbul Ekspres* made brief references to the industrial workers and told the story of peddlers and builders. Peddlers and builders were depicted as disturbing the quiet of the city with their increasingly loud yelling to sell their wares on the streets or their merrymaking on construction sites at night and as disturbing the beauty and order of the city

---

[73] Mehmet Tanju Akerman, *Istanbullu* (Istanbul: Elçi Yayıncılık, 2005), 46. The kahvehane served as "the center of employment," according to Akerman. Or as a "communication center," according to Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 133.

[74] "Yeni Açılan Yağ Fabrikası," "Şehrimizde yakında üç ilaç fabrikası kurulacak," and "Yeniden Onyedi Çimento Fabrikası Kuruluyor," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1952-1953.

[75] "Kalkınma," in *Akbaba* 112, 13 May 1954.

with their attire and increasing numbers blocking the streets.[76] An *Akbaba* cartoon captioned "Kadıköy Vapuru: II" (Kadıköy Ferry) depicted a newspaper seller on the ferry peddling loudly as one of the passengers who was trying to read his newspaper hushed him like a nurse would in a hospital. In the next square four peddlers were depicted as screaming at the top of their lungs.[77] Clearly the "original Istanbulites" were losing their hold on the city and the civilized manners it stood for.

As Karpat revealed, migrants who came to Istanbul between 1950-1957 arrived during a construction boom. However, besides being builders, migrants found jobs as "drivers, waiters, maids, servants, dairymen, cook, mason, gas station worker, janitor, porter, coffee seller, salesmen, hawker, peddler, gardener, photographer, grocery men, florist, blacksmith, watchmen."[78] According to *Istanbul Ekspres* reports, there were 7,000 bakers who were dissatisfied with their conditions, 35,000 street vendors who displayed their wares at every possible street corner a city resident turned, as well as over 74,000 shoemakers and about 60,000 müstahdem.[79] Along with the types of employment available to newcomers, the numbers of the people engaged in these types of jobs reflected a concern in rising unemployment. Rising unemployment was portrayed in a satirical way in a story in *Akbaba*. Due to increasing competition, even the very low paying jobs had become hard to come by. The story discussed an announcement for the position of a "hademe."[80] Requirements for this position were listed as

> 1. Having at least graduated from the University (those who speak a foreign language will be preferred) 2. Having completed the compulsory military duty

[76] *Istanbul Ekspres*, 24 July, 1952; 1-12 August, 1952; 12 October 1952.
[77] "Kadıköy Vapuru: II," in *Akbaba* 110, 22 Nisan 1954.
[78] Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 87, and 101.
[79] *Istanbul Ekspres*, 24 July, 1952; 1-12 August, 1952; 12 October 1952. Müstahdem is difficult to translate into English. A müstahdem is a person who had various duties ranging from cleaning (janitorial) to serving tea and coffee, from being a messenger to a doormen in a government office.
[80] Like müstahdem, a hademe is a person who cleans and runs errands in government offices or schools.

> (Those who provide a photo in uniform will be given preference) 3. Being no older than 30 years of age (Those who have reduced the number of their years through a court order will be accepted) 4. Providing a report of endurance that testifies to one's ability of surviving anywhere in the nation on the salary offered... 48. After passing the written exam, those who meet all the requirements listed must provide a notarized written contract that testifies that they will not take their life. Those who trust themselves please apply.[81]

Listing such high requirements for such a low scale job, the story addressed the impossibility of placing newcomers in gainful employment. Migrants continued to be drawn to Istanbul during this time period, but clearly the level of industrialization in 1950s Istanbul was nowhere comparable to that of Chicago earlier in the 20th century.

Yet, even if one did not find a job in one of the industrial and manufacturing ventures, one could trade, go into sales, or peddle (marginal sector).[82] As one "esnaf emeklisi" (retired tradesman) remembers, Istanbul provided a wide field for employment with a wide spectrum of jobs.[83] At times even peddling and street vending in Istanbul was more profitable than sharecropping in rural areas.[84] At other times peddling was used as additional income.[85] Profitable or not, one man's livelihood became another man's nuisance. Original Istanbulites were not pleased with the increasing numbers of street peddlers and vendors and this period was the beginning of the government's cat and mouse chase with the peddlers. As one *Akbaba* story depicted, the government tried to deal with the menace of peddlers by chasing them, which could be quite comical.

> Officials in Eminönü put on a hunt to catch peddlers this past week in Mahmudpaşa, Postane önü, and Yenicami. Officials pursued five lemon

---

[81] "Hademe Alınacak," in *Akbaba* 111, 6 Mayıs 1954.
[82] *Istanbul'da Enformel Sektör: Işportacılar*, Tekin Akgeyik, Arif Yavuz, Halis Yunus Ersöz, Süleyman Özdemir, Hasan Şenocak (Istanbul: Erguvan Yayınevi, 2004), 19, 25-28.
[83] See interview with former shipper (nakliyeci: one who operates a transport company; forwarding agent), now a sales retiree in Kazgan, ed., *Kuştepe Araştırması*, 92; Şenyapılı, *Kentleşemeyen Ülke*, 64 and 36.
[84] This is what the author calls "relative wealth." Included in this arrangement/view is the availability of better services in the city and opportunities for education. Şenyapılı, *Kentleşemeyen Ülke*, 47-48.
[85] Güzel, *Türkiye'de Işçi Hareketi*, 140.

> peddlers, four sock peddlers, three peddlers who sold combs, and one who sold clothes hangers. They missed three soap sellers, and two who sold roasted chickpeas. They caught one juvenile peddler because he was running barefoot and stepped on pieces of broken glass. Meanwhile, in this hunt to catch peddlers, a peddler named Moiz who was being pursued broke the record of the nation's leading long distance runner. Another peddler named Durmuş, from Sivas, broke the national high jump record by jumping over a truck while still carrying a basket of wares on his back.[86]

On the whole, one had to read between the lines to get a sense of the newcomers in this rapidly growing city. Only then were the signs obvious. Newspapers widely reported that city services were falling behind demand, but this was depicted as the shortcoming of the municipality. For example, existing transportation services had to be improved, additional services added, and old buses repaired. New roads and avenues were being built, such as Vatan Caddesi and Bağdat Caddesi, while existing ones were being expanded mercilessly, with little regard to the historical buildings. Newspapers photographed the conditions of road construction without a single mention of the workers. They criticized the mentality that built without regard to historical sites, but not the workers.[87] In a recent interview, one migrant from Sivas, who arrived in Istanbul in 1953, was asked "how did Istanbulites treat you upon coming to Istanbul?" He replied, "Back then they admired us. Back then Istanbul needed workers. The Democratic Party was in power and Istanbul's roads were expanding. They needed laborers to build those roads. Who built their roads? People who came from Anatolia, that's who. They loved us then. They used to offer us tea and coffee on site then."[88] Along with the existing and slowly expanding industrial economy, new buildings were springing

---

[86] "Sürek Avı," in *Akbaba* 111, 6 May 1954.

[87] Sema Erder finds that "each of the groups that arrived in the city could settle without experiencing much resistance or a sense of alienation and could comfortably establish their own networks" which is important for the comparison between the existence/ activity of old settlers in Chicago and lack of it in Istanbul. Sema Erder, "Nerelisin Hemşerim?" In Çağlar Keyder, ed., Istanbul: Küresel ile Yerel Arasında (Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1999, 198 in Turkish- or Sema Erder, "Where Do You Hail From?" in Çağlar Keyder, ed., Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999), 166.

[88] Kazgan, ed., *Kuştepe Araştırması*, 122.

up; these events drove workers to Istanbul, yet little attention was being paid to them in the press. There was no fear of invasion. No provocative headlines. No militant editorials. Rather interestingly, even though migrants were flocking into the city by tens of thousands, Istanbul newspapers made no such systematic and alarming announcements of a mass movement from villages. There are only few accounts of rising unemployment.

When it came to finding work, for all of the strengths of the informal networks, newcomers could also find employment through formal means. Some found jobs through the Iş ve Işçi Bulma Kurumu (government employment agency), while others frequented the offices of newspapers in their search for jobs. In a story titled, "Looking For a Maid, a Cook, or a Nanny?" the author argued that innocent girls and women who came from various parts of Anatolia were being taken advantage of in the hands of the kapıcı, even the milkman, the butcher, etc. The kapıcı, milkman, and/or butcher charged both the girl looking for employment and the prospective employer finder's fees, and returned shortly after placing a newcomer in a gainful position to offer another, more profitable, position somewhere else. The author wanted both the employers and job seekers of this story to be informed that there was an institution which would provide the most qualified maid, cook or nanny, free of charge. All housewives had to do was to "dial 81849 or apply at the Çalışma Bakanlığı Iş Bulma Bűrosu at Beşiktaş Akaretler Street No. 54." Bahire Zaim (female), the director of the bureau, reported that those seeking employment were 80 percent middle aged women, and that the numbers of those seeking employees far exceeded the number of those seeking employment.[89] The Bureau also had a branch in Beyoğlu. There seems to have been some disparity between the skills applicants reported they were qualified for and their actual

[89] 17 October, 1952. In May 1958 numbers of those seeking employees still exceeded the numbers of those who were seeking employment. *Havadis*, 15 May, 1958.

performance of those skills, because some examinations had been instituted to properly identify the skills of applicants. The bureau placed about four to five thousand employees annually and certain establishments only hired through the Bureau.[90]

By 1954, hundreds, sometimes thousands, of newcomers waited outside some factory gates and hundreds more also applied at the Vilayet, the municipality, Çalışma Müdürlüğü, Iş ve Işçi Bulma Müdürlüğü, and the newspaper headquarters. Yet the way unemployment was framed is interesting. The increasing numbers of unemployed were seen as a threat to tourism in Istanbul.[91] *Akbaba* commented on the fact that peddlers caused tourists to run away. One cartoon depicted numerous street peddlers including newspaper, vegetable, fruit, milk, and fish peddlers. The caption of this cartoon borrowed from the title of the poem by Orhan Veli Kanık that this chapter began with: Istanbul'u Dinliyorum Gözlerim Kapalı (I am Listening to Istanbul With My Eyes Shut).[92] Istanbul's sounds had become so overtaken by peddlers and become unbearable that peddlers were running the tourists out of the city with their noise pollution.

By 1957, *Akbaba* cartoons were visually making the point that rural newcomers were loud (crying baby, snoring man), smelly (flies around their peddling goods as well as all around their shoes and bare feet), poor (they are clearly dressed in rural clothes patched in the knees and elbows), nuisances to the urban people. One woman representing the urban woman in the cartoon was in high heels and a mini skirt, fully made up and she had a

[90] *Istanbul Ekspres*, November 1952.
[91] *Son Saat*, 25 February, 1954.
[92] Cartoon title: "Istanbul'a Gelen Seyyahlar; Gürültüden Kaçıyorlar (Gazetelerden);" Caption: Istanbul'u Dinliyorum Gözlerim Kapalı, *Akbaba* 124, 29 July 1954.

scandalized look on her face as she sat between a rural couple. The hat of one of the urban man on the ferry was blown off by the scene/presence of the rural travelers.[93]

Unlike the informal networks that provided jobs for newcomers in Chicago, the government took some measures to meet unemployment in Istanbul. As a result of government involvement four years later, in 1958, the Bureau provided a series of classes (kurs) that taught twenty-nine attendees on how to improve their waiter skills. The classes provided instruction in math, service instruction, tourism, Turkish, (adabi mŭaseret) and those who passed their exams would go on to complete their internship at hotels such as the Hilton and Divan, and restaurants.[94] There were also rumors that a School of Tourism was being planned to meet the need of sheltering and training qualified personnel.[95] The Iş ve Işçi Bulma Kurumu drew on foreign officials to design its functions and activities. In a meeting of this institution those present deliberated on issues such as the protection of the deserted children, the population density in Istanbul, and the placement of those who came to Istanbul in search of employment in city jobs or sending them to other provinces that needed labor. A commission was established to continue work on such issues, and it was decided to make a wide-ranging survey.[96]

By July 1959, recognizing that rural newcomers to Istanbul were not sure of what to do about finding employment, the Employment Bureau decided to meet them at their ports of entry. The Bureau considered sending jeeps to meet newcomers at sea ports, bus stations, and the main railroad station and announcing employment opportunities through loudspeakers. Likewise bureau agents were to go to the kahvehane where the unemployed newcomers

---

[93] Cartoon: "Yalova Vapurunda Bir ada Yolcusu!" Ibid., 385, 30 July 1957.
[94] *Havadis*, 5 May, 1958.
[95] Ibid., April 1958.
[96] The roots of such attitudes can be traced back to the Ottoman elite's attitudes. Ibid., 23 February, 1958.

congregated and do the same. It is not clear if this decision was carried out, but its mere consideration tells of the official fears that the unemployed newcomers were becoming an urban problem, a threat to the image of the city.[97]

Employment opportunities for both groups of rural newcomers were restricted by the state of economic development of each city. Yet, these opportunities were also constrained by race in Chicago. In Chicago, the city of broad shoulders, African Americans from the South were paid better than they would have been in the South. Still, the jobs open to them were mainly unskilled industrial jobs or menial and domestic labor. This meant that some migrants actually took a step down the occupational ladder. Further, these jobs lacked opportunity for advancement for a very long time. In Istanbul, migrants mainly worked in construction, in small scale manufacturing and industrial establishments that were owned and run by their kinsmen, or in the informal/marginal sector. It was equally difficult for them to move up the occupational scale, but this was mainly due to economic conditions and not racial prejudice. In both settings, one could eventually improve his/her chances for employment. The possibilities for good housing, however, were quite a different matter.

---

[97] Ibid., July 1959. In the pages of *Hürriyet*, or *Istanbul Ekspres* little was mentioned on the need to instruct newcomers on industrial conditions perhaps due to the fact that there were no readily available large-scale industrial jobs for which newcomers needed instructions. Istanbul's industrial boom came around the 1960s and the early 1970s. Even after the boom though, throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the migrants' chances were being engaged in "the tertiary economic sector" at best. By then, the more recent the migrant, the more difficult it was for him to find employment. The avenues that were open to them as they waited for factory or city sanitation jobs were "hawking small items on street corners or selling peanuts and sandwiches at sports events, in transportation terminals, or in parks. See Arıtan, pp. 6-8, and 31-32. See also Tansı Şenyapılı, "A New Content in Metropolitan Areas: The Gecekondu Women" in *Women in Turkish Society* edited by Nermin Abadan-Ünat (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981) "The transition of the migrant from unorganized to organized urban work is not realized in a clear, single-step passage. Instead, the migrant draws a pendulum-like curve moving among jobs in the section of urban work space reserved for him, according to his skills, experience and social relations in hopes of landing a permanent and secure job." p. 197. Or they could be employed in construction, technical operations, trade and crafts. See Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 38-39.

Chapter 2

Settling into Place: Housing

Once set in place, urban housing patterns are difficult to alter. Homeownership provides homeowners a sense of permanency and stability in the urban setting.[1] Further, owning one's dwelling can become an investment, a financial security against the future unknown, and it can evolve into a profit-inducing venture. Housing, perhaps more than employment opportunities, determined the experiences of newcomers to cities. In both Chicago and Istanbul this was the case, and housing patterns established early on defined the struggles of both groups in their respective cities. Looking at how housing was conceptualized and how Chicago and Istanbul dealt with housing issues of the arrival of the newcomers under study here gives us an opportunity to observe the forces at play in setting those patterns. By looking at the patterns in housing, we can understand the failure and successes of governments (regulations, enforcement, and provision of decent housing). Examining the tensions over housing, moreover, helps us to trace the issues that led to newcomers' inclusion or exclusion in these two cities during their urbanization processes.

Settling into Chicago

In Chicago, the issue of housing acquired a sense of urgency and took place at the center of public debates early on, marking the players in the contest over housing to come. The urgency stemmed from periodic epidemics, easily spread by the congested living conditions of working classes in the middle of the city, which heightened questions

[1] In the U.S. the understanding that property brought stability and status was not new in the late 19th and early 20th century, but by then property in urban home ownership had evolved to symbolize respectability for all classes in society. Margaret Garb, *City of American Dreams: A History of Home Ownership and Housing Reform in Chicago, 1871-1919* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 177.

and concerns over this particular type of housing. Officials and interested parties alike quickly connected lodging house and tenement conditions to the spread of disease. Yet, municipal measures were makeshift and short-lived until the last quarter of the twentieth century.[2] From the 1870s, following the disastrous 1871 fire that nearly destroyed the city, housing investigations and passage of new municipal codes enhanced the power of the city government to monitor housing conditions. Each municipal intervention, however, brought with it opposition from varied groups concerned either about the sanctity of property ownership or access to affordable housing.[3] By then, owning one's house had become a way of augmenting household income, and working class owners viewed their residential property as long term investments, "a hedge against future uncertainties...a strategy for leaving something of value to the next generation." Inversely, residing in a tenement began to symbolize vulnerability, dependency, and a danger to public health. Increasingly, the tenement was seen as an "emblem of a wide array of social problems in the industrializing city"; and further, once disease became linked to "race or national origin of tenants," propertied Chicagoans avoided "investing

---

[2] Edith Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago, 1908-1935* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), 1, 14-15, 9, 26-29, 35-43. After many years of periodic cholera and smallpox epidemics, with Health Committees abolished when the epidemics subsided, and creating new ones when epidemics came back, finally in 1867 "the legislature authorized the creation of a Board of Health," in the name of permanence. "The creation of the Board led to an elaborate Sanitary Survey of the city, by wards, covering among other subjects the general features of the district, the grade and pavement, the drainage, the water supply, and the buildings." As can be seen, the early (1867-1877) reports of "the Board and of the health officer had to do with the outside insanitary conditions." Between 1877-1882, official *Chicago Department of Health Reports* followed.

[3] A Municipal Building Department was organized in 1875, headed by the inspector of buildings, whose duty was "to grant permits for the erection and removal of buildings and who had a staff of ten fire wardens to serve as inspectors." An elaborate building code was adopted also in 1875 "requiring the submission of plans and specifications to the superintendent of buildings, who must, in turn issue a permit before building operations could begin." This technical ordinance contained "provisions with reference to the materials of which foundations, walls, and roofs might be constructed, the thickness of walls, and required among other precautions the erection of fire escapes on dwellings of four or more stories." See Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 54-57. For more detailed opposition from homeowners to the ban on "wood frame construction within the city limits" 1872-1875, and later opposition to the 1880 Department of Health housing ordinance see Garb, *City of American Dreams*, 11-35, and 73-81.

capital in improving tenement dwellings."[4] By the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, investigations undertaken by civically-motivated citizens became the engine of efforts to improve tenement conditions and use the powers of government to do so. Groups consisting of housing reformers and settlement workers, particularly reform minded social workers and investigators who resided at the Hull House Settlement, investigated conditions, published their findings, educated the public in hopes of creating a public consciousness, and pushed for new housing legislation.[5]

When large numbers of African American newcomers entered the Chicago housing market between 1916-1919, they were caught in an unwinnable situation: property values ruled, and white racism assumed that black neighbors would devalue property. Newcomers had little choice but to locate in already crowded and dilapidated areas of the city where they paid some of the highest rents. Because landlords' prejudice kept improvements at a minimum, the dilapidated conditions worsened, as then did the prejudice that was responsible for their demise in the first place. Once located in the Black Belt, newcomers' chances of moving out into better areas became slim. This was orchestrated in large measure by real estate agents who played into homeowners' fears that having African American homeowners would depreciate the value of all the property in a given neighborhood. Aware of these circumstances, old settlers instructed newcomers in certain ways so that the community could at least dispel the notion that African Americans depreciated property values.

---

[4] Garb, *City of American Dreams*, 55-57, and 60-63; Robin L. Einhorn, *Property Rules: Political Economy in Chicago, 1833-1872* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991); and Christine Meisner Rosen, *The Limits of Power: Great Fires and the Process of City Growth in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

[5] Examples include: Robert Hunter, *Tenement Conditions in Chicago: Report by the Investigating Committee of the City Homes Association* (Chicago: City Homes Association, 1901); Series of publications on Chicago Housing Conditions conducted and published by the students and professors of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy (1908-1911); and Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago.*

The beginning

Poverty, insanitary living conditions, and disease had presented themselves as associated problems from the beginning of city growth, and increased both in their scale and their association as industry and commercial development expanded in Chicago.[6] From the cholera epidemics of 1849 and 1850, to that of 1867, which was accompanied by a smallpox outbreak, officials linked disease and contagion directly with poverty and the living conditions of the poor. An 1878 Chicago Board of Health Survey found "overcrowding," "lack of sanitation," "wretched housing" in the poor districts of the city, conditions which further deteriorated as industrial development advanced.[7] As population flow into Chicago increased, overcrowding in the poor districts became the "tenement problem." Because the majority of the tenement dwellers were immigrants, the tenement problem came to be regarded as the immigrant problem.

Following the survey of the Chicago Board of Health and others by the U.S. Immigration Commission and the U.S. Department of Labor, the city instituted some public measures intended to improve tenement conditions. Unfortunately, enhancing the powers of the city government did not always yield better tenement conditions because tenements were also privately owned. As such, private ownership entitled owners with the right to object to the city's involvement in, what owners pointed out, was private

---

[6] Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago,* 1-43.

[7] In this early period a tenement house was defined, quite vaguely, as "dwellings occupied by three or more families" and generally associated with being the center and breeding ground for disease. Tenement houses were frequently referred to as "the foci of infection" and regarded as "a great menace to the public safety and health." Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 44-46. Meanwhile the (federal) United States Immigration Commission took notice of questions related to immigration and immigrants' work, and after recognizing that conditions were bad, concluded that Chicago's tenements compared favorably to those of other cities. Chicago's tenements were not as crowded as those seen elsewhere. On the survey of the Immigration Commission see, Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 30-31.

property.[8] In the 1880s-1890s growing public interest in housing reform led to more inspections and reports that emphasized the unsanitary conditions in the dwellings, followed by recommendations for more effective legislation.[9] In their conceptualizations of the tenement problem, some concerned residents equated the tenement problem with the immigrants themselves, attacking their nationalities and foreign habits. Others pointed out that it was the poverty of immigrant wage earners, not their national origins, that was responsible for the tenement conditions.[10]

Discussions of housing conditions, whom to blame, and how to fix them, took interesting turns. As discussions centered mainly on the issues of immigrants' backgrounds and their suitability for Chicago living continued, an understanding that their wages prohibited them from doing better entered the mix. Builders and industrialists, landlords and property owners were regarded as culpable in the deterioration of property and inside and outside sanitary conditions in general. It was in these decades that George Pullman built his model company town, where he took responsibility for housing the company's workers. The Pullman town was to operate on a strictly business principle that would bring profits. Regarding housing the poor on anything other than the business creed-- even a brief mention of municipal corporations to take on the role of providing low cost housing for the industrial classes or rent

---

[8] For a more detailed account see Garb, *City of American Dreams*, 74. For example, following the 1878 Board of Health survey the city passed the first housing ordinance. According to the 1880 ordinance, owners had to remove stench-causing refuse and provide their residents with garbage containers. Owners refused to comply. Subsequently, the states passed its first tenement and factory ordinance in 1881 giving health officials the right to inspect and regulate tenement housing like they would inspect and regulate factories and requiring all new construction plans to be approved by the Health Department. This new ordinance drew objections from property owners, builders, architects, and plumbers alike.

[9] Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 52-53.

[10] Garb, 78-79; and Thomas Lee Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto: Neighborhood Deterioration and Middle-Class Reform, Chicago, 1880-1930* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 15-17. Following Pullman's example there was some movement towards building working class tenements among the prominent businessmen but nothing tangible came out of these efforts.

regulation-- was scorned for harboring socialistic sentiment, which American business rejected.[11]

As the 19th century drew to a close, attempts to define functions and powers of city departments in charge of construction and inspection procedures gave way to the efforts to improve the efficiency of these departments. Even as ordinances were being formulated, tenement conditions worsened. Property owners and landlords continued to blame the immigrants for the worsening housing conditions even as they challenged the ordinances that obviously would have solved many of these housing problems.

Shortly after the founding of Hull House in 1889, settlement house workers associated with the settlement were asked to aid the agents of the U. S. Department of Labor who were "conducting a comparative survey of slums" in four cities, a survey the findings of which became the 1894 *Slums of Great Cities*. After the publication of the findings, settlement workers further pursued their studies of tenements and published *Hull House Maps and Papers*. A group of settlement workers then founded the City Homes Association and a resident of Hull House directed the housing survey that resulted in the publication of *Tenement Conditions in Chicago* in 1902.

In this report the City Homes Association recognized that it was harder to fix what has been ruined than to take necessary precaution before housing conditions worsened. After clearly laying out the "typical" (not the worst) conditions in the tenement housing of the West Side of Chicago in tables, diagrams, photos and commentary to complement the photos, and comparing the pasts of other great cities such as London and New York with what the Association saw as the impending future of Chicago, the Association concluded that the tenement problem was on its way to becoming an evil for

[11] Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto*, 54 and 90.

the new century. Left unregulated, slum landlords would continue to build in a manner crowding the city lots, the Association warned. And as clearly seen in the examples of other American cities as well as older foreign ones, overcrowding the lots would further worsen the existing wretchedness of the sanitary conditions inside and out, leading to increased social pathology as well as increasing death rates. Even though Chicago lacked the necessary data collection to link tenement conditions directly with increasing disease and death rates (because Chicago collected such vital information by wards, and wards contained wealthier districts as well as tenement areas), the Association drew from studies conducted in other cities. Coupled with the conditions detailed in the study, drawing on other cities' statistics did indeed draw a horrific picture, and these areas were not even the worst in the city.[12] When the City Homes Association made its survey of tenements in the late 1890s, it excluded the Black Belt on the South Side on the basis that the interior conditions were the worst in the city, and therefore not "representative" of other areas in the city the Association set out to survey.[13]

For the purpose of comparison with Istanbul, it is necessary to explain briefly the contents of the City Homes Association Report, which specifically aimed to stop the spread of lot crowding, but contained more general issues as well. Authors of the report pointed out that before any steps could be taken towards betterment, the definition of a tenement, standards of cleanliness both inside and outside, regulations, and enforcement mechanisms all had to be classified and systematized.[14] Once these measures were taken,

---

[12] Hunter, *Tenement Conditions in Chicago*. See also Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 58-61 on the City Homes Association; and Martin V. Melosi, *The Sanitary City: Urban Infrastructure in America from Colonial Times to the Present* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).

[13] Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto*, 27.

[14] The rhetoric, intensions and results of Progressive Era reforms may have differed, but systematic investigation was a typical method of the era. See Maureen A. Flanagan, *America Reformed: Progressives and Progressivisms 1890s-1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore,

the report concluded, interested citizens could assist city departments when they themselves undertook investigations, and they would also be able to determine if the city officials were actually doing their job. The Association emphasized the need for preventive work (new laws on lot crowding and heights) before the overcrowding of lots became as acute as in other cities where too much money went towards the demolition of such evils. The city could accomplish this by enacting "definite laws" that would not leave the details of sanitary construction to the discretion of employees, who in a political climate, might be easily swayed. Further, city residents would benefit from forming a "single responsible body" that would unite the various responsibilities divided between various other official bodies. But none of this would have any staying power without frequent and regular inspections. Lastly, the Association ended with special emphasis on the need for small parks and gardens, making public baths places of recreation to draw larger crowds, and the importance of the Sanitary and Housing Associations (which created and maintained public sentiment to support the Health Department's efforts, provided help towards obtaining better legislation, conducted investigations and educated the public).[15] In 1902, the City Council passed a new ordinance in accord with the recommendations of the Association.[16]

---

ed., *Who Were the Progressives?* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002); Arthur S. Link and Richard L. McCormick, *Progressivism* (Arlington Heights: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1983).

[15] Hunter, *Tenement Conditions in Chicago*, 161-179. At the time the report was published, many potential landlords wielded political power, which left the city employee defenseless in the face of his power, and often led the employee to make exceptions. Also at the time construction and sanitation responsibilities were divided among the Building Department, the State Factory Inspectors, the State Board of Health, the City Board of Health, the Bureau of Streets and Alleys, and other official bodies.

[16] According to the new ordinance of 1902, which closely followed the publication of *Tenement Conditions in Chicago*, a tenement acquired a more specific definition: "any house or building or portion thereof which is intended for or designed to be occupied or leased for occupation as a home or residence of two or more families, living in separate apartments, and included all apartment houses, flat buildings, and residential hotels," reducing the original number of families from three to one. The allowance of building space on lots was reduced and further measures were taken to increase ventilation and clean air inside the buildings.

From the 1902 ordinance through the 1930s, both official statutes and citizen pressure continued to confront the housing problem. In 1908, with the establishment of Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, the city gained a permanent non-governmental housing research body. The Department of Social Investigation of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy drew professors such as Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge from Hull House.[17] The investigations they conducted collected numerical data concerning the number of rooms per apartment/house, dimensions of rooms, number of people per apartment, the amount paid in rent, and general housing conditions. The numbers compiled allowed the investigators to clearly define the problems and identify certain commonalities in the various communities.[18]

This ordinance, however, had little influence on the "old tenement" because of a general lack of enforcement. Tenements built before 1901, did not have to comply with its the provisions. As the City Homes Association had drawn attention to overcrowding of lots, the new ordinance ordered that "no new tenement house was to occupy more than 85 percent of a corner lot, nor more than 90 percent of a corner lot bounded on three sides by streets or alleys, nor more than 75 percent of the area of any other lot, provided space occupied by fire escapes not more than 4 feet wide be deemed unoccupied." Provisions were also made for space and ventilation of rooms: rooms had to have a window leading to outer air to be considered habitable. Along with increasing the air-space required for each person in rooms and apartments, insisting that there be at least one sink per floor and a toilet facility in each apartment, the new ordinance also addressed the hygiene of the premises. For more details, see Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 59-60.

[17] Towards the end of the first decade of the 20th century professors and graduate students in the University School of Civics and Philanthropy canvassed 151 city blocks house-to-house, covering 18,225 apartments of one-family dwellings in the tenement districts in every section of Chicago. As the study had initially set out to prove, the results revealed that tenement ordinances failed to be enforced. Additionally, a Board of Survey was established in 1908 "to inspect any building alleged to be a public nuisance." Numbers of sanitary inspectors and appropriations for the work were increased. For further information on the Board of Sanitation, its administration and the role of inspectors after 1908, see Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, preface, and 65-71; and Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto*, 104-107. While conducting their investigations the canvassers found many houses were built before the tenement law of 1902, but even those that were built after 1902 displayed conditions that were outlawed by the tenement law of 1902. By the time the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration published *The Tenements of Chicago: 1908-1935* in 1936, the national government had finally taken notice of the acuteness of the housing situation, and there was much talk of slum clearance. Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 9.

[18] Further, the numbers and facts allowed them to make some moral commentary concerning the danger such conditions posed to children, and their demoralizing effects on all as well as commentary on health hazards they constituted, and the barrier they posed on immigrants' adjustment to American culture. See Milton B. Hunt, "The Housing of Non-Family Groups of Men in Chicago," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 16: 2 (September, 1910); Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, "Chicago's Housing Problem: Families in Furnished Rooms," Ibid., 16: 3 (November, 1910); Breckinridge and Abbott, "Housing Conditions in Chicago, III: Back of the Yards," Ibid., 16:4 (January, 1911); Breckinridge and

"Chicago Housing Conditions, VI: The Problem of the Negro" was number six in the series of publications which resulted from the investigations. Investigators picked the largest two of the well-defined African American districts: the Black Belt on the South Side and one community on the West Side. Canvassing four blocks on the South Side and three on the West Side, the study reported that the houses occupied by the African American population in these districts consisted of, in large measure, small frame houses of one or two stories with fairly large backyards. The presence of these backyards was significant for investigators who knew that large backyards, even if covered with grass and shrubs, dirt and rubbish, afforded access to fresh air which was increasingly important for overcrowded apartments with inadequate windows and indoor ventilation.[19] Overcrowding inside apartments, especially in sleeping rooms, was caused by a few different reasons. It was sometimes due to lodgers. Housing reformers perceived the lodger issue as a moral issue that ruined family life as it invited strangers into the family home, yet lodgers were sometimes family members who had recently arrived from the South, and at times they enhanced family stability by allowing the mother to make money by staying home with her children.[20] For African American residents who paid higher rents than other groups elsewhere in Chicago, the extra income from lodgers also helped pay that rent. Other times, overcrowding was due to the fact that African Americans took pride in having five to six rooms, not all of which were used for sleeping purposes. They

---

Abbott, "Chicago Housing Conditions, IV: The West Side Revisited," Ibid., 17:1 (July, 1911); Breckinridge and Abbott, "Chicago Housing Conditions, V: South Chicago at the Gates of the Steel Mills," Ibid., 17:2 (September, 1911).

[19] Alzada P. Comstock, "Chicago Housing Conditions, VI: The Problem of the Negro," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 18:2 (September, 1912).

[20] Chicago Commission on Race Relations, *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and A Race Riot* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1922), 154-165; and James R. Grossman, *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 133.

used some rooms as kitchen, parlor, and/or dining room, which was a source of pride and status in the community. Yet, the investigation commented, some of the problems such as overcrowded sleeping rooms could have been solved with the elimination of their use other than for sleeping purposes.[21]

This investigation was the first to confirm "the general impression that the rent paid" by African American tenants was "appreciably higher than that paid by the people of any other nationality." It was also the first public and official acknowledgment that higher rents were due to the racial discrimination faced by the African American community in housing.[22] Breckinridge herself now claimed that every black man was entitled to "a decent home for his family in a respectable neighborhood" at "a reasonable rental." The housing problem of African Americans, she announced, differed from that of white immigrants. "With the Negro the housing dilemma was found to be an acute problem, not only among the poor, as in the case of the Polish, Jewish or Italian immigrant, but among the well to do."

She further denounced the unscrupulous practices of real estate agents who "register and commercialize what they suppose to be a universal race prejudice are able

[21] Reformers continually commented that it was legal to sleep in such overcrowded quarters, yet it was as unhealthy as if it were illegal. In all of the publications this group of investigators reiterated that an adult person needed about 400 cubic feet of air space and a child 200 cubic feet of fresh air for a room to be considered healthy. The building code regarding air and window requirements appear in the first study and then in all the studies that followed. Hunt, "The Housing of Non-Family Groups of Men in Chicago," 162. Another problem, the condition of toilet facilities in these dwellings, added to insanitary inside conditions and once again it was not illegal but unhealthy. Investigators found that one third of the families did not have "closets within the apartment." Residents used "yard, basement, and hall closets" which were within legal parameters since most of the buildings had been built before 1901, whereas new-law tenements were required to have "one water-closet for every apartment of more than two rooms, and one water closet for every two apartments when the apartments consisted of one or two rooms." The toilet facility requirements are first mentioned in the second publication and then frequently mentioned in the subsequent publications. Breckinridge and Abbott, "Chicago's Housing Problem: Families in Furnished Rooms," 296.

[22] Comstock, "Chicago Housing Conditions, VI: The Problem of the Negro."

to enforce one in practice."[23] Real estate agents played into the fears of property owning whites by spreading rumors that blacks were moving into the neighborhood and that soon the whole neighborhood would be taken over by black neighbors. Because white homeowners believed blacks depreciated property, realtors profited handsomely when they scared white homeowners into selling their homes for less than its market value and then sold it to African Americans for more than its market value.[24]

The truth was dilapidation and deterioration resulted from a few different sources. In the first place, the buildings that African American newcomers moved into were already old. Secondly, the sheer numbers of newcomers who were directed to and crowded the areas were responsible for some of these conditions. As Chicago's African American population increased by more than one hundred and fifty percent between 1910 and 1920, the black belt was forced to absorb many of these newcomers. Besides the factor of increasing population, tenants in such areas also faced difficulty getting the landlords to invest in the upkeep of their property. Deterioration continued through the decade and by 1922, when the Chicago Commission on Race Relations published its

---

[23] Sophonisba B. Breckinridge, "The Color Line in the Housing Problem," *Survey*, February 1, 1913 in Illinois Writers Project Box 37 Folder 4. By the time *Tenements of Chicago* was published in 1936, these originally well defined earlier areas were "seen to be very greatly expanded, and more than twice as many new Negro areas had developed." Since this last study included previously investigated areas, they were able to trace deterioration across the prewar, war and postwar periods. On the South Side they found that things had "greatly deteriorated" between the first and second canvasses and foresaw further deterioration. They came across "general evidence of neglect by the proper city departments" in the outside sanitary conditions in that streets were "poorly paved and inadequately cleaned" and the community had "small resources in the way of municipal playgrounds." Also on the outside they found "considerable amount of vacant space in the lots... sometimes with grass and shrubs growing in them, but more frequently disfigured by shacks and rubbish heaps." Along with junk-dealers' heaps, many lots housed stables. On the inside, canvassers found little effort towards repair evidenced by "broken doors and doorways, unsteady flooring... windowpanes were out, doors hanging on single hinges or entirely fallen off, and roofs rotting and leaking." It was "difficult to exaggerate the wretchedness of the housing accommodations which the poor Negroes endure in this area," they pointed out, and "inside and outside buildings compare unfavorably with those in other districts." Abbott, *The Tenements of Chicago*, 117-124.

[24] William M. Tuttle, Jr., *Race Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919* (New York: Atheneum, 1970), 168-169; and Philpott, *The Slum and The Ghetto*, 148-149.

report, *The Negro in Chicago*, "the only change in the situation was further deterioration in the physical state of the dwellings." Commissioners classified black housing into Types A through D, with A being the houses in the best condition, and D the poorest. They concluded that scattered around the districts, 5 percent of the African American population lived in Type A housing, 10 percent in Type B, 40 percent in Type C and 45 percent lived in the poorest houses.[25]

The Chicago Defender takes charge

The *Chicago Defender* writers were well aware of the difficulty in the housing situation. They recognized that for the African American community moderate rentals were almost impossible to secure in "a desirable neighborhood" both for flats and houses. "The white man of whatever caliber" had no trouble "in getting any place" providing he could pay the price, *the Defender* explained, which was "invariably from ten to twenty-five per cent less than the same accommodations offered to the colored man." Writers blamed this on those whose "flimsy excuse" was that African Americans "depreciated" property, destroyed "the plumbing," burned up "the woodwork," knocked off "the plaster," without any differentiation between the "rough, ignorant" and the better elements.[26] By being excluded from dwelling in a desirable neighborhood, the middle class and working class African Americans together were denied a good address, and the respectability that it would bring.[27]

Writers were also aware that landlords who failed to invest in the upkeep of their property were violating city ordinances and wanted to draw the community's attention to this by establishing a Complaint Department. In February 1916, the *Defender* began a

---

[25] The Chicago Commission on Race Relations, *The Negro in Chicago*, 186.
[26] "How We Live In Cities" in *The Chicago Defender*, January 8, 1916.
[27] Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto*, 148; and Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 133-135.

campaign against violations of city ordinances in housing, against tenement buildings without proper lights in the hallways, safe elevators, and fire escapes. They announced the establishment of the new department that would "have charge of the prosecution of all complaints made to the *Defender* by its readers concerning the housing and food conditions of this city." The newspaper requested the "co-operation of its readers," and encouraged them to participate by emphasizing that the paper's service would cost them nothing.[28]

In April 1916, the *Chicago Defender* began a neighborhood-level campaign. "Because you don't own the property is no reason why you should not see that the surroundings are kept in a clean, sanitary condition," it advised its readers. "If you are fortunate enough to have a yard—front or back—see that it is kept free from debris."[29] As discussed earlier, lot crowding was prevalent in the city, and having a yard was almost a privilege. As one would expect, it would be emphasized since yards and the fresh air they provided balanced the insanitary inside housing conditions. Taking a few minutes to clean the yard would mean, "so much to the health of those around and about, to say nothing of the ugly appearance a littered yard presents." The author next reminded readers that it was the city's duty to keep the streets and alleys clean. If the city did not do its job residents were encouraged to find out why. As with the creation of the Complaint

---

[28] "Chicago Defender Opens New Department," *The Chicago Defender*, Saturday, February 19, 1916.
[29] "Spring Cleaning," Ibid., April 15, 1916. Throughout this period the *Chicago Defender*, along with the Urban League and Wabash Avenue YMCA, organized other community cleaning campaigns. One example was Tin Can Day. "Tin cans here and tin cans there, tin cans everywhere; rubbish piled high, garbage strewn in every direction, with disease and vermin lurking about with a death message more serious than a Hun shell." This description on a Second Ward alley was given by a reporter who argued that it was time for the public to extend "a helping hand toward prompting a general clean-up. Sanitary heads fear that unless some immediate steps are taken in an attempt to get the public interested an epidemic may possibly sweep this city with as telling effect as the war's casualties." See "Looking down your alley," Ibid., April 20, 1918. In one instance a competition was conducted and prices offered to the children who collected the greatest number of cans. See Tuttle, *Race Riot*, 169-170; and CCRR, *The Negro in Chicago*, 194.

Department, the *Defender* wanted newcomers to understand that the city had obligations towards its residents; but if the new residents did not hold their government to its responsibilities, then improvements would not come around on their own. "As to faulty plumbing, leaks, sewer gas, etc.," the author continued, "this should not be tolerated at all. If it is, it simply means one is courting typhoid fever or some disease equally as serious."[30] The neglect of landlords was not to be tolerated if people valued their health.

Getting landlords to comply with city ordinances was easier suggested than done. Home ownership appeared to be the alternative if not the solution to suffering landlords. "Why pay rent?" one editorial asked. The newspaper recognized the hardship in becoming a homeowner in a desirable neighborhood, but advised "it should be the ambition of every man, married or single, and every woman too for the matter of that, to own a home of their own." And it was as easy as putting down "a few hundred dollars in earnest money," and the rest of it could be paid as if paying rent. "Opportunity does not knock upon the door with a sledge hammer, it taps gently, the ear must be turned to hear it," he warned. The piece ended with the advice that "it is always a safe investment, and the person with property always has a safer standing in a community."[31] As a matter of fact, a large portion of newcomers did become homeowners within the Black Belt by putting down a few hundred dollars and paying the rest in installments. Yet they did not necessarily socially benefit from it as much as they would have benefited from owning a house in a more desirable neighborhood, nor was it always a safe investment. The houses newcomers bought in this area were already old, they could not afford to spend extra for upkeep until the house was completely paid for, and sometimes taking in lodgers to make

[30] "Spring Cleaning," *The Chicago Defender*, April 15, 1916.
[31] "Why Pay Rent?" Ibid., April 30, 1916.

the installments caused overcrowding which led to further deterioration. And there were other reasons why values depreciated, some which were out of the African American newcomers' hands. Remodeling of residences for business purposes in the area depreciated neighboring property. The city's failure to protect this area from gambling houses, cabarets, saloons and other places of immoral character further devalued property.[32]

If educating newcomers could stop some of this depreciation, then the *Defender* was determined to urbanize newcomers from the South by outlining what not to do even if it meant publicly humiliating citizens who lived like they had not left the South. Writers signaled that certain sections of Chicago, "especially on the South Side," resembled "some of the back streets in southern cities." They counseled newcomers not to be too lazy to cut the grass or too stingy as to get it cut, pointing out that "on Wabash Avenue, in many blocks," the grass was so high that it resembled "early wheat fields." In this vein, the paper printed the story of "a little boy [who] was thought to have been lost. The police were called and they looked all over on the South Side for him. Finally they stumbled in the grass and there lay the boy asleep, covered by grass." Visible signs of dirt and disarray brought shame on the entire community. "Grass on the pavements, dirty curtains, and shades in many houses tell that that is where Race people live." Pressuring newcomers to take upkeep more seriously, *the Defender* even published avenue, street, and block names and numbers of offenders.[33]

---

[32] CCRR, *The Negro in Chicago*, 200-203.

[33] "On some blocks on Wabash Avenue," for instance, the Fifty-third street block was an example, "in the Thirty-second street block and further north" the way front yards and pavements looked were a shame and a disgrace. *The Chicago Defender* urged that "more care be given to homes and that they should be so clean that it cannot be pointed out that there lives members of the Race, whether it be on Armour Avenue or St. Lawrence Avenue." See "Keep Front of Your Residence Clean" in *The Chicago Defender*, July 15, 1916. In line with these warnings the *Defender* also published *Do's and Don'ts* of housing in their Lists. Some of

Editorials may have encouraged residents to become homeowners, but writers knew very well that the real estate business was a complex and troublesome matter. The newspaper believed "every citizen has a legal right to buy where he or she chooses, and wherever they elect."[34] When a committee of representatives from the Chicago Real Estate Board called for a meeting with leaders of the African American community-- Jesse Binga, Robert S. Abbott, and A. L. Jackson among them-- "to discuss the practicability of block-by-block segregation" and "asked them to persuade the black realtors to 'desist' from selling homes to their people in white neighborhoods," the black leaders refused. Binga announced that there was justice in the state of Illinois and encouraged those who were in any way affected by segregation to consult their lawyers.[35]

With the money he made in the real estate business, Jesse Binga had opened the first African American bank in Chicago. Loans to potential African American homeowners were hard to come by and attempts to obtain loans from white owned banks for the purpose of buying a house in the Black Belt especially proved futile. The Binga Bank, as it was popularly known, did provide loans, but could provide only so much.[36] As homeownership debates continued 1916-1919, Binga continued to deny that African Americans depreciated property and explained that "the value of property is taken from

---

the "don'ts" were issues taken up all along. "Don't let your property run down. Don't let it stay run down, if it's that way now. Don't fail to paint up or make your landlord do it. Don't forget to cut the grass. Don't forget to keep all trash and garbage in proper receptacles. Don't neglect washing your windows often. Don't leave the windows without screens, and also doors. Don't leave your home shut up all day. Don't hang out the windows. Don't sit around the yard and on the porch barefoot and unkempt. Don't fail to air you home every day. Don't let your curtains get black with dirt. Don't be damphool and say this is none of your business. It is." Along with "planting flowers" in their yard, "having music in the home," and "sweeping the house and scrubbing the kitchen everyday if needed" readers were urged to try to make their homes "the prettiest and most comfortable in town." See "A Few Do and Don'ts" in *The Chicago Defender,* Saturday, July 13, 1918.

[34] "Quit Real Estate Meeting In a Body," *The Chicago Defender*, April 21, 1917.

[35] Tuttle, *Race Riot*, 171-173. "Quit Real Estate Meeting In a Body," *The Chicago Defender*, April 21, 1917.

[36] Garb, *City of American Dreams*, 188-189.

the location, improvements, income, or rentals, transportation facilities, and last but not least, the mortgage or incumbrance it will carry to make it merchantable." The widespread belief that blacks depreciated property often made landlords hesitent to rent and owners refused to sell, yet landlords asked top prices and increased their profits further by spending very little in the upkeep of their property. Since housing was in such demand newcomers often accepted the conditions presented to them. Binga summed up the perpetual cycle in the following way:

> Unfortunately in not giving the better class protection, when their leases expire they move to more desirable places, and the owner or agent accepts the first applicant who comes along with the money, and is willing to take the place in the conditions they find it. The tenants who follow take no pride in protecting the property or the sanitary conditions and many times sub-rent each room for light house keeping, crowding the place beyond all limitations, with undesirable roomers. This creates unfavorable comments in the neighborhood and discrimination follows. Again unscrupulous agents call a meeting of property owners in certain localities, start a secret propaganda, with restrictions in selling and renting; then later find some of their number making profit by dealing any one who has the money to buy. When these sales are consummated this starts a controversy, and the others become disgusted, throw their property on the market for sale regardless of value, and we are receiving all benefits from their corrupt practices.

Binga believed that deterioration and depreciation would lessen if owners investigated "the character of their tenants and superintend the repairs to the property keeping it in good condition," saving millions of dollars in money and property.[37]

Outside sanitary conditions continued to make the news, but as much as the *Defender* liked to give directives to newcomers, it also wanted to report on the progress made. In the summer of 1918, it proudly reported on the success of Aldermen Anderson and Jackson in getting second ward streets repaired. "The asphalt streets in the Second Ward, principally State, Indiana and Cottage Grove Avenue, and the cross town streets

---

[37] Jesse Binga, "Weekly Talks on Real Estate: Property Values," *The Chicago Defender*, February 22, 1919.

were repaired last night by a large force of asphalt pavers, due to the vigorous efforts of Aldermen Anderson and Jackson in convincing the Commissioner of Public Works that the need of this repairing was urgent and pressing."[38] That summer, again due to aldermanic efforts, more streets were cleaned. But there was a limit to what the aldermen could achieve as their ward's appropriation for 1918 was 45 percent below the previous year. Nonetheless, Alderman Anderson "called the Commissioner's [Commissioner of Public Works, Bennett] attention to the fact that in a number of other congested wards... the department had used prisoners from the House of Correction to make a general clean-up" and suggested the same be done in the Second Ward. When the newspaper realized that the appropriation for cleaner streets and alleys had been reduced by half, it renewed its efforts to generate the residents' help in keeping alleys and streets clean. "Under the ordinances of the city landlords are required to furnish ash and garbage cans, and if they fail to do so it is only necessary to report it to the aldermen and they will see to it that such accommodations are furnished."[39] This clean-up campaign brought about cleaner alleys and streets and did get citizens to take "a greater interest in their localities," the newspaper next commented.[40]

By 1919, the *Defender* was much more aggressive in the way it instructed readers about behavior in and around housing. Identifying behavior such as sitting "in open windows and upon the steps half-clad" as having belonged "to a day that should have

---

[38] "Second Ward Streets Being Repaired: the Reason Why," *The Chicago Defender*, July 6, 1918.
[39] "Streets Cleaned," Ibid., August 3, 1918.
[40] "Aldermen Anderson and Jackson Doing Good Work," Ibid, September 14, 1918. For more information on the street cleaning efforts in the early 1910s, African American women's "Chicago Women's Street Cleaning Bureau," and broader implications of these efforts such as the idea that the "government and citizens had to work together to provide a common welfare," that "keeping the city was a public responsibility," and that a portion of ward appropriations" should be spent towards clean streets, see *Flanagan, Seeing with Their Hearts*, 102-103.

long since passed," the writer reminded that "such practices may find ready excuse upon the country cross roads of the South, but people living in large cities are intolerable of such things and mark the neighborhoods where these things are observed as plague spots." The *Defender* was very firm in its instructions, "Don't live in insanitary houses, or sleep in rooms without proper ventilation. Don't throw garbage in the back yard or alley or keep dirty front yards."[41] The more aggressive tone of the newspaper paralleled the worsening housing conditions in the South Side. Due to a halt in the new housing construction between 1917-1918, an increasing number of African American newcomers had to look for housing as lodgers. Furthermore, as James Grossman established, the housing available to migrants was already decrepit and in some cases migrants had to close off drafty rooms to reduce heating costs.[42]

In 1919, too, the *Defender* was making an equally firm point about neighborhood and community improvement and how essential these were to creating community pride. "Community pride, when evidenced in group form gives sustenance and life to the argument that we are entitled to an equal share of self-respect." Community pride also meant that migrants should "Stay out of windows." "Visiting front windows in bedroom clothes" and "discussing the issues of the day with neighbors across the street" were antithetical to the claims of being possessed of "sufficient personal pride to entitle us to domicile in a respectable community." To convince landlords that their presence did not depreciate property, readers were advised to "first present your argument in concrete form that you have an abiding respect for neighborhood and community improvements." Vindicating rights to purchase in select communities would begin by establishing that

[41] "Some Don'ts," Ibid.,, May 17, 1919.
[42] Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 135.

they could keep a respectable front yard and back porch. "Boudoir gowns, night caps and bedroom slippers were not made for street apparel, nor were they intended as the proper garments to lean out the windows to talk to friends across the street." Not only did the newspaper announce their pride "in the efforts put forth by those communities" which formed community improvement associations, but to ensure that these communities would continue to succeed, they decided that they would publish "letters of not more than 200 words dealing with How Best to Improve Our Community and pointing out the name and addresses of those who refuse to heed the request."[43]

In the next issue, the editor of the Neighborhood Improvement column announced that he had received the following from the Calumet Improvement Association:

> 33—Calumet Avenue, Chicago, Ill.—Dear Madam: Last night between 12 and 2 o'clock one of your roomers on the second floor front sat in the window and whistled incessantly for two hours. We are warning you that if it happens again the police will be called, as this is a nuisance. We also wish that you would help us to keep up the neighborhood by keeping your lawn, front and appearance of your tenants out in front in a creditable condition.

Accentuating that he had withheld the last two numbers of the offender's address, he threatened that upon a second complaint he would publish not only the full address, but also the names of the occupants.[44]

By 1919, thus, the *Defender* had taken it upon itself to act as the regulator of those who misbehaved in African American communities. The newspaper was continuously instructing newcomers on how to act in and around housing and encouraged them to keep up their property, or to force their landlords to do it.

---

[43] "Neighborhood Improvements" *The Chicago Defender,* June 7, 1919.
[44] "Neighborhood Improvements, A Noisy Bunch," Ibid., June 14, 1919.

After the 1919 racial rioting that convulsed the city, and the establishment of the Chicago Commission on Racial Justice, multiple studies detailed the dire conditions of African American housing needs. Following the Commission's 1922 Report, St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton wrote that newcomers experienced a relatively heightened sense of physical and political freedoms in the North, and "discrimination in public places is not widespread and being illegal can be fought." Yet the authors acknowledged two areas "in which the color line is tightly drawn- employment and housing... The job ceiling subordinates Negroes but does not segregate them. Restrictive covenants do both."[45] After 1919, the housing issue came to represent exclusion, segregation, increasing friction, and white hostility. Housing became a contested urban area where reformers, city officials, real estate agents, property owners, landlords, and tenants all had differing and competing interests.[46]

Even after African American newcomers had been in the city long enough to know it better, or had made enough money to move out of what was rapidly becoming the ghetto, they could not easily break through this physical boundary. Within these constraints, the older African American residents constantly worked to dispel the misconception that African Americans depreciated property values by instructing newcomers in how to take care of their property (inside and out) even if they were tenants. But the established patterns became increasingly difficult to change. African American newcomers who came to Chicago in the late 1910s and beyond struggled with the housing boundaries set by prejudice and racism for decades, just like the gecekondu

[45] Drake and Cayton, *Black* Metropolis, 111-113.
[46] Allan H. Spear, *Black Ghetto: The Making of a Negro Ghetto 1890-1920* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967); Tuttle, *Race Riot*; Philpott, *The Slum and The Ghetto*; Grossman, *Land of Hope.*

phenomenon, which proved to be a lasting institution regardless of the laws instituted, and regardless of the times structures were demolished.

Settling into Istanbul

In Istanbul, the situation, if not the need for housing, was different. Newcomers built "gecekondu" houses wherever they could: generally on the outskirts of the city, on lots owned by the government or owned privately by Istanbulites, and literally overnight. Settling on the outskirts of the city placed newcomers out of sight for a while. Because they were out of sight, they were also out of mind for the "original" Istanbulites. Moreover, these areas lacked any kind of decent, acceptable infrastructure: there were no water or sewer connections, no electricity, no gas, and the roads both leading to the settlements and inside them were merely dirt tracks. Newcomers needed certain basic services, which only the municipality could provide. As such their houses were seen as a legal issue with which only the state was able to deal. In this Istanbul differed greatly from Chicago. The municipality was directly involved in providing not only basic services but also affordable housing from the beginning.

Also in contrast to Chicago, Istanbul's older residents rarely thought about the newcomers in the early years of their arrival and settlement. Since it was the state's modernization project that brought rural newcomers to Istanbul and the state welcomed their arrival as it would facilitate rapid industrialization, both the state and original Istanbulites tolerated gecekondu conditions as a temporary measure. In the early1950s reports about migrant settlements in Istanbul appeared sporadically in newspapers. Among the few initial reports there were even some positive portrayals of the gecekondu as a very safe and organized community. When original Istanbulites turned to the state, it

was with the expectation that it would take measures to protect property owners' rights and bring an end to gecekondu construction.[47] Working with the central state, the municipality tried to enforce a series of housing laws between 1948-1960 intending to end gecekondu construction, and tried to meet the housing shortage by providing land legally on long term, low interest credit and by building low cost housing.[48] However, unable to meet the housing shortage as fast as increasing population demanded, the state ended up passing measures that provided permanency to the settlements by distributing land deeds and by bringing services to the areas.

There was some opposition to this at the time, but it was after gecekondu-the-dwelling became gecekondu-the-rental-property, a profit making venture, that opposition increased. In more than a few instances criticism targeted newcomers but for the most part it was directed more at the municipality than the newcomers themselves. Istanbul columnists and journalists mainly criticized the municipality's handling of such dwellings and its inability to meet the housing shortage. Largely because of the "illegal" nature of these settlements, but also because of the spatial distance of the settlements from original Istanbulites' everyday living quarters and because of the belief that they were only temporary settlements, Istanbul residents left the matter up to the authorities. Thus any interaction, cooperation, or form of guidance that might have happened between the two

---

[47] Even if it were the state's responsibility to deal with the new structures, Karpat reminds us that the designation of newcomers' dwellings as "gecekondu" by Istanbulites reflected some negative feelings towards them from very early on. Kemal Karpat, "The Genesis of the Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization," in *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue No. 1, Gecekondu http://www.ejts.org/document54.html Last accessed on 10/17/2007.

[48] Ruşen Keleş, *100 Soruda Türkiye'de Kentleşme, Konut, Ve Gecekondu* (Istanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1978); Metin Heper, *Gecekondu Policy in Turkey: An Evaluation With A Case Study of Rumelihisarüstü Squatter Area in Istanbul* (Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications, 1978); Semra Şenol, Istanbul Kentinde 2. Dünya Savaşından Sonra Gelişen Yasal Olmayan Konut Tipleri ve Oluşum Nedenleri Üzerine Bir Inceleme (Zeytinburnu Örneği), Unpublished MA Thesis Sumitted to Mimar Sinan Üniversitesi, 1996; Hüseyin Çelik, Türkiye'de Gecekondu Sorunu, Unpublished MA Thesis Submitted to Ankara Üniversitesi, 2000.

groups of citizens was minimized by both groups' turn to the government to resolve problems.[49]

The beginning

Following the end of World War II Istanbul's housing situation began to draw increasingly more attention. Even though Turkey did not enter the war, building activity had halted in Istanbul. By the late 1940s, population increase due in large part to rural-urban migration to major cities like Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir, made provision of affordable housing one of the biggest public issues.[50] Further in the 1950s, two issues compounded the housing shortage in Istanbul. One was the growing middle class's desire to adopt the dictates of "modern" life, which was directly tied to modern apartment building life--an ideal borrowed from the West. The second one was the Menderes government's Haussmannesque large-scale road constructions, which claimed large numbers of existing housing structures, displaced many residents and forced them to look for alternative dwellings. Already overburdened and understaffed, municipalities tried to adapt to such changes.

Municipalities' responsibilities to solve housing problems dated back to 1930 to Turkish Law Number 1580. This law provided the municipality with the power to regulate vacant lots. This power was voluntary; any municipality, if it wanted, could purchase vacant lots and resell them at low cost to those who wanted to build on them. A series of laws followed this initial law, both facilitating and encouraging construction by

[49] The municipality in turn turned to the central government, which was otherwise occupied: general improvement of the city, widening streets, etc.

[50] The Turkish phrase for this is "ucuz evler" which translated directly means "cheap houses," but they connote affordability for middle and lower middle class people. Sometimes in English usage the phrase low income housing is used. I will use "affordable dwellings" in translation here since I find it to be the closest to the meaning intended in Turkish usage.

providing cheap lots, credit, and discounted construction materials. One side effect of such laws was that each successive law pardoned gecekondus built before it took effect and outlawed the new ones that may be built afterwards. Yet considering new laws took effect annually in the last years of the 1940s, there was little room for outlawing the gecekondu. Then in 1950 a new law took away the voluntary of nature of housing provision, and *required* a municipality to provide it, placing the decisions in the hands of the City Council.[51] In the decade that followed, debates concerning the site of such dwellings, and who qualified for them kept officials and reporters busy.

The Building Market in Istanbul

A Housing Commission, made up of the governor/ mayor Gökay, Prost (architect), professors from the Technical University, members from the City Council Development Commission (Şehir Meclisi Imar Komisyonu azaları), the Municipal Development Director (Belediye Imar Müdürü), and development engineers, met in April 1950 and discussed the housing shortage situation and how to provide "the people" dwellings they could afford. "The Commission will build affordable dwellings in city districts determined by the municipality," a story in *Hürriyet* announced. "They are still debating just what type of dwelling to build on these designated plots. Some members want single story, single-family houses while others are encouraging multistory apartment buildings and arguing the benefits of apartment buildings." While the deliberations continued the majority still leaned towards building blocks of apartment buildings.[52]

---

[51] Nuray Bayraktar, "Toplumsal Değişim Sürecinde Konut ve Gecekondu Sorunu, Yasalar ve Belediyeler," *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, No. 631, (May 1998): 295-296; Ruşen Keleş, "Gecekondu Kanunu Tasarısı ve Belediyelerimiz," *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, No. 245 (March 1966): 49.
[52] "Mesken Komisyonu dün uzun bir toplantı daha yaptı," *Hürriyet*, 22 April 1950.

As deliberations on what type of building to construct continued, the public wanted to know the location of the designated lots on which the affordable dwellings would be built. The governor/ mayor told the reporters that he would not reveal the location of the sites under consideration for the imminent construction of affordable dwellings because he did not wish for there to be any speculation. He further pointed out that he was not authorized to give out that information anyway since the City Council, not the mayor, was responsible for making that decision. The only piece of information reporters could get out if him was that as soon as the Council decided the location of the construction site in a June meeting, the construction activities would commence.[53]

This was a very bureaucratic process that required guidelines before building could commence. While the project competition was still taking place, regulations that had already been drawn up waited until the City Council met next. Once the Council accepted the regulations, building activity could commence. The regulations addressed particulars such as who might be eligible for the affordable dwellings. It was agreed upon that eligibility would absolutely exclude anyone who owned a dwelling. To be eligible, one would have to have a steady income, but the income was not to exceed a certain amount. In case the head of household died while still paying the installments, it was decided that the dwelling would not be taken from the family.[54]

About two months after the Commission met in April, the City Council picked a winning project, passed the guidelines for design and eligibility requirements, and set the location. The dwellings would be built in the area between Yedikule and Silivrikapı. The

[53] "Ucuz evlerin nerelerde yapılacağı malum değil," Ibid., 8 May 1950.
[54] "Ucuz mesken proje müsabakası 29 Mayısta bitiyor," Ibid., 11 May 1950.

Council requested a development plan to be drawn up immediately.[55] Yet, these locations were on the outskirts of the city and immediately provoked dissension. With all the services the municipality would have to provide, just how affordable could the dwellings be became an important question. Furthermore, as one author pointed out, Istanbul faced the threat of becoming a "spread out city of villages" if these dwellings were constructed in the areas designated by the Council. This author further suggested charging very high taxes on vacant city lots so that those who hoarded such lots with the hope of making many more returns on such prime city property in the future would have to either sell their property or build on it.[56] So the Council had finally announced the designated sites, but debates continued, and nothing guaranteed the realization of this project.

In January 1951, about half a year after the Council had agreed to build in Yedikule and Silivrikapı, the City Council and the municipality still disagreed over the exact building sites, stalling the commencement of construction. The Council wanted the blocks to be built on empty lots within municipal limits, while the municipality, whose job was to carry out the construction process of these plans, wanted to build outside the city. The empty plots in the city were highly expensive and this would likely preclude the affordability of dwellings.[57] By February 1951, however, a final decision had been reached. *Hürriyet* announced that building activities would begin on municipal lots within the municipal budget in Üsküdar, Kısıklı, Beşiktaş, Kadıköy, and Mecidiyeköy, providing about 1,000 dwellings. Construction would be considerate of the aesthetics of the city, and some of the dwellings would be single-family units, others apartment

[55] "Şehir Mecllisinde ucuz evler projesi Kabul edildi," Ibid.,17 June 1950.
[56] Hikmet Bil, "Düşünceler: Bir Hasbıhal," Ibid., 14 September 1950.
[57] "Ucuz evler suya mı düşüyor?" Ibid., 17 January 1951.

blocks.[58] But before the public even had time to celebrate this new information, the problem of overlapping authorities intervened to further delay the project. All decisions had to be further discussed in the Vilayet Umumi Meclisi, the other local (provincial) administrative unit that had control over public works.[59] The location of the buildings had finally been resolved between the municipality and the City Council but now the project was stuck being taken to a higher council. By March, however, newspaper reported that construction would soon begin behind the Gureba Hospital and in Kadıköy.[60]

Once put in place, municipal construction progressed speedily. More good news followed. By May 1952, affordable dwellings in Üsküdar-Selamsız and Kadıköy-Koşuyolu were almost completed, with an opening ceremony scheduled for June. The municipality announced that it would build 2,500 additional dwellings in Zincirlikuyu on municipal lots, followed by 1,500 more in various areas of the city. Because the number of applicants exceeded the number of dwellings, there was a drawing to determine who could buy them.[61] In February 1953 the municipality announced its decision to build even more affordable dwellings on the Istanbul Londra Asfaltı, on the property (Baruthane arsaları on the Bakırköy-Yeşilköy axis) provided by the central government and deliver them to citizens on long-term installments. *Istanbul Ekspres* reported in February that the property had already been divided up into lots. Meanwhile, the empty Municipal lots scattered all over the city would also be used for the same purposes.[62] Gökay reminded

[58] "Ucuz evlerin inşaatına başlanıyor," Ibid., 1 February 1951.
[59] "Ucuz evlerin inşaası gene geri kalıyor," Ibid., 2 February 1951.
[60] "Ucuz ev inşaası kararı dün kati safhaya girdi," Ibid., 9 March 1951.
[61] "Atatürk Bulvarında Belediye, blok halinde apartman yaptıracak," Ibid., 20 May 1952.
[62] "Dar gelirli vatandaşların ev ihtiyacı karşılanıyor," *Istanbul Ekspres*, February 1953.

Istanbul Ekspres readers that the municipality had completed about 1,000 dwellings by February 1953, delivering its 1950 promise.[63]

By April of 1953 the municipality reported that it would soon be putting up to tender the construction rights for 150 low income, low cost houses in Rami, and 50 more in Yenibahçe. Preparations had also begun for the block apartments along the Atatürk Boulevard.[64] By July the newspaper praised and listed all the positive steps taken towards progress and improvement towards the provision of low-income housing: "The production of cement will soon be increased 4 million tons. The proposal to increase Emlak Kredi Bank's capital has been submitted and well received in the National Assembly yesterday. New brick factories have been set up."[65] News reporting an increase in cement production and new brick factories provided builders and future homeowners some relief. For a long time Turkey had been dependent on imported cement and other building materials, which had resulted in a black market of such goods. Now production of building materials at home would speed up construction and perhaps reduce prices.

Yet the municipality could not keep up with housing demand. Rural-urban migration to Istanbul did not let up. In addition to building low income housing the municipality decided to provide cheap land for construction purposes. The municipality was seeking different ways of meeting the housing shortage, and for a while provision of cheap land was seen as the best solution. *Istanbul Ekspres* reporters speculated that the government would sell these lands both to individual builders and the major bank at the time, Emlak Bankası. The central government would sign some treasury lands over to the municipality, and the municipality would then divide the lands into plots. After selling

[63] "1953, Geniş Çapta Bir inşaat yılı olacak," Ibid., 27 February 1953.
[64] Ibid., 6 April 1953. ("eksiltmeye çıkartmak" is putting up to tender)
[65] "Vatandaşı ev sahibi yapmak için müsbet çalışmalar," Ibid., July 1953.

some plots to citizens at very reasonable prices, the municipality could then sell some land to the Emlak Bankası, which would build and sell houses on a long term, low interest installment plan.[66] Scattered all over the city, these plots would accommodate thousands of dwellings. Further this being a government operation, officials would see to it that infrastructure such as roads, water and electricity systems were put in before construction began.[67] 1953 was declared "a year of building," and various building activities and improvement projects commenced around different parts of the city ranging from blocks of apartment buildings to avenues to shopping centers.

All of this activity created chaos in the building market. The municipality was not the only force in building projects. There were private builders and the public's need for dwellings left it open to being taken advantage of by swindlers. In "The nightmare of being a home owner," an Istanbulite recounted the story of how he was swindled:

> I have a small piece of property left over from my father. The neighbor's son, who was practically born into our hands (whom we have known since he was born), is an engineer. He said to us, 'let us build a villa on your property. Without the expense of the property, it won't cost anything.' We thought, well he is an honest, educated young man. We began by making installments to him. He proceeded as we made him the monthly installments. On the first installment the foundation holes were dug up. On the next installment the concrete was poured into the foundations. I began going to the site everyday. Two months passed. The neighbor's son only showed up to collect the installment. Three months. They never began building the brick walls. One day I gave it my all and like a police dog I searched high and low and finally tracked him down. He did not look too pleased to see me. I asked him, 'well why haven't the brick walls been started yet?' He answered, 'if you'd like we can begin right this minute. However, it is hard to find the quality brick that you picked. And the prices have gone up.' I was surprised and asked him 'it is summer time now. Aren't prices lower?' and he answered 'yes, normally prices would be lower in the summertime. But it rained, and so the prices have gone up. And then, you know, up until recently one would pay half the cost of things before the shipment and the rest upon delivery. Nowadays suppliers want the whole amount upfront.' So you see, I felt obliged to make another payment. Meanwhile, there was another house being built across

[66] Ibid., 20 January 1953.
[67] "Halka ucuz arsa veriliyor," Ibid., 20 January 1953

the street from our new house. Even though they had started working on that one a month after our construction began, it was moving along speedily. Before our brick walls were completed, they had closed the roof on that one. Some more time passed. Then suddenly one day the roof was placed on our house. I became a little suspicious. Then the engineer showed up and I realized I had ample reason to be suspicious. He said that he had mortgaged my house. I reminded him that we had enough money in the bank and that we did not have to borrow money from any bank to pay the rest of the cost, to which he replied, 'you are not going to get the money from the bank, I am.' As this made little sense to me I wanted to know why. He explained that he had other buildings that had to be completed. Why would my house have to be mortgaged to pay for other buildings? (Because apparently he had used other people's money to finish mine.) 'Because' he expanded, 'when your first installment was not enough to cover the cost of the building materials to proceed with your house, we used other people's money to pay for the cost of the materials used in your house.' Since this explanation made a little bit more sense, we paid him the last two installments and the money we borrowed from the bank. And that's when the disaster hit. We never saw him or the master builder again. We looked for him to no avail. We took turns staying in the house (there was a roof but no windows or anything else) to make sure no one stole the pipes and the fixtures. The other house across the street was almost completely finished. One day I stopped to ask the builder whose house it was. He said it belonged to some engineer. I remarked on how fast it had been completed, adding 'of course things proceed with speed when you have lots of money.' The builder pointed out that it was not a lot of money that sped up the process, it was trusting fools. He further explained that the said engineer had six clients and he used all of their initial payments to start his own house and then he used one client's money to start work on the other's and made them mortgage their houses when he needed more money. You can imagine the rest of this story.[68]

This satirical story addresses the emergence of the yap-satçı (construction for the market). This style of construction depended on small operations, generally of a single civil engineer, architect or a master builder (inşaat ustası). In this case the storyteller was having a single-family house built, but as a matter of fact, this sort of dwelling was decreasing in quantity as the prices of urban lots increased throughout the 1950s. Rather, a property owner would sign over his rights to the builder who would pay the property owner back in kind, with the mutually agreed-upon number of apartments in the

[68] The disaster of home ownership, by an Istanbulite, in *Akbaba* No. 34, 6 November, 1952.

apartment building constructed.[69] Not all such builders were swindlers, but swindling soon became a group activity. Stories began to multiply. For example in one story a construction company was reported as having swindled 42 citizens out of their savings;[70] in another story 40 people had invested in a questionable firm and due to rising suspicions the bank had blocked the firm's account.[71]

There had always been many hardships involved in getting a house built in Istanbul. One columnist captured the essence of the difficulty. He wrote, "to be a homeowner one has to: 1. Find a suitable plot of land, 2. Obtain a title deed from the government, 3. Get house plans drawn up 4. Obtain permission from the municipal department of technical services (Fen Işleri Müdürlüğü), 5. Wait in consumers line for cement, 6. Try to come up with more money because the engineer underestimated the cost of building materials, 7. Pay various taxes, 8. Obtain a residency permit, 9. Finally rent out the house thus built to pay up the debts incurred during construction!"[72]

To avoid continuing chaos and provide standardization, a municipal commission put together some guidelines to regulate the state of construction, development and improvement. These guidelines determined that in order for construction to be permitted, the size of the land on which it would be built had to meet the minimum standard requirement of 250 square meters. Unfortunately some people had already purchased lots smaller than the standard and to make matters worse, some of these lands were outside the municipal limits. Lands within municipal limits, having been registered in a cadastre, awaited permission from the Directorate of Development (Imar Müdürlüğü) for

---

[69] *Istanbul*, Inşaat: Yap-Satçı Konut Üretimi, p. 3957.
[70] "42 vatandaşın yuvasını yapan inşaat şirketi," *Istanbul Ekspres*, September 1954.
[71] "Halkı dolandırdığı iddia edilen bir inşaat şirketi hakkında tahkikat açıldı," Ibid., March 1955.
[72] "Mesken davası," *Hürriyet*, 8 April 1950.

construction. However, it was clear that some land both inside and outside the municipal boundaries were not suitable for construction, and some would never receive electricity and water facilities by the municipality because they were outside the municipal boundaries. So the people were advised not to buy land smaller than 250 square meters in the future and were highly encouraged to check with the municipality before purchasing any land.[73] Larger and more established building firms received this notification from the municipality very positively.[74]

Rents in Istanbul

While local officials were building "low cost housing," the question of rents became a national issue. As well as building, the national government was reforming housing practices and new laws were being proposed. While rent regulations were being discussed in the Grand National Assembly (Büyük Millet Meclisi) at the end of 1952, the press and the citizens, tenants and landlords alike, eagerly awaited some news on the matter. A front-page headline announced that section 30 of the National Defense Law (Milli Korunma Kanunu), which had given the government extensive emergency economic powers in 1940, was being brought up for changes in the Assembly's meeting along with the reports of the Budget Commission. The Commission on Budgets suggested that the restrictions on dwelling rents be lifted effective the beginning of 1954, and those of businesses in 1955. The new law would take 1939 rent rates as a base and allow a gradual increase of fifty percent on dwelling rents in the first year, and one hundred percent following that. This was expected to stir up heated debate in the

[73] "Belediye zarara uğramaması için halkı ikaz ediyor: Ikiyüz elli metre kareden küçük arsa almayınız," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 14 July 1955.
[74] "Arsa Satışları: Belediyenin ikazı büyük firmalar tarafından müspet karşılandı," Ibid., 15 July 1955.

Assembly.[75] Within a few weeks into 1953, a proposal for a new law to amend the National Defense Law was being drawn up. Once the Budget Commission finalized the proposal it would go back to the Grand National Assembly. Some penalties were being worked into the new law proposal such as a jail sentence of up to a year for those who collected or paid "hava parası," (the cash payment demanded of a renter before he takes possession, or money paid beyond what can be shown on a receipt), and charging them double the amount asked or offered.[76]

Once the proposal for the new law was finished, the Budget Commission requested that the Assembly pass it as an emergency law. But the proposal concerned the whole nation, so it came as no surprise when the Assembly turned down the Budget Commission's request. "There is no need to hurry in the matter of rents," a newspaper headline read. "In deliberations yesterday it was decided to discuss further and in more detail the issue of rent increase which concerns the whole country. The petition to speed things along was turned down."[77] The petition to pass an emergency law was turned down precisely because the matter concerned all of Turkey and not just Istanbul.

Authorities were somewhat correct to want to slow down the process and discuss matters in much more detail. Matters were much more complex than they first met the eye. There were very serious differences among the tenants and landlords themselves. Füruzan Tekil, representing Istanbul in the Grand National Assembly pointed out just such differences between property owners: that some owned one apartment, others more, yet some owned a combination of apartment and business structures, and some were

---

[75] "The Grand National Assembly will discuss the rent increase today," front page headline news in *Istanbul Ekspres*, 22 December 1952. See also "Kiralar tasarısına konulan mühim cezai hükümler," Ibid., 6 January 1953 for further details.
[76] "Kiralar tasarısına konulan mühim cezai hükümler," Ibid., 6 January 1953.
[77] "Kiralar meselesinde acele karara lüzum yok," Ibid., 13 January 1953.

newly coming into being property owners because their building or apartment was just completed.[78] These differences gave lawmakers some pause.

It caught *Akbaba* writers' attention too that the new "law" under discussion made broad generalizations by regarding all landlords as rich and all tenants as poor. *Akbaba* writers knew better. In a story titled "The landlord and the tenant" an author sketched varieties of landlords and tenants. For example, an old widow who lived in a single room with a family of four and rented out the two extra rooms in an old wooden house in an obscure part of Istanbul (Karagümrük) was also a "landlord." Or a young businessman of means who drove a sports car, who could afford a maid, expensive European vacations, etc. who rented a flat overlooking the Bosphorus on Harbiye Emlak Street was also a "tenant." The gist of the story was that lawmakers needed to take into consideration the nature of both the landlords and tenants.[79]

Enacting a law that would protect the rights of both sides was no easy task. "We have to admit that in the last 13 years of 'bickering,' rents have become a very sensitive issue for all, tenants and landlords alike. Hence it has become exceedingly difficult to please either side," Tekil, who represented Istanbul in the GNA, started her column. But she defended the possibility of making certain changes that property owners would benefit from while causing no discomfort to tenants. Drawing on the Swiss example, she suggested leaving room for some negotiation between the tenant and the landlord. "We are not out to punish the landlords or property owners," she explained. But even a country like Switzerland regulated rents. "People should be able to hold whatever property they can afford. But the government should have complete records of these and

[78] "Kira kanunu dün görüşülmeğe başlandı," Ibid., 31 January 1953.
[79] *Akbaba* No. 13 page 3, 12 June 1952.

be able to regulate as seen fit. Meanwhile," she continued "those who are still paying rents equivalent to those charged in 1939 should be accepting of some proportional increase in rents, keeping in mind that in the last 13 years prices of various goods have gone up 400 percent." Some people of means were still paying rents adjusted back in 1939. The Grand National Assembly wished to address just this type of inequalities.[80]

Tekil defended her neutrality, saying that a comparison with Switzerland would be a fitting comparison since Turkey borrowed many laws and the civil code from them and interpreted and applied them to Turkish society. "They are way ahead of us. They are also our guide in the understanding of laws and how they should work. Swiss Federal Council met February 6 to discuss prices and rent regulations. The majority of the people voted for regulations to stay in place until the end of the year." Furthermore, "the Council was also given the power to continue regulations in the next four years, and the Council explained how this was to be done." The Swiss central government regulated abundantly but with attention to detail, taking into consideration varieties in each situation, the overall economy of the nation, the rise in prices, inflation, mortgage rates, wages and salaries- making sure to look at it from all angles. Even in a "freedom loving country like Switzerland," the government had regulating powers.[81]

Tenants, for their part, collectively feared being thrown out on the street. By 1952 the gecekondu had entered the consciousness of Istanbul residents as some held the ever-changing nature of decision on rents responsible for the gecekondu. In a series of issues that seemed to be dedicated to housing problems, an *Akbaba* cartoon portrayed a family displaced by what was obviously high rent. This family was doomed to live in a

[80] "Kiralar meselesi" Füruzan Tekil, *Istanbul Ekspres*, 31 January 1953. (Çekişme is bickering).
[81] Füruzan Tekil, "Kiralar Meselesinde Bir Mukayese," Ibid., 12 February 1953.

gecekondu. Their gecekondu was portrayed as an open book, turned upside down so that it looked like a tent, titled "the new rent law."[82] Another one depicted a family of three looking at an open grave as the father of the family pointed to it and told his family that the open grave was perhaps the most comfortable place in the city since there was no threat of eviction there. Fear of eviction and the lack of the prospect of finding a new place to live drained the joy from tenants' lives, as evidenced by another cartoon of a tenant family of four. The husband reminded his wife "there are fifteen days to the bayram dear wife" to which the wife replied, in shock, "have you lost your mind? What bayram do you expect the tenant to have in this day and age?"[83] These cartoons showed that while officials decided to take more time to discuss rent measures in detail, families were suffering in anticipation. And they did not expect the measures to be in their favor. The prospect of increased rent rates appeared as a fearsome ghost, an evil apparition that scared the hat off the tenant's head.

Meanwhile the "landlord" image grew increasingly unpopular in the public mind and stories appeared about landlords without a conscience. In one story, the author, who called himself "the tenant," ran into his landlord who seemed angry about the 30 percent raise in rents. A landlord who was angry about rent increase was quite an anomaly. "What a just, equitable man you will say," the author mused, "but this is hardly the case. The landlord was angry because he would have liked an even higher raise in rents!" The landlord told the author "You are an author. Go ahead and write this in your magazine. A raise of 30 percent is hardly enough," he retorted, "a raise of 30, 50, 100, no 200 percent would not be enough. Everything else has gone up six fold. The government cannot

[82] *Akbaba* No. 10 page 7, 22 May 1952

[83] Ibid., No. 13, 12 June 1952. Bayram is used to refer to both religious and national holidays. Here it is not specified which, so it can very well be read as an unspecified festivity, but a festivity nevertheless.

control the meat, vegetable, fruit prices so they are taking it out on the landlords." The landlord asked, "do you know what I have been through to get this apartment building built?" to which the author replied,

> Of course I do. Let me tell you what you have been through. First you bought a lottery ticket. Then when you won lots of money, you sent your wife a telegram giving her the good news. Meanwhile you got very drunk. After this building came into being you wasted no time protesting tenants who did not pay their rent on time. Then you beat up the kapıcı when he did not collect the rents on time. This is what you have been through. Do you want to hear the list of things you put us through? When the coal cellar was overflowing with coal you turned the heat down and claimed there was no coal. Two occupants caught pneumonia because of you. Then you increased the amount collected for the coal and water bills. Of course 30 percent increase in rent is not enough for you. Off the record you collect much more money from us.

Shocked, the landlord pointed out that it was no wonder the writer was a tenant, that he probably could never manage his own property with that kind of thinking. The author replied "you are probably right. But then again at this rate you will never have a conscience." The author concluded with "the landlord walked away, probably wondering, what is conscience? How many stories tall is it? How much rent do they charge there?"[84]

One did not have to be poor to fear or suffer the rising rents. One well-dressed family of three was portrayed as walking up to a camping goods counter to ask for a big tent. When the sales representative asked if this was for camping purposes the man of the family replied "no, it is to be lived in." Another seemingly well-off couple was portrayed in the bedroom with the husband fast asleep and the wife unable to go to sleep thinking "goodness what a laid back man! He sleeps as though he does not know about the new

---

[84] Ibid., No. 13, 12 June 1952. Here, the landlord uses the term "çekmek" to portray his suffering (woes). Çekmek has many different meanings such as to pull and to be going through something. When placed in front of other verbs and nouns it can be used to create many more meanings such as to buy a lottery ticket as in "bilet çekmek," to send a telegram "telgraf çekmek," to get drunk "kafayı çekmek," to protest "protesto çekmek," to beat someone up "sopa çekmek," and to withdraw money "para çekmek." The author creatively uses all the variations of this term to construct the whole story around one word. It is quite difficult to translate the satire in this story in its entirety.

rent law." Yet another cartoon illustrated a family of three having walked up to a realtor, asking to purchase land. When the realtor wanted to know whether the buyer intended to build a house or an apartment building on the land, the buyer replied, "We will be building a gecekondu on it!" Family imagery, both poor and rich, served the purposes of cartoonists in their efforts to appeal to the sympathies of officials. Everyone suffered as illustrated in another cartoon which depicted a whole mixed group of tenants, well dressed and worse off alike, leaving the city with their belongings on their backs with a caption that read "migrants from an apartment building."[85]

Akbaba cartoons satirized the communal suffering in the hand of landlords across the city while the "bickering" continued on the institutional level. In the next two months the reporters continued to follow the matter closely. It was finally decided that within one month of the passage of the law, dwelling rents would increase by 100 percent (not the gradual fifty percent that would lead up to 100 percent as discussed initially) of the 1939 rents.[86] But when the proposal was accepted with a vote of 247 to 12 and 4 neutral, it was again decided that as soon as the new law was published in the Official Gazette (Resmi Gazete) tenants would have to pay an increase of fifty percent.[87]

Tenants panicked and organized a Tenants Association. The director of the Association, Hüsrev Gerede, explained their purpose was "to ensure our rights are protected within the limits of the new law and to take proper legal measures against the merciless landlords, against the possibility of landlord cruelty." The Association did not mean to break the law, Gerede explained, as a matter of fact they wanted to ensure that it was executed justly. "We are against landlords with malicious intent," the director

---

[85] Ibid., No. 13, page 7.
[86] "Mesken kiralarına yüzde yüz zam esası kabul edildi," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 18 April 1953.
[87] "Kiralar Hazirandan itibaren yüzde 50 zamla ödenecek," Ibid., May 1953.

explained, "we will explore the options of tenants within the scope of law when we have cause to believe that the said tenant is being unjustly treated."[88]

If the Association worked hard, it worked quietly because the next time it made news in this newspaper was eighteen months later. To clarify the parts of the law that caused conflicts in opinion and a lot of disputes between tenants and landlords, the Association consulted experts and had them shed light on vague points. The experts prepared a report that answered many questions (Long list of questions and answers).[89] Another two years later the Association made the news again for having submitted a report to the government that detailed how increasing rents hurt the middle class and listed suggestions on how to end it. Gerede called attention to the fact that it was no secret that the city was in the midst of a housing crisis and that the radical solution to it would be through a fundamental and long term building program like those being carried out in Europe and the United States, and by putting an official between the tenant and landlord thereby removing the kapıcı, commissioner, private agents and the landlord from the mix altogether.[90]

Deliberations on rent regulations were hardly finished. In 1955 it was decided that rents would be adjusted according to the value of the property. According to a decision reached in the City Council meeting, the annual amount of rent the property owner could then ask for could not exceed 10 percent of the property's real value. The Council was

[88] "Kiracılar Cemiyeti Resmen Teşekkül Etti," Ibid., September 1954.
[89] "Kiracılar Cemiyetinin Mütehassıslara Hazırlattığı Rapor. Kira Kanununun Tereddüde Yol Açan Noktaları Nelerdir?" Ibid., 2 March 1956.
[90] "Gayrimenkul kiraları sebepsiz yükseltiliyor," Ibid., 21 February 1958.

given the authority to adjust rent increase rates up to 25 per cent, in accordance with increase or decreases in the price of building materials.[91]

The gecekondu comes into being... and stays

While a few victims of rent law did construct gecekondus, these settlements were largely the result of rural-urban migration. Migrants, unable to afford high rents, constructed shacks initially near their jobs but then wherever they could. Even as the municipality was undertaking various steps towards helping to improve the housing situation by constructing new housing itself, or providing cheap land and credit for others to build alongside, the gecekondu was becoming more prominent in Istanbul. It seemed to be well accepted as a temporary condition even as the municipality was doing all in its power to eradicate it. The housing shortage, high rents for the available housing, frequent lapses in executing the regulations regarding illegal constructions, helping established settlements better their living conditions, and the growing population all added to the staying power of the gecekondu.

In early April of 1950 *Hürriyet* published the observations of an official visiting the Kazlıçeşme settlement who reported that people should not believe the positive descriptions of gecekondu in the newspapers. Even though the general media depicted this area as if it were a modern Swiss village, the lack of electricity and water, sidewalks

[91] "Kiralar gayrimenkulün kıymetine göre ayarlanacak," *Istanbul Ekspres*, September 1954; and "Kiralar meselesi yeniden ele alındı," Ibid., 30 March 1955. Despite any agreements, published stories seemed to indicate that the problems between tenants and landlords did not abate. For example, in one case a tenant ended up in a coma. The said tenant had gone to his landlord to discuss the rent increase and in the height of the heated debate the landlord attacked and wounded his tenants with a kitchen knife. "Ev sahibi kiracısını yaraladı," *Hürriyet*, 17 January 1955. In another case, the public prosecutor's office was notified that Serpuhi, who lived in Rumelihisarı, sent a petition claiming that the owner of the apartment where she resided and the owner's daughter together wanted to throw her out on the street, and when they could not do this, they beat her up severely and that she was put in the asylum as a result of their disagreement. "Müddeiumumilliğe yapılan mühim ihbar: Bir kiracı deli diye tımarhaneye sokulmuş," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1 July 1955.

and sewerage made him question the stories published in newspapers. "Where were the school house and the cinema these newspapers spoke of? Where were the cobblestone sidewalks, the roads paved with asphalt?" he asked. "There was not even a coffeehouse with two chairs," he remarked. "I want to ask the media: why do you make up such lies?"[92] In reality, gecekondu settlements consisted of makeshift shacks put together illegally and lacked basic amenities.

General outside conditions might have been bad and amenities lacking, but another story emphasized the safety and neighborliness of the "Gecekondular mahallesi" (Neighborhood of gecekondus) across the tracks from Kazlıçeşme. Astonished with the lack of crime in a neighborhood of 30,000 that had not a single case of crime for three years, the author argued that the area was so safe, people were so trustworthy here, that residents did not have to lock their doors or close their windows. They took care of each other's children, lent a sympathetic ear when one was needed, and helped each other take care of the sick. "Even though this area is in the hills," he continued, meaning it was considered outside of civilization, "it is so much more organized than any community in the city."[93]

It did not take too long for bad news to follow. Two weeks later, according to the complaints registered with the Province, gecekondu dwellers around the Feriköy area had begun fencing in parts of the graveyard lots to use as their own backyards. Also included in the complaints was that gecekondu dwellers did not pay due respect to the existing graves and broke the headstones; even worse, some used the headstones to build a gecekondu. Family members of those resting in the graveyard requested that the

---

[92] "Kim söyledi? Ne söyledi?" *Hürriyet*, 4 April 1950.
[93] Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel, "Haftanın Manzarası, Çinde Maçinde Değil," Ibid., 9 April 1950.

municipality put an end to this. The municipality began looking into the matter and decided gecekondu dwellers who let their children play in the graveyard and those who used headstones to build a gecekondu would be taken to court.[94]

Gecekondu dwellers moved swiftly to organize themselves into a vocal force in the city. By May of 1950 they had formed a committee and visited the governor/ mayor and "asked for municipal involvement in bringing electricity and road construction to their neighborhood." Not only did such association give them a voice in demanding schools, bus service, public utilities, street improvements, and the legal deeds, these associations linked gecekondu dwellers with political parties and the local and national governments.[95] By June the newspaper reported that a "plan for the development of the gecekondu neighborhood" was to be turned into the City Council. The Commission working on this plan had almost completed its work and had decided to suggest, "completing the roads and other incomplete construction in the area as well as supplying electricity" to the neighborhood.[96] This was simple enough because municipalities had been accorded this right to develop gecekondu neighborhoods by a 1948 law that "authorized the municipal government to develop/ improve gecekondu areas."[97]

Regrettably for the squatters, by July 1950 the Ministry of Internal Affairs sent the Province a telegram that stated they had heard rumors of new gecekondu construction activity in some parts of the city and that the Province should follow this matter closely and absolutely ensure that new construction not take place, and see to it that any new

---

[94] "Feriko mezarlığı gece kondulara bahçe mi oluyor?" *Hürriyet*, 23 April 1950.
[95] "Gecekondu sakinlerinin müracatı" Ibid., May 3, 1950. The squatter settlement residents created neighborhood organizations called ***Gecekonduyu Güzelleştirme Derneği*** (Association for the Beautification of the Squatter Settlement). See *Untidy Gender*, 13.
[96] "Gecekondu mahallesinin imarı" *Hürriyet*, June 6, 1950
[97] Danielson and Keleş, 174.

gecekondus be demolished. The Ministry was also looking into the procedure followed by the Province in the handling of the already existing gecekondu. They would soon send the Province new regulations.[98] Although it seems that demolition would have been contradictory to the 1948 law, it was nevertheless supported by 1924 and 1949 laws that authorized municipalities "to demolish dwellings built on land that belonged to persons other than the builder himself," and "to demolish buildings without construction permits" respectively.[99] The previously built gecekondu neighborhood was to be left intact and a week later the newspaper reported that "the mayor/ governor would investigate Kazlıçeşme dwellings." Three police stations were to be opened in the area, in Merkezefendi, Balıklı and Kazlıçeşme.[100]

Twelve gecekondus were demolished in early September following the municipal elections. "While investigating around the city yesterday, the municipal police force (zabıta) carried out the demolition ordinance when they came across new construction activity on the hills in the vicinity of the Hacı Hüsrev mosque located near Baruthane between Feriköy and Kasımpaşa."[101] The municipal police force continued to demolish newer illegal constructions throughout September. It was clear that residents whose gecekondus were demolished would need a place to stay. The municipality announced that it would allow some people to transfer their dwellings to a municipally designated area. "As winter is around the corner, the transportation, sewage, and electrical facilities are being examined in areas that will be designated for future gecekondu construction," one newspaper story explained. Further *Hürriyet* gave good news to the Kazlıçeşme

---

[98] "Gecekondular hakkında yeni bir emir" *Hürriyet*, July 1, 1950
[99] Danielson and Keleş, 171, 254.
[100] "Vali gecekondulara gidiyor" *Hürriyet* July 8, 1950
[101] "Dün oniki tane yeni gecekondu yıkıldı," Ibid., 5 September 1950.

settlement: they would soon get "the bakery, a police station, and street lights" they had requested.[102]

After the Kazlıçeşme gecekondu settlement reached population 35,000, it was suggested that the settlement be divided up into neighborhoods. The regulation was that when a settlement reached a population of 35,000 then it would be divided up into five administrative units.[103] Once a settlement was established and had been around for a while, it even warranted an occasional visit form the mayor/governor.[104]

Housing shortage was often used to justify the inception and the continued existence of the gecekondu so officials continued to work to build to meet that housing shortage. Meanwhile though, they also took the time to recognize and to try to improve gecekondu dwellers' troubles. For example, the growing Kağıthane settlement in Şişli, which had about 20,000 gecekondu dwellings by 1965, organized a beautification association (Şişli Gecekondularını Ihya ve Güzelleştirme Derneği) and appealed to authorities in all levels of the government. In a letter writing campaign, the association sent letters to GNA Representatives, Council of Internal Affairs, Prime Minister's office, City Council members, and the governor/mayor as well as newspapers requesting new roads, sewers, water lines, electricity, schools and doctors.[105] In another instance *Istanbul Ekspres* reported that the commission working for the solution of the gecekondu problem had just returned from Ankara having "brought the gecekondu dwellers' troubles, the difficulty of their living conditions, their wishes and desires to the president" of the

---

[102] "Yeni Gecekondular yıkılıyor," *Hürriyet*, 26 September 1950.
[103] "Dünyada 24 saat, içerde," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 2 February 1953.
[104] "The governor visited the Bakırköy and Kazlıçeşme gecekondu settlements and heard citizens' complaints." See "Dünyada 24 saat, içerde," Ibid., 26 March 1953
[105] Mahmut Kemalettin Gürlük, "Gecekondu Meselesi ve Kağıthane," *Iller Ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, No. 239, (September 1965), 469-470; Ruşen Keleş, "Gecekondu Meselesi," *Iller ve Belediyeler*, No. 147, (January 1958), 41-42.

Grand National Assembly, Refik Koraltan. Meanwhile the governor/mayor Gökay had begun his visits to Istanbul gecekondu districts. Additionally, *Istanbul Ekspres* informed, the Commission requested that the investigations on the proposal regarding "building encouragement and building without a license" be moved along quickly for deliberation in the Grand National Assembly. The president promised that the proposal would be brought into the Assembly in 15- 20 days.[106]

It may have resulted from housing shortage and high rents charged for the existing housing, but gecekondu building had to end. The Assembly deliberated the conditions of the new law. It would ensure that occupants of buildings built on other persons' property for purposes other than family occupancy would demolish such structures within six months. The municipality would step in and demolish the structure if said occupants failed to follow the requirements of the law. In the case of buildings built on other peoples' property but in use as family dwellings, if the family in the said dwelling had nowhere else to go, the family would have to officially register the dwelling and pay the owner of the property the proper fee. If a person had built more than one dwelling without a license or deed, he was required to pick one for himself and sell the other, or the others, to the municipality. In the case of demolition of a building for the purposes of the progress of the development/ improvement plans, if said building was built on someone else's property without a proper deed, then the amount spent on the building would be given to the builder and a plot of land provided in low-income housing areas, but the builder would himself carry out the demolition and remove the debris. Owners of dwellings built on grounds not permitted for settlement by the municipality

[106] "Gecekondu davası," *Istanbul Ekspres*, July 1953. The law was "bina yapımını teşvik ve izinsiz yapılan binalar hakkınadaki kanun."

would be held responsible for the transfer of such dwellings over to proper settlement areas.[107]

Once the law was published in the Resmi Gazete, it was in effect. The building encouragement law of 1953 (Law No. 6188 Bina Yapımını Teşvik Yasası) legalized any gecekondu built prior to 1953 and again prohibited further gecekondu construction, and allowed the Municipality to allot land to those who wanted to build legal dwellings.[108] New gecekondus had to be demolished immediately, but old ones were given some options. If the land on which the dwelling gecekondu was built belonged to the municipality then the owners could take up to five years to pay off the land's value and keep it. Owners of dwellings built on private property would have to reach an agreement with the owners of the land. If, in an effort to profit from the new law, a person made a false declaration then that person would be jailed three to six months, and pay a monetary fine of up to 500 lira. Henceforth the Municipal Council would carry out the demolition of units built on others' property, the cost to be transferred to the offender/s. Should a mayor or other municipal employee fail to follow the law, said persons would receive a jail sentence of 3-12 months.[109]

While the newer gecekondus were demolished, the long established settlements "awaited government help and protection." With fourteen thousand dwellings and a population of seventy thousand, Zeytinburnu was such a settlement. There was at the time one schoolhouse for ten thousand school age children. Foodstuffs were expensive

---

[107] "BM Meclisi Gecekondular Hakkında Hükmünü Verdi," Ibid., July 1953.
[108] Çelik, "Türkiyede Gecekondu Sorunu," and Şenol, "Istanbul Kentinde 2. Dünya Savaşından Sonra Gelişen Yasal Olmayan Konut Tipleri ve Oluşum Nedenleri."
[109] "Gecekondu kanunu dün meriyete girdi," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 30 July 1953.

and spoiled, and the district was fast becoming a criminal haven. "This district is clearly deprived of many things," one report began,

> At the top of the list is the lack of proper roads, schoolhouses, and police protection. The dwellers are requesting that Gökay keep his promises. There is no control, and there is very little regulation in Zeytinburnu. The Municipal Council's decision to open a bazaar on the 64th and 65th streets have not been followed thorough, forcing the residents to pay higher prices for spoiled vegetables and fruits. The health facility is even worse: there is a dispensary with two doctors, one nurse and one midwife. Since 1949, the dispensary has seen about twenty six thousand citizens. Fortunately, the dispensary works efficiently and there has been no contagious diseases. Yet the fact that there are no telephones in the area coupled with the lack of transportation makes it very difficult for the dispensary to function effectively in emergency cases.[110]

Gecekondu settlements, thus, became a site of mixed messages. Some received services, and some were demolished. Gecekondu was tolerated as an inescapable but "temporary" part of urbanization. Yet it multiplied, even while the municipality fought to eradicate it. By 1955 individual gecekondus had spread to sixty districts in the city, housing 250,000 newcomers, or approximately one fifth of the whole population of the city. Istanbul's most modern gecekondu settlement was in Kuştepe, and gecekondus continued to be built on the land provided by the government.[111] Three years later, the gecekondu was far from becoming obsolete. A new site was born: Gültepe had reportedly come into being due to absolute necessity, just like the Zeytinburnu "gecekondu sitesi." Gültepe was a settlement of twenty three thousand (23,000 out of the 49,000 families who did not have anywhere else to go), consisting of two thousand dwellings, founded by tenants whose dwellings were expropriated, and citizens whose houses were demolished. "Today, on the one hand the modern roads and avenues are being built in accordance

[110] "Zeytinburnu Himmet Bekliyor," Ibid., 1 August 1953.
[111] "Land big enough for 306 dwellings have been supplied by the government and 200 gecekondus have already been built." See "Şehir halkının beşte biri gecekondularda oturuyor," *Hürriyet*, 22 August 1955.

with the new modern architecture, while on the other hand a patchwork of settlements are taking shape outside the municipal boundaries," one story pointed out, "Gültepe is 1.5 kilometers away from Levent—somewhere between the workshops in Mecidiyeköy, Kağıthane and Eczacıbaşı. It is connected to the paved road on the Bosphorus by a rough cobblestone pavement of about 1.5 kilometers. It was supposed to be settled temporarily by those whose property or rented dwellings were expropriated during the improvement activities." The municipality had distributed among those without other means 62.5 square meter lots. Now the area was covered in two story brick buildings and single story wood shacks and it was divided into neighborhoods, the names of which reflected settlers' place of origin in Istanbul: Yıldızlılar, Aksaraylılar, Sarıgüzelliler, Fatihliler, Yenicamililer, Tophaneliler, Cerrahpaşalılar, and Sulukuleliler.[112]

The Municipal Development Directorate worked feverishly to put an end to gecekondu. They supposedly worked "around the clock" on the project to replace the gecekondu with blocks of apartment buildings. "In the next few days the number of gecekondus will be known along with who live in them and where they came from." The project would start with Zeytinburnu. The new project aimed to move people out of the gecekondu, have them construct new gecekondu on lands provided to them by the municipality, and finally move them into the apartment blocks once said blocks became available.[113]

Amidst reports that "the gecekondu problem would be eradicated from its roots," Emlak Kredi Bank announced its plans to build apartment blocks big enough to house one thousand families who were residing in gecekondu dwellings in Zeytinburnu at the

[112] "Yeni bir site doğdu," *Yeni Istanbul*, August 1958.
[113] "Gecekondular yerine blok apartmanlar," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 8 January 1958.

time.[114] The governor and mayor at the time, Mümtaz Tarhan, held a press conference and explained to the reporters that the reports on the "imminent and absolute demolition" of the gecekondus were unfounded and that instead of carrying out such drastic measures the municipality was concentrating on a much more constructive solution: building faster.[115] Meanwhile Zeytinburnu was now being provided with an additional dispensary.[116] The next plan was to buy the eight thousand square meter land on the Çırpıcı çayırı from the Vakıflar, have the Emlak Kredi Bank build 5000 apartments, empty out the 5000 gecekondu dwellings and demolish them after the residents have moved into the apartments. Then the land taken away from the gecekondu settlements would be used to build new blocks.[117]

Possibilities for good housing for newcomers in these two cities were slim in the time periods examined. African American newcomers to Chicago entered a city in which property values ruled, homeownership defined stability, security and respectability, and racial prejudice blocked newcomers' possibilities to attain those ideals. The old settlers of Chicago, on the other hand, took responsibility for the urbanization of newcomers in order to ameliorate some of the misconceptions of the homeowners in better neighborhoods so that they, and anyone else who could, would be able to have a "better address." There were things they could do to prove to others that they did not always depreciate property values, and that not all African American homeowners let their property deteriorate. Yet, there were other factors that they could not control such as real

[114] "Gecekondu derdi kökünden halledilivor," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 10 January 1958
[115] "Istanbul Belediyesi Birbuçuk ayda 45 milyon lira ödedi," Ibid., 11 January 1958
[116] "Zeytinburnunda dispenser binası hizmete giriyor," Ibid., January 1958. It is opened in February.
[117] "5 Bin dairelik blok apartman yapılacak," Ibid., 3 February 1958.

estate agents and their drive for profit, or the location of vice districts near their neighborhoods.

Rural newcomers to Istanbul, for their part, entered a city in which their means of housing was a legal problem in the public mind, the solution of which lay in the hands of city and national officials. Even though the municipality constructed new dwellings to meet the housing shortage, the demand far exceeded the supply. Building low cost housing, providing long-term, low interest credit for construction, and passing new laws did not end the problem of gecekondu. In welcoming rural migration to Istanbul, the modernization project of the national government had overreached its means to cope with urban problems, yet migration could not be reversed. Istanbulites, whose city was changing in ways they could not control, could do little but watch and wait.

Health problems that accompanied the overcrowding produced by rural migration were another matter confronting both cities. In Chicago, again old settlers would shoulder the responsibility to urbanize newcomers in Chicago, teaching, directing, cautioning, and explaining to newcomers their own role in prevention of disease. For Istanbul residents, health matters were another area over which the local and national officials presided, while Istanbulites sat on the sidelines, watching and waiting.

Chapter 3

Health

Examining the different approaches to health in Chicago and Istanbul affirms that responses to modernization varied across time and place. Citizen participation in health matters in Chicago and the government's provision of curative facilities in Istanbul reflect two very different approaches to health care needs necessitated by increases in urban populations.

In Chicago, local participation was reflected in milk quality and regulation issues, Chicago Department of Health campaigns, and the *Chicago Defender*'s columns that instructed African American migrants about how to live healthily so as to prevent disease. African Americans who migrated to Chicago in 1916-1919 entered into a city that had been largely linked together by health concerns dating back to the first half of the 19th century. Starting in the 1890s the work of settlements, medical charities, physicians and nurses bear testament to how citizens organized locally to address health problems. Such efforts had very much to do with mothers and children especially and everything to do with newcomers to the city. Citizens' local organizations, however, remained truly local, which meant that even when leaders did not specifically mean for them to be, health services, like housing, were segregated. African American community leaders, men and women, provided health services and education for newcomers from the southland. By the time rural-urban migration of African Americans had reached its height, local efforts initiated by Chicagoans had been joined by the Department of Health, and the department soon undertook an intensive educational campaign in which

they disclosed information about the existing diseases and preventive measures. In fairness to the Chicago Department of Health, the department aimed citywide education and worked with all groups—African American leaders included. *The Chicago Defender* became a conduit between health officials and newcomers. Through the columns of the *Chicago Defender*, African American community leaders did for the growing Chicago African American community what the Department of Health was trying to do for the whole city: prevent diseases for a healthier Chicago. These efforts contributed to a growing sense of community living in the city.

Turkey, at the time of rural migration into Istanbul, was trying to modernize by catching up with the latest medical advances and technologies. The Turkish state directed the health of Istanbul by opening more curative facilities, hoping the effects of these would trickle down to all residents. Rural newcomers to Istanbul in 1950-1955 entered a city in which many of the directives to address health care were driven by the central government in Ankara. With the passing of the 1930 Public Hygiene Law, the health of all Turkish citizens was placed under the care of the central government. Operating through municipalities, the central government took on the duty of ensuring preventive and curative facilities for its citizens. A Ministry of Health was founded to guide and oversee municipalities' actions.[1] Istanbul met the increasing health concerns of "the people" by opening new hospitals, increasing the number of beds, adding new wings to existing centers and opening dispensaries throughout the city. The dispensaries were strategically opened in parts where new gecekondu settlements were mushrooming. Newspapers kept Istanbulites informed about the health related developments in the city.

[1] Fahrettin Tatar, and Mehtap Tatar, *Yerel Yönetimler Ve Sağlık* (Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1998), 109-110.

When reporting to the press, rather than concentrating on real or potential diseases, officials generally emphasized numbers: numbers of new facilities, of increasing capacity and of people being helped by the expansion of health services. In this matter especially, Istanbul became a showcase for the nation's modernization efforts.

Chicago

From its incorporation as a city in 1837, Chicago had suffered severe outbreaks of diseases such as scarlet fever, smallpox, cholera, typhoid, dysentery, diphtheria, and measles that had resulted in fearful increases of deaths.[2] The Board of Health established in the early years had very limited powers such as moving boats suspected of carrying diseases, removing visitors suspected of carrying diseases, and collecting patient information from physicians. In the next two decades the powers of the Board grew as need arose to control many outbreaks. In 1860 the Board of Health was abolished due to "a financial depression, and the absence of any alarming conditions." The next year guarding public health, removing nuisances and enforcing ordinances became the charge of the Board of Police created the same year. Seven years and many disease-related deaths later, the Board of Health was reestablished. In 1876 a permanent and more soundly established Department of Health replaced the 1867 Board of Health in Chicago.[3]

The events leading up to the creation of the permanent Chicago Department of Health resemble the typical way that health was dealt with in the two centuries preceding the late 19th century, when "public health work was occupied chiefly with attempts to control the spread of smallpox and to a lesser extent yellow fever" through quarantine,

---

[2] G. Koehler, M. D., *Annals of Health and Sanitation in Chicago*, Microfiche 24/26, Chicago Public Library.
[3] Koehler, Ibid., 1469-1492.

isolation, immunization and disinfection. The efforts to control the spread of such diseases were temporary; public and private measures taken in the face of an epidemic were usually repealed and discontinued after such epidemic ended. Efforts to prevent various nuisances were limited to addressing general pollution issues. At the close of the 18th century, as nuisances became linked to smell and decay of goods, it was agreed, "municipal cleanliness was about all that was necessary to preserve public health." In light of filth theory of disease sanitarians, tried to improve environmental factors.[4] Efforts to provide municipal cleanliness continued through sanitary reforms, but starting in the 1870s the filth theory of disease gave way to germ theory of disease.

Once the scientific proof of the germ theory made it understood that germs (microbes, bacteria, bacilli) "existed in air and on all substances," and that they caused diseases,[5] knowledge of germ theory changed the course of modern attempts to prevent disease, and "the attempt to control contagion became the chief function of the health department." The environment continued to receive attention but the individual became the focus of efforts as interested parties educated the society at large in preventing the spread of disease.[6] The gradual switchover from the Board of Health to a more soundly established Department of Health paralleled the advancements in scientific knowledge of disease. As filth theory gave way to the germ theory, attempts to control contagion through methods such as disinfection, elimination of disease causes, protection of food, and developing individual immunity, informed groups tried to prevent diseases. In

---

[4] Charles V. Chapin, M. D., Sc. D, "History of State and Municipal Control of Disease," in Mazyck P. Ravenel, M. D., ed., *A Half Century of Public Health* (New York: American Public Health Association, 1921), 133-136; and Martin V. Melosi, *The Sanitary City: Urban Infrastructure in America from Colonial Times to the Present* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).
[5] Lent D. Upson, *Practice of Municipal Administration* (New York: The Century Co., 1926), 244.
[6] Chapin, M. D., Sc. D, "History of State and Municipal Control of Disease," in Mazyck P. Ravenel, M. D., ed., *A Half Century of Public Health*, 136.

addition to changing practices, the germ theory of disease began to transform "understandings" of disease. For middle and upper classes this would mean abandoning the general belief that diseases were caused by a deficiency in one's character. For immigrant and migrant groups it meant that they could no longer regard diseases as an act of an Angry God or try to cure diseases with home remedies.

Thus, acknowledgment of the germ theory, and establishment of a more permanent Department of Health, was the context into which immigrants with rural backgrounds arrived in Chicago. By the end of the 19th century, efforts to Americanize, urbanize, and modernize newcomers in health issues appeared throughout the city.[7] For example, when, due to social changes that came with urbanization, Chicago mothers stopped breastfeeding their infants and turned to cows' milk, and infant deaths soared,[8] these deaths were linked to the low-grade quality of milk in the city. Officials recognized the need to improve the milk supply by ordinances.[9] Ordinances, and regulations were passed to end milk adulteration, to bring about pasteurization and refrigerated shipment of milk, to eradicate the evil of disease carrying cows. But passing ordinances did not always translate easily into improved practices in daily life. Ordinances met opposition from providers of milk at every step. To meet this challenge, and as citizens who envisioned a healthier city that worked for everyone, women increasingly became active in promoting health issues. The history of Chicago women's engagement with municipal affairs has been well documented[10] and their efforts in regard to public health pushed the

---

[7] Lynne Curry, *Modern Mothers in the Heartland: Gender, Health, and Progress in Illinois, 1900-1930* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999), 47-48.
[8] Jacqueline H. Wolf, *Don't Kill Your Baby: Public Health and the Decline of Breastfeeding in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2001), 105-110.
[9] Koehler, *Annals of Health and Sanitation in Chicago*, 1488-1491.
[10] Maureen A. Flanagan, *Seeing With Their Hearts: Chicago Women and the Vision of the Good City, 1871-1933* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 86.

Department of Health to expand its services. Medical charities, physicians, visiting nurses and later the Department of Health turned to educating mothers in child health.

Visiting nurses (VNA) brought tents, or "portable hospitals for sick infants," to the congested neighborhoods. These portable or field hospitals took traditional medical settings into immigrant communities thereby succeeding in the intricate task of gaining immigrant mothers' trust by demystifying examinations and procedures.[11] Following the success of the visiting nurses, the Chicago Infant Welfare Association also sent nurses to immigrant neighborhoods to instruct mothers in their homes on how to properly care for their infants. Medical charities and doctors together operated free medical dispensaries. Even though the African American community received some assistance from visiting nurses, it was through segregated means. The IWS ignored African Americans altogether while the VNA sent African American nurses to African American communities and white nurses to white mothers. By 1907 the Department of Health had joined in the efforts for infant welfare through surveys, interviews, campaigns, posters, bulletins, and films. In 1913 the Department of Health opened four infant welfare stations. Together, nurses, physicians, and the Department of Health shouldered the broader responsibility of citywide disease prevention by educating the masses that their city was a single organism.[12]

Chicago Department of Health Bulletins

First circulated in 1906 as a weekly publication, the Chicago Department of Health Bulletins for the years 1916-1919 did what it advertised in the caption under the title: they privileged sanitary instruction. In each issue the Bulletin provided the names,

---

[11] Wolf, *Don't Kill Your Baby*, 105-110; Curry, *Modern Mothers*, 47-48.
[12] Wolf, *Don't Kill Your Baby*, 121-126, 102.

addresses, offenses and punishments of individuals whom sanitary inspectors caught violating sanitation requirements. Some of the offenses listed in the pages of the Bulletin included "failing to wash glass in clean water after each using," "failing to sterilize all bottles, cans, utensils, etc. daily," "failing to provide facilities for sterilization," and "failing to provide sanitary machine for filling bottles."[13] The Bulletin, furthermore, reported the numbers of diseases recorded by the city, informed readers about the causes and prevention of these recorded diseases, reminding them repeatedly that diseases were preventable; it gave advice in short "health notes;" it instructed the general public about ordinances and above all it tried to create co-operation for a healthier, safer city.

Sanitary instruction played a significant role in the efforts to make Chicago a healthier city. Health officials and publicists believed that among the options of "To relieve, to cure, to prevent" the greatest one was "to prevent."[14] They emphasized prevention further by declaring hospitals were "monuments to ignorance, carelessness and selfishness." Chicago needed hospitals and sanitariums, the Bulletin explained, "to cure and relieve sickness and disease." But sickness and disease resulted "largely from wrong living." Wrong living stemmed from "ignorance, selfishness and carelessness." Chicago had a large number of hospitals; these monuments to wrong living, and their growing numbers caused one author to question "What's the matter with our system of

---

[13] *Department of Health Bulletin*, September 16 and 30, 1916; October 21, 1916; November 4, 1916, Chicago Public Library. The caption read: "Sanitary instruction is even more important than sanitary legislation." By 1919, the Annual Report John Dill Robertson, M. D, Commissioner of Health listed the health maintenance fundamentals of the Department, the first five of which were: a clean water supply; a clean milk supply; the maintenance of an uncontaminated general air supply; economical buying, proper preparation and serving of foods; publicity and health education, etc. See John Dill Robertson, M. D., (Commissioner of Health), Report and Handbook of the Department of Health of the City of Chicago for the Years 1911 to 1918 inclusive (Chicago: 1919) Microfiche No. 1/26, Chicago Public Library. Xiii-xxxviii.

[14] *Department of Health Bulletin*, August 5, 1916, Chicago Harold Washington Public Library. Hereafter CHWPL.

education and training?"[15] The Bureau of Publicity and Education of the Chicago Health Department soon tried to right the problem that question insinuated.

The Department of Health operated on the understanding that citywide cooperation would bring about a healthier Chicago. The January 1916 issue of the *Department of Health Bulletin* opened with words from Commissioner Robertson in which he addressed the toll of the influenza epidemic that hit Chicago at the close of 1915, and urged "upon all good citizens the importance of a citywide cooperation for health." He believed that "just to the degree" Chicagoans were willing to work for community health and safety would they be "free from those disease that are amenable to sanitary administration."[16] At times when the Department could not employ more sanitary inspectors due to budgetary deficiencies, such publicity came in handy, making "appeals in the interest of community pride and welfare."[17]

Citywide cooperation could only be obtained through arduous educational campaigns. To this end, the Bureau of Publicity and Education of the Chicago Health Department was established "on the assumption that concealed information has no value." Initially, the Bureau dealt with "knowledge of how to escape sickness and live long." Recognizing that "sixty-odd nationalities" lived together in Chicago, many of whom were "ignorant of the first principles of cleanliness," and many of whom further knew "little of the structure and function of their own bodies, the importance of pure water, pure food and pure air, or the effects of dust and dirt on personal health," the Bureau educated the public through various services, namely lectures, films, addresses,

---

[15] Ibid., September 2, 1916, CHWPL.
[16] John Dill Robertson, M.D., Commissioner of Health, Ibid., January 1, 1916, CHWPL.
[17] *Report of the Commissioner's Office: Publicity and Education 1911-1918*, Microfiche 5/26, CHWPL, 265.

bulletins, posters, etc. Lectures consisted of "five hundred health talks" in 1915 delivered to over "one hundred thousand persons." Further, there were moving picture films that reached "audiences totaling over sixty thousand" in their sixty-eight showings. Volunteer physicians and laymen addressed others in "churches, clubs, schools and before other bodies." The Department also distributed about "three hundred thousand copies" of the Bulletin through their mailing list. "The weekly press service furnished material to one hundred and forty papers published in Chicago," including the *Chicago Defender*, and "printed in almost every known language," reaching an estimated "one hundred thousand" readers each week. "School teachers, school engineers, food dealers, women's clubs, ward improvement organizations and other civic bodies" also benefited from lectures and talks. Posters, maps, circulars, cards, leaflets, cartoons, diagrams, charts, blue prints and pictures were issued. The Bureau increased its cooperation with other city departments, "notably with the Police and Public Works." They further enlisted "the aid of citizen cooperators in every block" citywide. And health gram bulletins were "posted in each end of some five thousand surface and elevated cars."[18] In short, the public was bombarded with information.

Educational campaigns had to be continuously repeated. During World War I "The Chicago Public Health Association" was organized to further the public health

---

[18] *Department of Health Bulletin*, Annual Review Number, February 5, 1916, CHWPL. See also January 12, 1918 on "concealed information is of no value to anyone... So if every daily newspaper in Chicago were to carry on its front pages a daily warning as to the dangers of neglecting a slight sore throat in children, and urge that parents call the family doctor and have antitoxin administered at once, it is certain that publicity of this kind would soon produce definite results in the shape of fewer cases and fewer deaths due to diphtheria." And it was "hard to get people interested in a subject they know nothing about. This is why the educational side of public health work is of value as an aid to bring about better health conditions. For example, when the people of a community are informed as to the dangerous character of the fly; and when they are educated on this subject to the point that they understand the relation of neglected piles of stable refuse to the existing swarms of flies in their community, they become willing workers in clean up or health promotion weeks because they know the importance of fly extermination as a means of protection against some of the most dangerous disease." Ibid., May 10, 1919.

movement. The Association divided Chicago into seventeen districts along the same lines as those used by the Department of Health for medical work. To meet the "great need for arousing public interest in all matters affecting public comfort and safety..." the Association undertook field work, "as broad as the city itself" to enlist "the interest and active support of every good, loyal citizen." This project translated into a monthly meeting at a local public school in each of the seventeen districts. In each meeting the same "one paper, of an educational character on some important health subject presented by a member of the Department of Health" was read, followed by a second paper "contributed by someone selected by the members of the local association." Additionally, these meetings served as public forums, where "any citizen may discuss any subject of public interest to the community, or present any complaints relating to health or community matters and involving the public service."[19] For example, topics ranged from presentation of specific diseases such as smallpox, whooping cough, TB, to discussions of enforcement of quarantine in cases of measles, modern superstitions in medicine, the purity of Chicago's water, and the importance of education in the control of contagious disease.[20] The November Bulletin estimated that 15,000 people had attended the October meetings.[21]

Certain truths had to be widely disseminated, accepted and internalized by the community as a whole before change could be brought to life. For example, an individual's entitlement to pure air was one that the Bulletins stressed. "Every man is entitled to pure air, without which he cannot live," the Bulletin reasoned. Pure air was

[19] Ibid., July 21, 1917, CHWPL.
[20] Ibid., August 18, 1917, CHWPL. Chicago hosted the American Public Health Association's 46th Annual Sessions on Industrial Hygiene and Industrial Disease. Ibid., December 14, 1918.
[21] Ibid., November 3, 1917, CHWPL.

defined as air free from "such irritating and infectious dust as is responsible for the carrying of the germs of tuberculosis, and pneumonia; of pus germs, influenza germs, and other microbes that give us serious colds; and all the other microscopic enemies" that had to be constantly fought "both as individuals and as a community." Individuals were likewise entitled to pure water, food and sunshine,[22] but the call for clean and fresh air appeared in many forms: children deserved to play in it, adults work in it and everyone ought to live in it. Throughout the pages of the Bulletin authorities could not advise it enough in various different ways. "Ventilate persistently your home and your shop; and battle for fresh air in public buildings and cars." "Good ventilation means fewer germs-germs diluted."[23] Improper or insufficient air supply caused what were called "dirty air diseases" such as coughs, colds, bronchitis, and pneumonia.[24] There was even a Ventilation Division established in 1912 within the Bureau of Sanitation that set standards by ventilation ordinances, made sure that public theaters were "equipped with ventilation systems in compliance with the ordinance," cooperated with the engineers of the Board of Education to work out changes in public schools, and worked with the Chicago Surface Lines to ensure the provision of "suitable ventilation" in their services.[25]

Clean air and clean surroundings were directly linked to a healthier life. The Bulletin made calls for spring-cleaning as early as February and March, reminding its readers that spring was right around the corner and encouraging that everyone, including children, participate in a citywide campaign against "flies, filth and disease."[26] Beginning

---

[22] Ibid., January 8, 1916, CHWPL.
[23] ,Ibid., January 8, 1916, CHWPL.
[24] Ibid., January 15, 1916, CHWPL.
[25] Ibid., Annual Review Number, February 5, 1916, CHWPL. Coupled with the findings of the Chicago Housing Conditions Surveys this insistence on fresh air is understandable. Working class homes lacked the proper window requirements and most windows did not open to fresh air, depriving many of fresh air.
[26] Ibid., March 2, 1918, CHWPL.

the cleaning process in March would make it a "flyless summer," a summer during which babies lived and thrived. After all, swatting a fly in March would "save a million swats later on." This meant "work for all, not the few, but the many. Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the city."[27] Albeit a year later, it was also in March when complaints "concerning dirty, vacant lots, backyards, and alleys" increased. The Department took these complaints as a good sign of early "cleanacitis" setting in, and cleanacitis was one of those rare diseases that the Health Department liked to see, especially in epidemic proportions.[28] April, the Department observed, brought with it a "housecleaning fever" which the Bulletin reminded was a "very desirable disease to have" and which the Department further encouraged by holding a "Clean up Week." Chicagoans were called to pay special attention to "the winter's accumulation of ashes, rubbish, and the many kinds of cast-off material and refuse" which accumulated during the winter months, and urged to whitewash basement walls and ceilings.[29]

City Ordinances backed up the Department's efforts, and the Bulletins instructed Chicagoans about various regulations. For example: "Section 1437 of the City Ordinances" pertained to "rug beating." The Bulletin printed the Ordinance and advised everyone to keep clean, but with some cautions about how to do it: "observe the law and think before you act, lest you work injustice to those other perfectly good folks whom the ways of the big city crowd into such small spaces and close proximity. Don't tread on your neighbor's toes."[30] In another instance, the Bulletin addressed that Section 278 of the Municipal Ordinances required repair of broken windows better to prevent fire.

---

[27] Ibid., March 18, 1916, CHWPL.
[28] Ibid., March 17, 1917, CHWPL.
[29] Ibid., April 21 and 22, 1916, CHWPL.
30 Ibid., April 29, 1916, CHPL. The rug beating fever was later termed "shakeabus-rugabus-back-porchabus." This was a complication much associated with "cleanacitis." Ibid., March 17, 1917, CHWPL.

Moreover the Bulletins urged readers to live up to the Ordinance because it "will improve the looks of your house," and also keep out "bugs, mosquitoes and other crawling, flying vermin. These insects bring increased risk of sickness in the family, as well as petty annoyance." By promptly repairing a broken window one not only protected one's self and family from burglars and fires but one also spent "a few cents to buy insurance against expensive sickness, and perhaps needless death, from one of those common communicable diseases carried by flies and mosquitoes." Other examples followed, encouraging citizens to report ordinance violations by directly addressing readers individually, "Who will save the day? You will, Mr. Citizen. You will not wait for somebody else to report the case, but will do it yourself without delay."[31] Citizens were repeatedly encouraged in this fashion: "The control of communicable diseases can only be made effective when health officials know where the cases exist and how the infection is being spread," the Bulletin maintained. "The first important step is in reporting promptly to the Department of Health."[32] In this manner not only did these bulletins tell readers what to do by explaining city ordinances, but they also explain to city residents why it would be in their best interest to obey such laws.

Spreading consciousness of city living was established, thus, through persistently addressing the power of one's actions to harm or help others. After the police caught Peter Bendenak of 850 Bismarck Street in violation of scarlet fever quarantine, his name and address were used publicly to expose him and he was fined ten dollars. This man had acted "with a full knowledge of his wrongdoing." His behavior was considered criminally selfish because he knowingly endangered his fellows, and he was further branded as a

31 Ibid., May 6, 1916, CHWPL.
32 Ibid., January 5, 1918, CHWPL.

bad citizen. "Laws that are enacted for the purpose of safeguarding the public health should be rigidly enforced, not by officers of the law, but by the people themselves," the author reminded readers.[33] "The citizen who reads this is appointed a committee of one by community interest to clean your yard and neighboring lots of" ashes, tin cans, and rubbish in general.[34] The issue of clean hands; a health measure of first importance: "When so many people have to live together in one community and come into close relation in each others service and society, it is vital that each should practice extreme care in keeping clean hands."[35]

The Chicago Defender Steps In

Disease and educational campaigns did not segregate, but Chicago's health activities were largely segregated. The press service provided health information to city newspapers weekly, including the *Chicago Defender*.[36] While the Department of Health concerned itself with preventive measures, and "had shouldered a more public assignment to educate the masses as a single unit"[37] through its educational campaigns, it was *The Chicago Defender* that extended the information on diseases and their prevention and the citywide concern to the African American newcomers. In doing so, it shouldered a similar but more specific duty. It emphasized raising individual as well as community consciousness, yet it was more specific in that the community consciousness it sought to raise revolved around race. If newcomers did not observe the general public advice and regulations and contracted disease, then the precarious place of all African

---

[33] Ibid., May 13, 1916, CHWPL.
[34] Ibid., June 3, 1916, CHWPL.
[35] Ibid., August 12, 1916, CHWPL.
[36] *Report of the Commissioner's Office: Publicity and Education 1911-1918*, Microfiche 5/26, CHWPL, 265-266.
[37] Wolf, *Don't Kill Your Baby*, 102.

Americans in the city would be shaken. This was also due to the inclination of non-African American groups in the city to group all African Americans, old settlers and newcomers alike, in one category by race. But if they were instructed in city ways and educated to adopt the new scientific advances (and shed their old country misconceptions) then newcomers could concentrate on the progress of the race.

Dr. A. Wilberforce Williams, and Provident Hospital—the city's only African American Hospital-- led the effort to educate, instruct, and organize the African American community through his columns in the *Chicago Defender*.[38] Dr. Williams had a lot on his plate. From detailing the causes of diseases to giving instructions on how to prevent them, from dispelling old country customs to instilling in newcomers the discipline to seek physicians' help, from ingraining in old settlers responsibility to newcomers to teaching newcomers how to live in the city, his columns titled "Dr. Williams Talks on Preventive Measures, First Aid Remedies, Hygienics and Sanitation"

[38] Provident Hospital "opened in 1891 with twelve beds in a three story house," and it was "the first black controlled hospital in the United States and a major institution in Chicago's black community." Smith, *Sick and Tired of Being Sick and Tired*, 21-25. See also Christopher Robert Reed, *Black Chicago's First Century: Volume I, 1833-1900* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 234, and 284. Provident Hospital was located in the most densely populated African American part of the city. It had been founded "primarily for the education and training of young colored women in the science and art of nursing; and secondarily, for the purpose of giving Negro physicians an opportunity to develop their skill in training along medical and surgical lines." See Dr. A. Wilberforce Williams Talks on Preventive Measures, First Aid Remedies, Hygienics and Sanitation: "The Provident Hospital and Training School—The Importance of This Institution in Relation to the Health of the Community," *The Chicago Defender*, February 19, 1916. The medical department of Provident Hospital housed a "surgical department, a department of disease of women, department of disease of children, and a department of eye ears and throat disease." The Dispensary associated with the Provident Hospital treated "over 3,000 patients annually free of charge, except a nominal fee or the charge of their medicine" regardless of race or nationality. A nurse, and a pharmacist were present at all times. Dr. A. Wilberforce Williams Talks: "Provident Hospital Dispensary" Ibid., March 4, 1916. Even though Provident Hospital was founded primarily for the education and training of African American nurses and secondarily for the practice of African American physicians, the hospital had not started out as a segregated institution. At its inception, the hospital assembled "an interracial staff drawn from the best medical talent in the city and admitted patients of all races." But because of segregation in the hiring practices of other hospitals, even though African American nurses and physicians completed the training school or the internship program and thus qualified to practice, they did not get positions in white hospitals. By 1916 African Americans made up the majority of the nurses and staff physicians at Provident Hospital, and the percentage of white patients had dropped 25 per cent. Allan H. Spear, *Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), 98-99.

addressed all. And sometimes he addressed more than one issue at the same time. For example in January of 1916 he had influenza very much on his mind, as did the Department of Health, when the number of deaths from influenza had reached alarming rates. Williams imparted some general guidelines: "Ease work, go home, take a hot bath, remain in bed until your strength is restored, drink hot fluids, eat light meals," and "ventilate your sick chambers." Mirroring the citywide campaign for cleaner and safer air, "Ventilate!" became a recurring piece of practical advice regarding this and other diseases/ illnesses. He cautioned against home remedies, hoping to help newcomers unlearn old habits and learn some new ones. "In the first place we hope you will not try to do certain things to work off the grippe by filling your stomach full of whisky," he advised. "Do not fill yourself up with rock candy, linseed oil, glycerin, rum, or gin, nor with cod liver oil. These things upset the stomach and make your condition worse." He insisted on the importance of having a relationship with doctors, nurses, and health authorities, and emphasized that many illnesses were preventable. He continued to detail what not to do about the grippe since one's actions had the potential to hurt others: "avoid crowds" simply to avoid endangering others, "do not sneeze, hawk, and spit in the cuspidor of your home, on the floor, or on the sidewalks." Drawing readers' attention to the fact that they lived in a community in which an individual's illness might endanger others was another thread that ran through Dr. Williams' columns. He ended his column by reminding his readers that using patent medicines on the market did not cure, they actually harmed and that such medicines were not made to cure disease but made to make money.[39]

---

[39] Dr. A. Wilberforce Williams Talks on Preventive Measures, First Aid Remedies, Hygienics and Sanitation: "Two Hundred Thousand Cases of Grippe in Two Cities," *The Chicago Defender*, January

Black women were involved with the health of their community as early as the founding of Provident Hospital. "Black female professionals and community leaders formed the backbone of the black health movement and were central to the founding and maintenance of black public health projects."[40] Nurses who completed their training at Provident Hospital "took on public health work in the African American community." Educating "especially poor mothers who had recently arrived in Chicago from the rural South" Provident Hospital and local black women's organizations together "supervised an infant feeding program for new mothers and operated a well baby clinic within the Hospital Building."[41] No sick child was ever denied treatment in the Children's Department of the Dispensary or the hospital as long as there was room. A fresh air tent was provided on the roof of the hospital building. Mothers were taught how to prepare and keep fresh their babies' food. The Children's Department boasted 20,000 "bottled feedings" a year, made possible by proceedings from the Tag Day, initiated by the Woman's Auxiliary Board. The hospital also employed a "social service nurse" who visited "the worthy poor" in the vicinity of the hospital. The social service nurse brought basic goods such as food, clothing, coal, milk, and ice. Like immigrant mothers, African American mothers from the South were "taught in their homes how to care for their sick babies, and how to keep their homes in the best possible sanitary and hygienic condition."[42] Community organizing and fund raising events rested on the shoulders of

---

1916. The next week, influenza was still very much on his mind. This time he explained the disease and its causes directly and in more detail: "The real cause of the disease is the bacillus influenza," he stated. This was the primary cause but there were many "predisposing" causes such as the seasons, colds, dampness, bad house hygiene, poor ventilation, foul air, crowding, over heating, bad personal hygiene, promiscuous kissing (which was actually banned in Milwaukee at the time as a health measure). Dr. A. W. Williams, "Influenza, La Grippe," Ibid., January 8, 1916.

[40] Smith, *Sick and Tired of Being Sick and Tired*, 1.

[41] Curry, *Modern Mothers*, 35-37.

[42] Dr. A. Wilberforce Williams, "Provident Hospital Dispensary" *The Chicago Defender*, March 4, 1916.

black women as well as the contributions of the churches, and women also made cash contributions themselves. The Woman's Auxiliary Board, established in 1896 institutionalized women's role. "Female board members expanded into public health programs designed to lower high infant mortality rates and improve the health of children" such as the infant feeding program and the fresh air tents.[43] They provided some of the same basic services and met the same babies' needs, but the middle class health professionals in the African American community were also motivated by their fear "that persistently high rates of illness and death from causes regarded as largely preventable could easily be dismissed by whites as yet another sign that black mothers were somehow failing in the proper conduct of their womanly duties."[44]

Much of Dr. Williams' advice in his *Defender* columns was dedicated to detailing symptoms and preventive measures, instilling the fear of disease if such measures were not followed, and conveying the developments in laws. Tuberculosis was another health issue that Williams continuously addressed in his columns. As Sylvia Hood Washington argued a series of essays published between 1912-1933, by contemporary M.D.s and prominent African American leader W. E. B. DuBois, on the association of African Americans with the so-called "white plague" underlined the link between poverty, living conditions (caused by the large influx of African Americans to Chicago and the congested living conditions due to their inability to leave the black belt) and tuberculosis.[45] Throughout the time period under study here, Dr. Williams took it upon himself to familiarize his readers with the available facilities in the city by introducing

---

[43] Smith, *Sick and Tired of Being Sick and Tired,* 21-25.
[44] Curry, *Modern Mothers*, 35-37.
[45] Sylvia Hood Washington, *Packing Them In: An Archeology of Environmental Racism in Chicago, 1865-1954* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2005), 147-152.

them to the Oak Forest Tuberculosis Sanitarium and outlining how one would benefit from this facility.[46] He also worked to dispel the notion that African Americans were racially prone to contracting tuberculosis. He emphasized the importance of conditions over race in the contraction of this disease.[47]

The doctor had received some letters that assumed that marriage cured tuberculosis. In one case a man who might have had a touch of tuberculosis explained, "I haven't any good home surroundings; the food at my boarding place is bad, the room where I sleep is not suitable for good ventilation," and he stated that he believed if he got

---

[46] With a capacity of 3,500 to 4,000 persons, the Cook County Infirmary located in Oak Forest, was twenty-two miles from Chicago and housed the Cook County Tuberculosis Sanitarium (700 capacity). The equipment, facilities, medical staff, and nursing force were "fully competent and obtain their positions through rigid civil service examinations." The laboratories, operating rooms, and food all passed muster. Further, the institution did not discriminate or segregate but admitted all "deserving poor." The institution provided "cottages and porches for open air treatment," and even operated a public school where children were taught. Whereas the municipal tuberculosis sanitarium only admitted patients in the early stages of the disease, Oak Forest Sanitarium admitted "patients in all stages of the disease." All one had to do to get in was "make application through the county agent's office, Mr. Wilson, 213 Peoria Street, or have your physician make application for you, or you may call up the county agent's office and request that the county physician be sent to you, and he will recommend you for the Oak Forest sanitarium or the county hospital, tuberculosis department." They even paid the train fare for patients who could not otherwise afford to pay it. Patients sometimes had to wait at the Cook County Hospital until space became available at Oak Forest, or if their disease was too far advanced they were retained there. All was well except "a southern gentleman from Kentucky" had arrived recently and imposed his southern prejudices on persons of color. Dr. Williams called to the attention of this gentleman that "patients should be classified according to their disease and not according to their color or race" and reminded him that so long as he was "living off of the public money" he had the responsibility to treat patients humanely. Dr. A. W. Williams, "Oak Forest Tuberculosis Sanitarium," *The Chicago Defender*, January 29, 1916.

[47] He fleshed out this point by detailing the factors that contributed to the prevalence of tuberculosis in certain communities: personal, community and public hygiene; poor diet; overwork under unsanitary conditions; bad air; bad housing. In his closing words, he vehemently attacked the advice that non-medical people gave and encouraged readers to attend the public meetings held "at the City Club every Monday and Thursday evenings from 6:30 to 7:30 o'clock" to learn more about the nature of the disease, and the prevention of its spread. Dr. A. W. Williams, "Facts About Tuberculosis: Sex, Age," Ibid., April 1, 1916. The following week Dr. Williams approached tuberculosis from a different angle. Acknowledging first that tuberculosis was as old as civilization, the doctor remarked that "the only way to learn how to control and prevent tuberculosis is by and through and thorough campaign of education." Dr. Williams approached tuberculosis as a community problem, "a state and national problem and not an individual problem." He wanted patients to understand that tuberculosis was curable albeit through a long and tedious process that was best brought about by institutional care. He reported that the United States was spending "thousands, and millions of dollars in the building and the equipment of institutions and sanitaria for the care and treatment of tuberculosis." Over 200,000 people died annually in the United States, and 4,000 in Chicago where over 15,000 people were sick and diseased with tuberculosis in the city. As worrying as the statistics were, some misconceptions were more upsetting.

married he and his bride would occupy separate rooms but she could care for him and he would soon get well. Dr. Williams advised him to postpone the wedding indefinitely, until after cured. He detailed all the upsetting events that would likely result from such a union, leading up to the wife getting pregnant and bearing sickly children doomed to an early grave. Further, he asserted, "If you marry a young woman, knowing at the time of marriage that you are afflicted with tuberculosis, this act endangers the life of the young wife, vice versa: to that extent you have committed a crime and the courts in some states of this country so regard it and have freely granted divorce to the deceived and injured person."[48]

Dr. Williams relayed the Health Department's message and measures to his readers.[49] He followed Health Bulletins (and new findings) closely and in August he quoted the Quarterly Bulletin of the Louisiana State Board of Health in its entirety hoping that his readers would benefit from its advice. He reiterated that fresh air cost nothing. He provided the breakfast, lunch and dinner menu for general good health.[50]

Meanwhile, the new municipal tuberculosis sanitarium had become the pride of Chicago. Dr. Williams explained to his readers that the municipal sanitarium was built out of the taxes of all citizens and it operated for the public, like public schools. "It is not a charitable institution for the poor or for those who cannot afford better institutional

---

[48] Dr. A. W. Williams, "Tuberculosis and Marriage," Ibid., April 8, 1916.

[49] "The Health Department has decided to first instruct all persons of open cases of tuberculosis, that they must obey the doctor and nurse in regard to ventilation, in being careful not to cough or sneeze in the face of others, in being careful of their sputum, not to spit on the sidewalk, upon the floors and other places that are inhabited by human beings." Through dispensaries, and district nurses the Department was to furnish cups, and bags for the proper disposal of sputum, which was to be gotten rid of by burying or burning in the furnace. If such persons continued to treat their tuberculosis as a milder form of disease such as "a heavy cold," or "a bad cough" and thus endangering the lives of innocent persons, such persons were to be quarantined against their will. Dr. A. W. Williams, "Quarantining Tuberculosis: The Tuberculosis Situation in Chicago," Ibid., July15, 1916.

[50] Dr. A. W. Williams, Ibid., August 1916.

care," he cautioned. It was "an institution fine enough for the most refined, and fastidious citizens, and at the same time, it is plain enough and democratic enough for the humblest and poorest citizens of this city to feel perfectly at home," he extolled. Over two million dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent towards this institution with the capacity for 700 patients, patients who were at the early stage of tuberculosis. Dr. Williams identified its educational feature as the institution's greatest feature. Patients were taught the values of "rest, sunlight, nourishing food and fresh air," as well as the importance of the sputum cup and the napkins and how to use them properly.[51] As with all institutions the sanitarium had rules and regulations, but "there is absolutely no discrimination among the patients," Dr. Williams pointed out, all patients had to do was obey the rules. He then explained the rules to his readers.[52]

---

[51] Dr. A. W. Williams, Ibid., September 2, 1916.

[52] By cooperating with the institution's authorities patients would be assisted. Getting in was competitive as there was a waiting list of over a hundred. And there were rules to make it to the waiting list: As this institution aimed to take patients and restore them to health, "Disease must not be advanced." The doctor detailed the procedure to be followed: "Apply first to a municipal tuberculosis dispensary in your district, go to the dispensary. Be seen by a nurse and a physician. If you are a suitable case they will make an appointment for you. The application will be placed on file, if accepted or approved, on the waiting list and as soon as there is an opening you will be notified by letter or card through the general office." (Never mind that with a waiting list that long, a person might have advanced tuberculosis by the time it was decided that they were a suitable case. They might be placed within two- eight weeks he said in one of the earlier TB stories.) The law further required that the dispensary have "three afternoon temperatures" of the applicant before an application could be filed. Applying directly to the municipal tuberculosis would save time because "if you make an appointment through your alderman or the board of health, you will be referred to your nearest Municipal Tuberculosis Dispensary for examination and the filing of your application." It was of paramount to apply early, because bedridden cases were sent to the tuberculosis ward at the County Hospital. The column also provided the names, locations, open addresses, and appointment days and times for the dispensaries. Dr. A. W. Williams, Ibid., September 2, 1916. Patients did not have to go South or West for the cure of tuberculosis; the taxpayers of Chicago were spending "nearly one million dollars yearly for the prevention and cure of tuberculosis." But patients had to "go to the family physician or to one of the city tuberculosis dispensaries and insist on an early and complete examination in order to determine the condition" of their lungs; it was their duty. Dr. Williams provided a list of symptoms to look out for ranging from frequent colds, prolonged cough, afternoon fevers, weight loss, shortness of breath, side or shoulder pain, bleeding from the lungs to stopping of menstruation, nervousness, feeling tired and worn out, disturbed sleep, night sweats, and loss of interest in one's work. Any three symptoms listed imbued one with the duty to take one's self to an exam by a physician. Dr. A. W. Williams, Ibid., January-February 1917.

In January 26, 1918 it became mandatory for physicians to report "every case or suspicious case of pulmonary tuberculosis." Tuberculosis had been declared a reportable disease in 1908 by city ordinance, but it was in1917 the State Department extended that responsibility to "parents, householders, and attendants" making it punishable by a fine of up to "$200 for each offense, or imprisonment in the county jail, or both fine and imprisonment." The *Defender* fully endorsed the law and wished that it had been passed twenty years earlier because a lot of patients and family members of patients had evaded reporting themselves or their loved ones, helping spread the disease. Dr. Williams told the story of one mother whose son was in the second stage of tuberculosis. At the end of the examination, the mother requested that officials not tell him that he had tuberculosis. "Just tell him it is just a little bronchial affection or a deep cold. I fear it will frighten him to know his true condition." The doctor scowled,

> This fear is groundless, fallacious and misleading. In order that people may make a fight against tuberculosis, they must know their true condition by a true diagnosis after a careful examination by a competent physician, for the good of the public. And in order that the public may be thoroughly conversant with the rules of the Department of Health, we are going to quote almost in total that part of rules of the reports to be made, instructions to be given, inspection to be enforced, open cases and precautions. We beseech our readers to carefully read and note these rules, to preserve them, and do not blame your family physician for obeying the regulations of the State Department of Health and that of our city.[53]

Dr. Williams' campaign to educate paid increasing attention to dispelling misconceptions, so much so that it became the sole content of some of his columns. "Mrs. S. L. claims that she can cure and has cured the worst cases of pneumonia with an old remedy used before the civil war by her grandmother in the treatment of pneumonia. Her

---

[53] Dr. A. W. Williams, "Rules of the Illinois State Department of Health For Control of Tuberculosis," Ibid., January 26, 1918; and "The Fight Against Tuberculosis- Rules Formulated by the State Department of Health," Ibid., February 2, 1918.

remedy is known as Hog Hoof Tea. She advises that you go to the Stock Yards and gather up hog hoofs; boil these hoofs for several hours, making a thick, soupy-like tea and drink it." What bothered the doctor the most in this case seems to have been the fact that Mrs. S. L. also claimed that it was "not necessary to be very particular about washing and scraping the hog hoofs," that she advised there was "more substance in the hoofs in their natural state." He highlighted that he had twenty-two years of experience, and stated that he was at a loss "to know where the Colored people find and learn of these foolish, nonsensical remedies for various diseases named." Examples of home remedies abounded. One lady "insisted on going to the Union Stock Yards, into the sheep pens there to get sheep ninny for the purposes of sheep ninny tea to cure a child of measles." "Mrs. J. S. T. recently from the South claims that she can break up any fever, cure pneumonia, la grippe, and bronchitis with plenty of boneset tea and the application of antiphlogistine to the affected chest. These remedies may ease the mind, satisfy the uneducated and often the nervous, sick individual but they have no curative qualities, for the reason pneumonia is a germ disease." Since Dr. Williams was a firm believer in prevention he next gave a detailed account of how to prevent pneumonia. Again he emphasized "good hygiene, sleep and rest, proper bathing and good ventilation," and reiterated the moral of the story in the end "The moral is: see your doctor first and do not follow the instructions of your ignorant friends."[54]

[54] Dr. A. W. Williams, "Hog Hoof Tea- Boneset Tea," Ibid., January 27, 1917. As if answering the question he posed back in January about "where the Colored people find and learn of these foolish, nonsensical remedies for various diseases" the doctor identified that "many of our new neighbors have come from the rural districts where there was a scarcity of doctors and often where there was no supervision by a health commissioner or board of health and where they have been compelled to be their own doctor or medical adviser. In many of those Southern districts often old grannies and experienced nurses have acted as chief medical adviser in cases of sickness, and the calling in of the real doctor has been put off until the very last moment after all home remedies and all foolish and ignorant advice have been exhausted, the medical man

Although he had alluded to it before in passing, in February 1917 Dr. Williams placed the duty of protecting, aiding, and educating the newcomers on the shoulders of old settlers by telling alarming stories, which signaled the need to do so. In one story Dr. Williams reported on a conversation that he had witnessed on a streetcar between two gentlemen. One of the gentlemen was a German, newly arrived in Chicago, the other a white gentleman of Chicago who proclaimed that he knew a great deal "about the health and other conditions of the Negroes." The newly arrived gentleman reportedly remarked on the scarcity of African Americans in the city to which the white gentleman replied "there were from 75,000 to 100,000 Negroes in Chicago; that they were coming into this city in great carloads everyday... but the Negroes are a weak sickly race of people and die as fast as they come into large cities... that all Negroes die of consumption—that they were a tuberculous race." The doctor commented that this was a "lie manufactured, published and circulated by the prejudiced American white men for the purpose of injuring the economic, insurable and social conditions of the Colored man in this country." To prove his point he turned to Army and Navy Reports that stated the sick and death rates of black regiments compared favorably with those of the best regiments. He also drew on a Chicago Report, and further elaborated that "there was an alarming increase of tuberculosis among the working classes of the white people; there were consumptives in the advanced stage all around and above some of them cooking, some making salads in first class hotels; others handling and dishing up food in the best hotels and restaurants in the Loop." Ending with the realization that very few white men recommended "that the Negro go to the new municipal tuberculosis sanitarium," that they

---

being called in for the purpose, often, of just writing the death certificate so as to avoid any difficulty with the undertaker." Dr. A. W. Williams, "The Newcomers Self Medication," Ibid., September 22, 1917.

more often recommended "to the poor Colored person the advantages to be had at Oak Forest—the poor house—" without regard to patient's stage of tuberculosis, Dr. Williams pointed out the duty before the African American community in Chicago to organize and help newcomers. "There are many new people coming to Chicago from the South and the Southwest sections of this country, and these people do not know how to live in this climate. They should be looked after and they should be taught how to take care of themselves until they become thoroughly acclimated." The "more fortunate, the better informed" owed the "less fortunate, less informed" that much. "We should try to teach, protect and guide the new people of the Colored Race coming to Chicago and aid and assist them in improving their economic, educational, and health conditions."[55]

In the context of such racism, Dr. Williams addressed the need to look out for the well being of the whole community with more regularity. "Many people, especially those who have come recently to Chicago- namely our foreigners from the old country and the Colored people from their old country (the Southland), strenuously object to having diseases [scarlet-fever, measles, German measles, small pox and chickenpox] reported and signs placed upon their homes, and to the quarantining of their children who are infected" the doctor informed. This threatened the well being of whole schools full of

[55] Dr. A. W. Williams, "Weak, Sickly and Short Lived Race," Ibid., February 10, 1917. With increasing frequency Dr. Williams addressed the need of individuals to take responsibility in their ailments and seeing the doctor early on. Many people harbored a false viewpoint of disease; they regarded sickness and disease as "a curse of a higher power." However, he reminded them that people were responsible for their ailments. He advised following physicians' advice. The doctor pointed out that sometimes when patients got better they concluded that their doctor did not know what he was talking about. This, he argued, stemmed from not completely understanding diagnosis. For example consumption caught at an early stage had a good chance of recovery with rest, fresh air and good nutrition than consumption caught at a later stage. A woman diagnosed of tuberculosis followed her doctor's advice and got better, but claimed that the doctor's diagnosis was wrong because she did not die. Too, diseases differed from individual to individual. Dr. Williams used the example of two patients diagnosed of appendicitis. The first did not take the advice of the physician but got better after a prolonged illness. His friend shortly after diagnosed of the same took his lead but died. Dr. A. W. Williams, "False viewpoint of disease," Ibid., February 24, 1917.

children.[56] Alarmed about an exanthemata epidemic (measles, scarlet fever, smallpox) Dr. Williams urged the public to cooperate with health authorities: "It is for your benefit, your protection to report cases not hide them." He urged for parents to make it their duty to acquaint themselves with the symptoms, to further make it their duty to call a physician and quarantine children until the Department of Health said it was ok to let them out. "If you are not able to pay a doctor, the Health Department or the County agent will send you a doctor without any charges," the doctor instructed, "or there is a general free medical clinic given everyday at Provident Hospital Dispensary."[57]

Continuing with his mission to prevent diseases before they became a problem, Dr. Williams also worked to dispel medical misconceptions: "Cold weather, rainy weather, damp weather are very negligible contributing factors to cold if the system is up to par," he clarified. "Colds are not contracted or carried by exposure to cold, damp weather, the chilling of the body, wet feet, drafts, open windows or good ventilation."[58]

When the Mississippi Valley Tuberculosis Conference for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis was to meet in late 1917, Dr. Williams used this meeting as another educational opportunity to stress the role of rural migration in urban health issue. The Mississippi Valley Conference contained Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Kentucky, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. "This conference is of

---

[56] In one example, one mother of seven children, from Alabama, four of which contracted measles and the mother treated them "after the fashion often followed in the South and in the rural districts." The four children got better, and were sent to school but a fifth child then contracted the disease. The mother then used boneset tea, sheep ninny tea, life everlasting tea, hog hoof tea, goose grease; she rubbed the child's body with kerosene oil but when the child resisted her home remedies, she called a doctor. By then the child's measles had been complicated with pneumonia. Dr. A. W. Williams, "Infectious Diseases," *The Chicago Defender*, March 17, 1917. *Department of Health Bulletin*, October 12, 1918, Chicago Public Library. This was punishable by a fine. And according to the Health Bulletins, "a quarantine sign on" one's home meant that "as a right thinking citizen you are doing your share to help prevent the spread of disease."

[57] Dr. A. W. Williams, *The Chicago Defender*, March 24, 1917.

[58] Dr. A. W. Williams, "The Catching of Cold Phobia" Ibid., September 29, 1917.

double importance to the Colored people for the reason that a large number of the newcomers have just located in the states mentioned as composing this Conference and that these new people will make and are making the housing conditions, the health and sanitary conditions more complex, much more difficult to handle and any light obtainable should be eagerly sought on the part of our physicians, nurses and social workers." Since this section of the country was experiencing an influx of southern rural migrants, many of whom were poor, unacquainted, and unaccustomed to living in the North, Williams feared that in their pursuit of cheap rent they would overcrowd into available quarters. Overcrowding in already bad housing conditions was sure to lead to "lung consumption and other infectious disease." There was a lot riding on the involvement and aid of the more well off and the more informed. "The Race has been so long charged with being a tuberculous race, a syphilitic race, a cancerous race..." that "the Negro doctors, nurses, and social workers should get busy and keep busy in doing their bit to reduce to the minimum any justification on the part of the dominant race in claiming that the Negro is a tuberculous race." Pointing out that these charges hurt the African American community economically and socially, he concluded with a call for readers, doctors, nurses, and social workers to attend the Conference.[59]

In April 1918, the doctor's campaign to disseminate information on preventive medicine raged on with a renewed sense of purpose. He warned against two pieces of advice given to patients: one, that was given to young women with tuberculosis to get married to cure her disease, and another that was given to men with venereal disease to marry or cohabit with a clean or virgin woman to cure venereal disease. "The public must be taught and enlightened on these two evil practices, if we hope to accomplish much in

[59] Dr. A. W. Williams, "The Mississippi Valley Tuberculosis Conference," Ibid., October 6, 1917.

protecting and conserving the human race." After he detailed the causes of tuberculosis once again, Dr. Williams reminded readers "various applications made to the chest for the purpose of drawing out the cold are worthless (antiphlogistine, poultices of flaxseed, snuff, garlic, cow manure, onions, salt), the wearing of red flannel underwear does no good."[60] He continued to provide facts related to tuberculosis, venereal disease, influenza in the ensuing months.

More importantly he continued to address the issue of community rights and responsibilities. "Prior to 1894," he began, "the rights of the individual patient as to the sacredness and concealment of the patient's ailments stood far above the rights of those of the community." But the development of social medicine compelled the modern doctors to take "a more comprehensive and a broader view of the matter. The modern physician feels that the community has certain sacred rights that must be safeguarded and not infringed upon, the same as his individual patient." Dr. Williams regarded having and concealing contagious and infectious diseases as "selfishness," "ignorance," and "lack of mental development of appreciation of one's relation to society."[61]

In May of 1919 Dr. Williams began walking about town and taking stock of sanitary measures dealing with restaurants and soda fountains. He observed and reported waitresses' dirty hands and nails, with which they handled knives, forks, spoons and beverage glasses they served the customers. He cautioned also "those who serve food should wear tidy clothes, clean aprons, have their hands clean and be free from cough and sneezing."[62] Soda fountains patronized by his readers did not have "running water for

---

[60] Dr. A. W. Williams, Ibid., April 20, 1918.
[61] Dr. A. W. Williams, "Development of Social Medicine," Ibid., April 5, 1919.
[62] Dr. A. W. Williams, "Sanitary Measures," Ibid., May 10, 1919. (See also *Department of Health Bulletin*, January 12, 1918 for Who Handles Your Food? Dirty hands and handling food: "Because this important

washing the glasses, dishes, spoons, etc. after being used."[63] These places thus were hotbeds for the spread of disease.

There is no way of knowing precisely the effectiveness of Dr. Williams' advice. Yet his call to community leaders to get involved in disseminating information was as important as his health advice. Like the rest of the city officials' and health authorities' approach, which imbued residents with a sense of individual responsibility to prevent diseases before they happened, Williams' columns thus served two purposes. The totality of the campaigns signal, for the sake of the comparison here, citizen led efforts that highlighted the "shared" nature of city living even as they educated individuals. Istanbul's approach to health care was more curative, and it revolved around government responsibility for increasing the number of existing facilities that offered curative measures. As an extension of the government's modernization efforts, Istanbul became a showcase for the technical improvements in health care. By 1950, central government and the Istanbul municipality together were opening new hospitals and dispensaries, and increasing patient capacity in existing centers.

It is impossible to know from existing sources the precise correlation between rural migration and health concerns. Perhaps because of the lack of major health/ disease concerns in the city, perhaps because they were out of the way, and perhaps because of the more pressing daily needs of the people citywide, newcomers from the rural areas did not receive special attention in the newspapers in terms of health issues. In the few instances when newcomers were accorded attention, there was no sense of urgency in

---

fact is becoming more generally known, there is a rapidly growing demand that those who handle and prepare food for others to consume must be physically well and sound, that is, free from disease of any kind, and that their hands must be clean. Also that they must be clean in person and attire" and laws on it.)

[63] Dr. A. W. Williams, Ibid., May 17, 1919.

dealing with them. They might be living in disease, but their living conditions did not threaten the well being of the city. It was their illegal status that bothered residents and concerned officials alike. Istanbul's approach to making and keeping a healthy city consisted primarily of increasing hospital capacity. The literature on the provision of health services takes the city as a whole, and discussions of aid available to the needy do not separate the poor who may have been born in the city from the poor who may have come to the city as rural migrants. However, correlating the geographical location of new dispensaries with new migrant settlements springing up in Istanbul throughout the 1950s reveals that they were one and the same.

Istanbul

The history of government provision of health services and hospitals can be traced to the 15th century in Istanbul, but when the Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Bakanlığı (Ministry of Health and Social Services) took on the administration of medical treatment services upon the founding of the new Turkish Republic in 1923, new laws and regulations solidified the primary role of government in protecting urban health.[64] According to the "Umumi Hıfzıssıhha Kanunu" number 1593 and "Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Bakanlığı Teşkilat ve Memurin Kanunu" number 3017 among the services provided by the Ministry and municipality were: opening hospitals, sanatoriums, centers for mental health, maternity hospitals and child care centers, and centers for the treatment of rabies where necessary. Not unlike today, in addition to the Ministry of Health and Social Services other organizations such as other ministries and government offices, Sosyal Sigortalar Kurumu, universities, municipalities and other public organizations and the private sector

[64] See Nuran Yıldırım, "Evvel Zaman Istanbul'unda Sağlık," *Istanbul*, January 2004, 57-63 for the history of hospitals in the Ottoman Empire.

participated in the founding and administration of health/ treatment services under different laws. The Ministry also guided the efforts of the "Il Özel Idaresi."[65] Starting in 1923, the Il Özel Idaresi in every province established what were initially generally referred to as the "Guraba Hastahanesi" (later became Memleket Hastahanesi) and the Ministry oversaw the treatment conditions and practices and helped iron out the management issues. Later these Numune Hospitals were to serve as guides for other provincial efforts. Founded in 1936 Istanbul Haydarpaşa Numune Hastahanesi was one such example. Other examples include the (Dispanser) Dispensaries that the Istanbul Il Özel Idaresi opened in conjunction with the municipality in Beşiktaş, Edirnekapı, and Üsküdar in light of section 162 of the Umumi Hıfzıssıha Kanunu.[66]

The first step the central government took towards the rational and planned practice of the health services, within the First Ten Year Plan (Birinci On Yıllık Milli Sağlık Planı) of 1946, aimed to spread these services and preventive medicine especially to the less developed parts of the nation. Although an acknowledgement that as an extension of government responsibility health services were the right of every citizen was

---

[65] Provinces in Turkey are both extensions of the central government, or "the main units of field administration for the national government" and "elements of local government." Locally their responsibilities include "public works, health, welfare, and some aspects of public education." The head of this unit of administration is the Vali, or the governor, and he is appointed by the center. The governor works with the Council, which "advises the governor on the provincial budget and related matters." These bodies have had "little independence" and have been weak fiscally and politically, and have lost "many of their local functions to the central government." See Danielson and Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization*, 76-77. According to a 1913 Law, Il Özel Idareleri were responsible for overseeing development and public works, industrial and commercial activity; opening elementary and secondary schools and other educational facilities such as training for industries; and building health centers, among others. Fethi Aytaç, "Türkiye'de Il Özel Idareleri," 1-3. See also Isa Sağbaş and Muhlis Bağdigen, *Local Government Finance in Turkey* (Istanbul: Istanbul Ofset Basım A. Ş., 2003), 42-45.

[66] Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Bakanlığı, Sağlık Propagandası ve Tıbbi Istatistik Genel Müdürlüğü, *Sağlık Hizmetlerinde 50 Yıl*, (Ankara: Akyıldız Matbaası A. Ş., 1973), 256; Fahreddin and Mehtap Tatar, *Yerel Yönetimler ve Sağlık*, 109-110; Yıldırım, "Evvel Zaman Istanbul'unda Sağlık," *Istanbul*, 63.

not widespread until after the 1960s, the foundations for government provision of health services were laid earlier.[67]

Within the body of the administrative division (idari olarak) of government a Press Bureau (Basın Bürosu) was established for the purposes of following and collecting news published in the media about the activities of the Ministry of Health in 1945. The Bureau carefully studied daily newspapers and other publications. It combed the daily news for reports concerning the Ministry and compiled, registered and sent such compilations to units in charge of each matter. Different units then took necessary measures as matters arose.[68] Newspapers did not make any direct references to the Press Bureau but a look at the stories published in the 1950-55 period reveal that newspapers served as a conduit between the municipality/ ministries and other government offices and "the people" (halk). This is evident in many stories that end with the words "we would like to draw the authorities' attention to the matter" and the references the governor/ mayor reportedly made about the stories published in the newspapers. Gökay was often quoted as having said, "complaints of *the people* have been heard and the information has been passed on to the unit in charge of the matter."

Against this backdrop, Istanbul had the highest percentage of hospitals in the nation for at least three decades following the founding of the Turkish Republic. In 1950 when there were 201 hospitals in the whole nation, Istanbul housed 54. By 1955 the

---

[67] *Sağlık Hizmetlerinde 50 Yıl,* pages 42-43. 1924te 150 yatakli Istanbul Çocuk Hastahanesi; Vakıflar Idaresine bağlı bulunan 20 yataklı Istanbul Guraba Hastahanesi- ödeneği vakıflardan temin edilmek üzere Bakanlığa bağlanmıştır. Istanbul Özel Idaresi Verem Savaş Dispanseri açıyor; ilk ve Bakanlık istek ve onayı ile. 1924 yılında 110 yataklı Haydarpaşa da bulaşıcı hastalıkların tecrit ve tedavisi için Bulaşıcı ve Salgın Hastalıklar Hastahanesi açılmış. 1941 de Istanbul Göğüs Cerrahi Merkezi: kalp ve göğüs hastalıkları. 1943 kemik hastalıkları, Istanbul Baltalimanı Kemik Hastalıkları Hastahanesi. 1924 Istanbul ruh hastalıkları tedavisi 1927 Akliye ve Asabiye Hastahanesi ismi altında Bakırköyde bulunan Reşadiye Kışlasına nakledilmiştir...

[68] *Sağlık Hizmetlerinde 50 Yıl*, 210.

number of total hospitals in the nation had doubled to 417 and Istanbul now housed 64 of them. Istanbul was also the educational center for doctors, so it comes as no surprise that in 1950 with 595 doctors, Istanbul had 20 percent of the 3,020 doctors in the country, while five years later 2,337 out of the nation's 7,077 doctors resided in Istanbul.[69]

Despite the central government's efforts to bring health services to the rest of the nation Istanbul health services were overloaded. Patients from across the nation came to Istanbul, and the city's own increasing population necessitated opening new hospitals, in some cases, adding beds or new wings in others. New dispensaries were opened across the city, especially around migrant settlements.[70] At first, only a few newspaper stories alerted Istanbul residents to the increase in health services. May of 1950 brought an announcement that the 100-year anniversary of Florence Nightingale's appearance in the city during the Crimean War would be commemorated by opening a hospital in her name in 1954. Ord. Prof. Sıddık Sami led the Committee in charge of the realization of the project for the Florence Nightingale Hospital/ Nurse School (Hemşire Kolej ve Hastanesi). This announcement came from a news conference held at the Büyük Klüp of Beyoğlu in which distinguished guests and philanthropists took part. As will be seen shortly, the presence of philanthropists (hayırsever zevat) was not something that generally appeared in *Istanbul Ekspres* stories. Rather, stories more frequently listed the governor/mayor, health directors, ministers of the central government, members of the National Assembly, and some others as those present in such occasions.[71]

---

[69] *Istanbul Külliyatı, Cumhuriyet Dönemi Istanbul Istatistikleri: Sağlık 1927-1996.*
[70] Dispanser: "outpatient clinics providing free or low cost treatment." The Municipality, Vilayet, various Ministries and private efforts worked towards opening more centers.
[71] "Florence Nightingale Kulüp ve Hastahanesi kurulacak," *Hürriyet*, 11 May 1950.

In April 1952 *Hürriyet* recognized that the "Işçi Sigortaları Hastahanesi" (Workers Insurance Hospital) no longer met the needs of the increasing numbers of workers in the city. The Sigortalar Müdürlüğü (Directorate of the Insurances) publicized their decision to build a new hospital of 200 beds in Samatya and open outpatient clinics in various parts of the city. In this way, they believed, the organization (Sigorta Sağlık Teşkilatı) would function "more perfectly" with the additional 250-300 beds.[72]

More good news followed in the December of the same year. Ekrem Hayri Üstündağ, (Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Bakanı) Minister of Health and Social Services, announced that the Beykoz Kasrı would be converted into a 250 bed tuberculosis center, that a 150 bed children's hospital (preventorium) would be opened on Koşuyolu, and a new 100 bed sanatorium would be opened in Erenköy for the University age youth.[73] This last effort, the Erenköy sanatorium for University age youth, seems to been undertaken with aid from Kızılay. The *Journal of Kızılay* framed adding 100 beds to the Erenköy Sanatorium as a service that would "advance the knowledge of the nation." By protecting those with "natural abilities," those with natural abilities being the intellectual treasure, the educated youth, Kızılay helped protect those who were destined to play important roles in the future of the nation.[74]

In September of 1954, the Minister of Health and Social Services (Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Vekili) Dr. Behçet Uz announced that a municipal hospital with one thousand-beds was in the works. This announcement followed inspections that Uz conducted of the existing Cerrahpaşa and Haseki Hospitals, which he left with favorable

---

[72] "Işçi Sigortaları yeni hastahane yapacak," Ibid., 7 April 1952. Notice the brief mention of two other hospitals in this story: "Tekel Sağlık Muessesesi" and "Denizcilik Bankası Hastahanesi."
[73] *Istanbul Ekspres*, 7 December 1952. Additionally a Cancer Institute was being built in Ankara. Cancer was starting to receive more attention from the Ministry.
[74] Mümtaz Faik Fenik, "Kızılay'ın çok hayırlı çalışmaları," *Kızılay Dergisi* No. 43, August 1952.

impressions.[75] Also in September of 1954, it was announced that a 500 bed Children's Mental Hospital would be opened in Bakırköy, thanks to the efforts of the Ministry of Health (Sağlık Vekaleti).[76]

In the period 1950-1955 beds were also added to existing hospitals or centers. In December 1952 Üstündağ announced that 800 beds would be added to the Mental Hospital in Bakırköy, and 120 beds to the Baltalimanı Hospital.[77] Records indicate that between 1950 and 1952 number of beds in Istanbul hospitals had gone from 9,875 to 11,594 in all hospitals, public and private. Beds in public hospitals had increased about ten times the beds in private hospitals (about 2000:200).[78] The annual increase in the numbers of beds reflected the nationwide increase in health and social aid needs. In 1955 *Hürriyet* reported that "1,320 new beds will be added to various hospitals." Because many patients did not find room in hospitals and because others waited a period of one year to be admitted into a tuberculosis (verem) center, this was good news. (Alakalılar) Interested/ Concerned parties "revealed that there are currently a total of 23,058 beds in various hospitals and they would like to bring that number up to 24,378 by adding 1,320 new beds within this year." 650 beds had been set aside as additions to the 6,557 beds in TB centers.[79] It is not clear how *Hürriyet* came across the number of beds but official records reveal that number to be 34,526 nationwide in the end of 1955 and 12,731 in Istanbul. This was an increase of 2856 beds in Istanbul between 1950 and 1955.[80]

---

[75] "1000 yataklı Belediye Hastahanesi kurulacak," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 9 September 1954.
[76] "Akıl Hastası Çocuklar Için Bir Hastahane Kuruluyor," Ibid., September 1954.
[77] Ibid., 7 December 1952. Additionally a Cancer Institute was being built in Ankara. Cancer was starting to receive more attention from the Ministry.
[78] "Tablo 2: Kamu ve Özel Hastaneler ve Yatak Sayıları," in *Istanbul Külliyatı Cumhuriyet Dönemi Istanbul Istatistikleri: Sağlık 1927-1996*, 108.
[79] "Hastahanelere yeniden 1320 yatak ilave edilecek," *Hürriyet*, 2 January 1955.
[80] "Tablo 2: Kamu ve Özel Hastaneler ve Yatak Sayıları," in *Istanbul Külliyatı Cumhuriyet Dönemi Istanbul Istatistikleri: Sağlık 1927-1996*, 108.

Meanwhile addition of new wings contributed to expanding health services as well. "70 thousand lira has been set aside by the Vilayet (Il/Province) to add a surgical wing to the Haydarpaşa Numune Hastanesi for brain surgery." The Directorate of Health (Sağlık Müdürlüğü) had also decided to begin the procedure for a new blood bank (kan verme istasyonu) within the Beyoğlu Hospital. The payments allotted for this new blood bank would be made in installments by the Ministry of Health. Additionally it was decided to build a new urology pavilion in Şişli.[81] A year later, following the municipality's decision to provide the necessary revenue from its budget, it was announced that a new children's clinic would be opened within Cerrahpaşa Hospital.[82] In December 1952 Üstündağ informed the public that 1.5-2 million lira had been set aside for the additional wing to the Şişli Hospital, and a new floor to the Taksim tuberculosis center.[83]

In addition many low cost/free (based on need) outpatient clinics appeared across the city. The opening ceremonies for these new centers provided an occasion for good deeds. Some of these good deeds consisted of distribution of free medicines. At other times such occasions gave the governor/mayor additional personal time with the "villagers." ("additional" because he did not wait for these occasions to communicate directly with the people. He made many separate visits to various villages throughout his career.) "Director of the Istanbul Health and Social Aid Directorate, (Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Müdürü) visited various villages in the Çatalca kazası (subdivision of a province) and determined the steps that will be taken to eradicate the cases of scabies (uyuz) and

[81] "Beyin cerrahisi pavyonu için 70 bin lira veirldi," *Hürriyet*, 9 April 1950.
[82] "Cerrehpaşa Hastahanesinde Çocuk Kliniği Açılacak," Ibid., 28 March 1951.
[83] *Istanbul Ekspres*, 7 December 1952.

distributed some medicine against the disease."[84] On the same day, the governor/mayor conducted the foundation ceremony for a Dispanser in the same area. Those present at this ceremony were: some members of the Grand National Assembly, the Vilayet inspector of the Democratic Party (DP vilayet müfettişi), the director of Health (Sağlık müdürü), doctors and a crowd consisting of "the people." The kaymakam (official charged with governing a provincial district) of Çatalca gave a short speech followed by the governor's speech in which he underlined how central government placed an emphasis on the efforts for a healthier Istanbul, and outlined the benefits this Dispanser would bring to the district. The governor then broke ground.[85]

Two years later, when the center opened its doors, the governor mayor again did the honors in the presence of members of the City Council and journalists. "The governor/mayor gave a speech which covered the significance of April 23 for the entire nation, and ended with his best wishes for the work that the Dispanser would provide for the community," a story stated. Those present got the chance to hear a full blown explanation of how the center was to carry out its work as they were given a tour of the center. Following the day's events, "the governor chatted with the villagers."[86]

---

[84] "Sağlık Müdürünün Çatalca köylerinde yaptığı tetkikler," *Hürriyet*, 28 July 1950.
[85] "Dün Çatalcada bir dispanserin temeli atıldı," *Hürriyet*, 28 July 1950. See also Erhan Kaplan, "Türk Siyasal Sisteminin Temel Belgelerinde Kadın ve Kadın Sorunu," (Unpublished MA Thesis Submitted to Istanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kadın Çalışmaları Ana Bilim Dalı, Istanbul, 1998), 1-55. This thesis looks at Political Party Programs from 1920s through 1980s to determine how each political party approached women's conditions and issues. Party programs, when they mentioned women at all, concentrated on women as child bearers and on their role in increasing the nation's population. Through the 1930s-1950 these party programs provide some insight into how political parties approached women's health issues: they promised to increase the number of maternity hospitals; to open child care centers for working mothers; to increase the number of professionally trained midwives. In the 10 year Democratic Party rule through the 1950s, the DP did not mention women once, but CHP (in power 1923-1947) continued to "promise" to provide more health education and professional health help.
[86] "Çatalca Dispanseri dün açıldı," Ibid., 25 April 1952. April 23 is Çocuk Bayramı, The National Children's Festival.

Soon, other centers followed. These centers were located in various districts of the city. Some of these districts may have been wealthier districts, which might be interpreted as not needing such low cost services. However, since even rich districts contained poorer areas within them a Dispanser could be opened in parts of Beşiktaş as well as Karagümrük, Bakırköy, Üsküdar, and Kuzguncuk as demand dictated.

Unlike the situation in Chicago, in Istanbul there was limited participation of citizen groups in promoting health care. Although established in Turkey as a war time measure that would also meet the need in emergency situations such as floods, and earthquakes, Kızılay served Istanbul in various ways from administering dispensaries, and distributing food items and cleaning products to educating and taking care of youth whose families were to poor to properly provide for them. In October 1950 Kızılay claimed to have helped 20,000 poor citizens and 12,000 poor students since 1942 through soup kitchens. Soup kitchens in 17 districts with 18 additional distribution centers distributed a bowl of food a day to the needy, provided a bar of soap a week, and coal when the organization's budget allowed for it. Further, the Istiklal Branch of Kızılay contributed to the intra-city circumcision ceremony that year which drew boys from Ankara, Izmit, Ayvalık, Bolu and Edirne to the Bebek Municipal Garden.[87] The next year Kızılay reported that in Beyoğlu, Istiklal and Nişantaşı districts their dispensaries had seen more than 1,718 patients between January and April, not including figures from the Nişantaşı branch.[88] By 1952 Kızılay took preventive medicine outside Istanbul, to the villages in three different provinces. The institution claimed that it served both "the

[87] "Kızılay Istanbul Aşocakları," *Kızılay Dergisi*, October 1950.
[88] Ibid., March 1951.

enlightened and elite citizens of Istanbul, and the producer class on the farm" and was now helping the people actively pursue happiness.[89]

Kızılay gently hinted at philanthropists' contributions to their events and efforts. *Kadın Gazetesi* recognized the need for the wealthier residents' contributions and called for them. Often stories on the activities of the Istanbul Branch of the "Yardımsevenler Derneği" (Philanthropic Association) appeared in the *Kadın Gazetesi*. The association had begun its operations in Istanbul 1941 with the general monetary and moral contributions of the governor/mayor. In its inception the association served soldiers and aided soldiers' families, and helped train volunteer nurses aids in Haseki, Guraba, Cerrahpasa, Numune, Gümüşsuyu, and Children's Hospitals and Kızılay Nursing School. Following the end of the war, the association continued to help the people's struggle with the rise in cost of living in their daily lives, and distributed sugar, soap and medicines to those who did not have the means to purchase them. Further, the association rented public Turkish baths and ensured that the poor could bathe. Association members also kept an eye on school age children providing them financial aid for schoolbooks, pajamas and underwear when they went to youth camps, and medicine.[90]

The fact that Istanbul had 50-60 hospitals did not guarantee patients a place in such. In 1951 a call for waiting and sheltering stations outside the hospitals sounded in the columns of the *Kadın Gazetesi*. *Kadın Gazetesi*, founded in 1947 and owned and edited by a woman, addressed the social issues of the city from the perspective of women. With a staff comprised of famous women authors, doctors, lawyers and educators, the newspaper campaigned to combine the efforts of all women across Istanbul

[89] Ibid., August 1952.
[90] "Yardımseverler Derneği Istanbul Il Merkezinin Yıllık Balosu," *Kadın Gazetesi*, 23 January 1950.

for general reforms. As it related to hospital conditions, authors revealed what they themselves had witnessed many times, that poor patients had to wait in the corridors, in front of hospital entrances, and on the cold stone floors of the hospitals. Similar conditions existed in all of the hospitals, which were broadly organized central hospitals that served the patients from all provinces of the nation such as Gureba, Cerrahpaşa and Haseki Hospitals and Clinics of the Istanbul University Faculty of Medicine. Authors called for the generous and well-to-do millionaires of Istanbul to act as did the wealthy in other nations and aid their governments to provide better health services.[91]

Along with the numbers of people needing help, the numbers of those getting help in the centers was increasing. In 1955 the Association for the Eradication of Tuberculosis (Verem Savaş Derneği) planned a new center in each of the five districts just listed, and was "in the process of purchasing the land necessary for the new centers."[92] A total of 20,387 patients had been seen in the various centers around the city in 1953 and soon those who benefited from this public service would reach 100,000.[93]

Occasionally newspapers reported doctors' individual activities and achievements. Given the scarcity of doctors at the time this should come as no surprise. But keeping in mind that Turkey wanted to be seen as modernizing both domestically and internationally, and that the nation depended on imported medicines and technologies, sending professionals overseas to top off their education and technical training was a part

---

[91] Hasene Ilgaz, Ibid., October 1951.

[92] "Verem Savaş Derneği, şehrimizde yeniden 5 dispanser açacak," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 23 February 1955. Likewise three years later in 1958 a new center was opened in Zeytinburnu with the traditional ceremony in which the Director of Health and an assistant to the governor each gave a short speech, emphasizing again the extent of the service provided: That being involved in community health was the biggest and most significant of public services. They also revealed that Kadıköy would soon become the host of a new Dispanser in the next year.

[93] "Zeytinburnu Dispanseri Merasimle Hizmete Girdi," Ibid., February 1958. In 1957 that number had reached 111,729.

of the modernizing effort. Newspapers especially reported when a doctor attended an international conference. For instance, upon his return from a Radiology Conference in London, Prof. Muhterem Gökem reported that about 1700 attended the conference and each attendee presented a paper on the works and progress made in his own country, which resulted in a very significant exchange of information leading to new developments in throat and breast cancer.[94] Again, when pediatrician Doctor Naci Somersan left for Europe he made the news.[95] The governor was also a doctor himself and made the news in his other professional persona when he traveled as a doctor.[96]

Newspapers also kept on top of reported diseases, changing regulations, and miscellaneous developments. For example, in 1950, following 430 health related complaints registered with a new Bureau of Complaints, founded by the Health Directorate, the newspaper happily reported that 338 of such complaints, many of which related to open sewers and public bathrooms, had been resolved.[97] In 1952 the newspaper printed a list of the reported diseases: 6 cases of typhoid fever (kara humma), 8 cases of diphtheria, 6 cases of (kızıl) scarlet fever, 31 cases of measles, 3 cases of anthrax (or charbon- şarbon), 16 cases of whopping cough (boğmaca), 1 case of paratyphoid, 1 case of meningitis, and the necessary precautions had been taken.[98] In that same year they reported that a new regulation (restriction of fresh fruits in the hospital) in the "Gureba hastahanesi" disgruntled patients and doctors alike when the director of the hospital

---

[94] "Radyoloji kongresinden gelen profesörümüzün anlattıkları," *Hürriyet*, 16 August 1950.
[95] "Doktor Naci Somersan Avrupaya gitti," *Hürriyet*, 30 May 1952.
[96] *Istanbul Ekspres*, 23 September 1952. If a conference took place in Istanbul it made the news as well, as in the case of the "Kanser hastaligi hakkinda muhim bir toplanti: turk mikrobiolji cemiyeti, yarin saat 1830da etibba odasinda ehemmiyetli bir kongre tertip etmistir. Bu toplantiya viyanali professor gerlach da istirak edecek ve kanser mevzuunda munakasali ve projeksiyonlu muzakereler yapilacaktir." "Kanser hastalığı hakkında mühim bir toplantı," *Hürriyet*, 28 March 1951.
[97] "Bir haftada sağlık işleriyle ilgili 43 şikayet yapıldı," Ibid., 11 May 1950.
[98] "Şehirde çeşitli hastalıklar görüldü," Ibid., 30 May 1952.

prohibited fresh fruit from being brought into the hospital. The director argued that fresh fruit, when left to sit out for a while, attracted too many flies. The newspaper just wanted to bring the people's displeasure with this decision "to the attention of the Health Directorate."[99] But the director's decision to disallow fresh fruits in his hospital does not sound so unreasonable when one considers that the increase of flies warranted a war against houseflies throughout the city in August 1952.

Concern for public cleanliness, thus, resembled earlier campaigns in Chicago, as Istanbul residents made this into a personal, as well as a public campaign. The motivations may well have differed,[100] yet the influx of migrants and their poor living conditions, moved some Istanbulites to undertake this campaign. *Istanbul Ekspres* called the people of the city to unite in their battle against the common housefly. "First things first:" the campaign writer announced, "Cleanliness." Filth attracted flies, which the author reminded his readers, "make their headquarters at the garbage dumps." The newspaper encouraged the public to put their garbage away and keep their living areas free of any kind of refuse. The public was also encouraged to keep an eye out on their neighbors and steer them towards cleanliness when necessary.[101]

The next summer it was reported that the municipal health director was expecting financial aid in the battle against the housefly.[102] It was now a war against both the housefly and the mosquito. In many districts residents, especially of Bakırköy, Erenköy and both sides of the Bosphorus, were under an unprecedented attack by armies of mosquitoes. Fingers pointed to the inefficiency and the indifference of the organizations

---

[99] "Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." *Istanbul Ekspres*, August 1952.
[100] Here I am referring to the fact that cleanliness in Turkish culture is part of the Islamic tradition, which maintains that it is a reflection of religious faith.
[101] *Istanbul Ekspres*, August 1952.
[102] "Karasinek mücadelesi," Ibid., Summer 1953.

in charge of this fight. According to the organization, rain was to blame for the increase in flies and mosquitoes. "Whatever the cause, our city is suffering from an increase in these nuisances and the people are awaiting rescue" the story ended.[103] Three days later headlines sounded more urgent: Houseflies and mosquitoes had "enveloped" the city, especially Bakırköy, Yeşilköy and Florya. The cause was buried garbage.[104]

The invasion of the houseflies and mosquitoes seems to have been a seasonal problem; the garbage problem was not. The problem of garbage collection was a year round problem which worsened in the summer time. Residents citywide suffered the shortage of garbage collection services and garbage collectors. In August 1950, two years prior to the invasion of the flies, *Hürriyet* reported that a thorough decision had been reached for the cleanliness of Istanbul: The city would purchase new garbage trucks and (arazöz: street sweepers?). "As publicly announced previously," the author added, "the municipality encourages all residents to keep the streets, store fronts, and the areas around their dwellings clean." Melon slices and corncobs were summer nuisances on the streets. They were planning to put into effect certain punitive measures against those who littered the streets with such objects.[105]

A few weeks later, the newspaper very enthusiastically announced that those who littered would receive "major punishments." It had also been brought to officials' attention that many districts across the city suffered from lack of public bathrooms. Residents were reported as using the streets for such purposes exacerbating the garbage

[103] "Karasinekten sonra sivrisinekte çoğaldı," *Hürriyet*, 14 August 1955.
[104] "Istanbul'u karasinek ve sivrisinekler kapladı," *Hürriyet*, 17 August 1955.
[105] "Istanbul'un temizliği için esaslı karar alındı," Ibid., 21 August 1950.

problem. The municipality would begin efforts to clean and upkeep such areas and take serious preventative measures, such as costly fines.[106]

For many years to follow garbage collection remained one of the "unresolved problems" of Istanbul, especially during the summer. *Istanbul Ekspres* published many stories of the suffering of residents in various districts. One resident complained that garbage men picked up their trash and then dumped it in front of their dwelling. Another agreed that even when they did work, garbage collectors never really complied with city regulations.[107]

In the beginning of August 1953 *Istanbul Ekpsres* published the response they received from the offices in charge of the garbage problem. In the response Temizlik Işleri, the office in charge, admitted that they were not pleased with the infrequency of the garbage pick-ups and agreed that the people had just cause for their objections. The city owned only fifty garbage trucks for the collection of the whole city's garbage. Realistically, fifty trucks meant that they were so ill equipped that the city could barely cover a quarter of Istanbul. To add insult to injury, most of these fifty trucks were in bad condition. For these reasons and for the fact that many garbage collectors went back to their villages in the summer time, the office had big gaping holes. At the time they employed one garbage man per 3-4 kilometers of the city, whereas the more acceptable number would have been six to eight garbage men per 600 meters.[108] In the end of August 1953 the governor/mayor made a public announcement kindly requesting residents' cooperation with the municipality in the face of a shortage of garbage men in

---

[106] "Sokakları kirletenler ağır ceza görecek," Ibid., 9 September 1950.
[107] See *Istanbul Ekspres*, August 1952; and Sabiha Tunçel, "Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." *Istanbul Ekspres*, July 1952.
[108] "Temizlik Işlerinden Aldığımız Cevap: Dört Kilometreye Bir Çöpçü Düşüyor," Ibid., 3-4 August 1953.

the city. Many garbage collectors had returned to their villages because it was harvest season hence disrupting city garbage pickup. Once again, he asked city residents to keep the streets, store fronts, and areas around their dwellings clean, adding a request for builders to dispose of their rubble properly, kindly reminding all citizens that doing otherwise was actually punishable by law.[109]

About a week later the newspaper reported that the municipality decided to expand the team of garbage collectors and to purchase new trucks. The municipality also publicly recognized that city cleanliness would lead to city health, a healthy city. Highlighting the newspaper's role in bringing about this positive change the author stated. "As our readers will easily remember this newspaper interviewed many residents in various parts of the city and they almost uniformly registered their complaints about the inadequacy of garbage collection and cleanliness."[110]

Yet change on paper did not quickly translate into improvement in all areas of the city. In the October of 1954 a cartoon displayed a neighborhood "receiving" ceremony, one fitting for the highest government officials, for the garbage collector. While the neighborhood was ready to receive the garbage collector, a group of residents from a neighboring area was trying to lure him toward their own district, telling him "We provide rice and dessert in our area."[111]

---

[109] "Şehrin temizliği," Ibid., 25 August 1953.
[110] "Şehrin temizliği, şehirlinin sıhhati demektir," Ibid., 3 September 1953.
[111] "Hoşgeldin Çöpçübaşı," *Akbaba* No. 137, 28 October 1954. Within two years it was announced that the municipality made the necessary appropriations for a new factory for "çöp imhasi" (incineration). One of the longest unresolved problems of the city would soon cease to be a problem. About a year prior to this it had been suggested to burn the heaps of garbage. Previously, garbage had been dealt with in different ways such as being dumped into the Boğaz, or being buried. A brief mention of how a group of professors at the Technical University worked on garbage analysis for a year and submitted their report to the proper authorities shows that University Professors were consulted in the search for solutions. "Çöp imhası için fabrika kurulacak," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 31 January 1955.

In the beginning of 1958 *Havadis* announced the completion of a film in which the new municipal bans were depicted. These three-minute documentary films depicted which behaviors merited punishment by the municipality and they were to be provided/distributed to various movie theaters across Istanbul. Meanwhile 48 persons had received punishment for failure to obey decisions regarding city cleanliness, and 15 kapıcıs who worked in areas between Taksim and Harbiye received (ceza zaptı) for dumping apartment building garbage on the street.[112] These documentary films were the later 20th century equivalent of the 1910s Chicago Public Health Association's public meetings.

In April the film was ready and one author believed it would be more effective than official written announcements by the press. Experience showed that written warnings and official reprimands, even under the threat of punishment, did not reach all of the people. Even those who did read them sometimes misinterpreted them.

> Let me use the example of the prohibition on beating rugs from the side of the balconies: housewives and cleaning ladies are still unaware of the ban. Or many of them interpret the ban in many different ways. When on the streets you can witness such rug beatings for yourself at all hours of the day. Furthermore, you may come across those who litter, and spit on the streets. The hemşeri of course did not hear about this ban either, or interpreted it in his own way. Someone who saw in the propaganda film a temizlik zabıtası (municipal police force on cleanliness) interfere with a passenger who threw his bus ticket on the street exclaimed, "oh this is banned, too?" This film clearly identifies what is banned, leaving no doubt for any misunderstanding or misinterpretation.[113]

[112] *Havadis*, 23 January, 1958.
[113] Ibid., April 1958.

With this film in place, the next month municipal officials began collecting fines from offenders on the spot. 1,500 persons paid cash for the offenses of littering and spitting over three days before the second week of May ended.[114]

The seasonal problems seem to have received more attention in the *Istanbul Ekspres* than other, potentially more serious problems. In the few instances where the newspaper specifically mentioned spread of disease, messages were brief but clear. For example, in an interview with the Chief of Staff (Baştabip) of the Istanbul Cilt ve Zuhrevi Hastalıkları Hastanesi (Hospital for Skin and Venereal Diseases), Nurettin Bey revealed that newcomers from the rural areas made up the majority of the increasing Venereal Disease cases. In an interview replete with the interviewer's dramatic observations of the nature of patients sitting around the yard, the Chief of Staff provided some information about the workings of the hospital. It was a hospital of 100 beds whose patients were "licensed" women referred to them from Beyoğlu and Galata, and some men who frequented houses of prostitution referred to them by the Police Department. It was a small establishment consisting of one of each of the following: skin disease specialist, bacteriologist, assistant, head nurse, pharmacist and administrative government official in charge of the paperwork. The hospital also admitted patients from other hospitals when other hospitals ran out of beds. In the midst of all of this information, Nurettin Bey mentioned in passing that due to mere (here the word ignorance connotes innocence, because ignorance was no fault of their own) ignorance those who came from Anadolu

[114] Ibid., 11 May, 1958.

made up the majority among the patients in this hospital.[115] There was no sense of urgency in this story.

Likewise, the story of Tifo (typhoid) cases in the Rami immigrant neighborhood lacked a sense of urgency. It merely stated that Rami settlement contained seventy five cases of Tifo resulting from the use of contaminated well water, Sağlık Müdürlüğü had already inoculated six thousand persons in the area, shut down the use of wells and disinfected the houses.[116] Both stories depict incidences of containment, and provide the sense that such diseases were the responsibility of the officials, and they were easily contained by the Sağlık Müdürlüğü.

When it came to reporting on actual and/or potential diseases and health problems, the newspaper seems to have been more concerned with reporting numbers than actual cases. "1,101,500 patients have been seen and treated in the 63 hospitals in Istanbul in 1954. 127,000 of them have been admitted (yatakta), and 973,509 have been seen as outpatients (ayakta). 655,598 patients were seen in hospitals owned or run by the government (devlet ve devlete bağlı müesseseler hastahanelerinde), 294.067 were seen in municipal hospitals, and 151,830 received care in private facilities. There are currently 12,494 beds total in the 63 hospitals in Istanbul. In the last four years since 1950, nine new hospitals have opened, increasing the number of beds by 2,717."[117]

TB was taken more seriously than increasing venereal or typhoid cases.[118] "The TB 'disaster' will soon be outlawed," a headline announced. A new law was in the making that would speed up the war against TB. The new law would make the

---

[115] "Zuhrevi Hastalikları Yoketmeğe çalışan Hayırlı Müessesede...Hastalar içinde Anadoludan Gelenler Niçin Ekseriyeti Temsil Ediyor?" *Istanbul Ekspres*, June 1953.
[116] "Tifo vakaları," Ibid., June 1953.
[117] "195 senesinde," Ibid., 31 March 1955.
[118] Yıldırım, "Evvel Zaman Istanbul'unda Sağlık," *Istanbul*, 62-63; *Sağlık Hizmetlerinde 50 Yıl*, 253.

importation of medicines and other supplies easier, lifting the various taxes and tariffs on imported medicine. It was hoped that the new lift of taxes would help reduce the number of TB deaths, currently at about 40,000 annually. Civil servants (Devlet bütçesinden maaş alanlarla Belediye ve hususi idarelerinden maaş ve ücret alanlardan) with the disease would be considered "on vacation" for up to two years, and will still collect their salaries. A High Council for the Fight against TB, formed within the Ministry of Health, would concentrate only on the war against TB. The law that would lift the taxes would also apply to centers for TB, both public and private. According to the statistics complied by the Association for the Fight Against TB (Veremle Mücadele Cemiyeti) out of the 1 million 100 thousand Istanbul population in 1945, 314 died of the disease. The good news was that in 1953 the number of deaths had been reduced to 100. The story also announced that, as it was an annual custom, January 9-15 was declared the War Against TB week to instill in the public mind the idea of this war against TB. The minister of health was to launch the week with a speech and conferences at schools and on the public radio, and instructive films at the theaters.[119]

Chicago and Istanbul approached health needs brought on by increasing rural migration differently. In Chicago, spurred on by the combined voluntary efforts of women and medical professionals to modernize immigrant mothers, the Department of Health joined the public health movement, campaigned and educated Chicagoans about preventive measures for a healthier overall Chicago. Because many facilities were racially segregated, and also because they were familiar with the threat posed by poverty and congested living conditions in the spread of urban diseases such as tuberculosis, old

[119] "Verem afeti yakında kanun dışı edilecek!" *Hürriyet*, 1 January 1955.

settlers again shouldered the extension of the citywide public health campaign to their own group of newcomers. These included sending African American visiting nurses to African American households, explaining the city's health services via the pages of the *Chicago Defender*, and advising newcomers to adopt new habits to prevent diseases.

In Istanbul, as they had done with housing issues, local and national officials presided over health matters as well. In this, officials took steps to increase the number of professionally trained midwives, nurses, and doctors, some of whom were sent to Europe and the United States to top off their training and learn the most recent technical advances. The whole nation would benefit from such advances. More specifically local officials increased patient capacity in existing hospitals, added new wings, and opened new hospitals and dispensaries to meet the needs of a city whose population was rising by hundreds of thousands of rural newcomers. Rural newcomers received little special attention, Istanbulites' contributions were hinted at, and the few calls for more citizen involvement to improve the conditions in the existing facilities remained largely unanswered.

How much potential there was for local involvement in local politics also differed between the two cities, a factor that also characterizes the ways in which rural newcomers became part of their new city. In Chicago newcomers would take their new political freedoms and power to new heights by working with leaders in the African American community and voting to elect the first few African American aldermen into the City Council. In Istanbul, because the solutions to newcomers' local problems such as housing and provision of services lay in the central government, and because the nature of local government was defined differently, local politics took back stage. Istanbulites, old and

new, watched as their municipality took measures to improve daily life in a general way, but felt either powerless to participate or did not see local politics as an important element in their daily lives.

> "The city is the largest corporation in Chicago. ***Every citizen benefits*** by its annual expenditure of some $70,000,000. The aldermen are its board of directors, elected by over 800,000 registered voters..."[1]
>
> "Under the Turkish Constitution, local governments are public corporations ***established to meet the common local needs*** of the citizens of the provinces, municipal districts, and villages, whose decision making organs are popularly elected..."[2] (emphasis mine)

Politics, as with housing and health, was an arena in which a sense of belonging, or not, to the city was fashioned. Despite the seemingly similar political situation that the above quotes describe, the precise dimensions of the corporate nature of each city determines the relationship of each city to its municipal government. Examining residents' interaction with their local government provides another window through which to observe the time- and place--specific responses to the modernizing city. Chicago residents felt that they could change and shape their local government and its officials with the power of their vote; Istanbul residents and their local government depended on decisions from the central state. Examining these different local political cultures, and whether they facilitated interactions among city residents or not, demonstrates how old settlers in Chicago could work to integrate newcomers into the existing political order of the community, while the modernization project of the state continued to shape the political culture and limit the political possibilities of Istanbul residents.

---

[1] "Twenty-Second Annual Preliminary Report of the Municipal Voters League," February 2, 1917, in Charles E. Merriam Papers, Box 73 Folder 11, University of Chicago.
[2] Michael N. Danielson and Ruşen Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization: Government and Growth in Modern Turkey* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), 75.

Chicago was first chartered as a city in 1837. New charters and state incorporation laws were implemented over time as the city grew and its government "became correspondingly large and complex."[3] Throughout the 19th century, Chicago mayors and City Council members had been associated with political graft and bossism such as speeding up immigrants' naturalization processes for voting purposes, impersonating people or double voting, providing jobs for their constituents in exchange for their votes, and accepting bribes from companies that competed for contracts, among others.[4] By the late 1910s the city administration had gone through different stages of corruption and growth, culminating in massive and far reaching Progressive Era reforms such as more efficient city government and civil service reform.[5]

In the United States, all cities are the legal creatures of their state governments. State legislatures confer power upon cities either through state incorporation acts in their constitutions or through individual municipal charters. In Illinois, despite state laws, especially those regarding taxation and finance, that placed restrictions on Chicago's ability to govern itself totally free of outside interference, the City Council exercised much autonomous power. Because Chicago aldermen were elected on a ward basis to serve on the City Council, Chicago residents had a very direct relationship with their local representative to the Council. These 70 aldermen, 2 from each of the 35 wards, held

---

[3] Chicago then began operating under "the Illinois State Statutes, Chapter 24, the Illinois Municipal Code, which was originally passed in 1872 and has been periodically revised." Modern urban problems have heightened this complexity." The city was only granted home rule in 1970, a change that guaranteed "the city's right to exercise any power and perform any function pertaining to its government and affairs including, but not limited to, the power to regulate for the protection of the public health, safety, morals and welfare; to license, to tax, and to incur debt." Judith E. Purcell, *The Government of the City of Chicago: A Guide to Its Structure and Function With a Directory of Officers* (Municipal Reference Library Chicago, Illinois, Revised edition, 1978).

[4] See the chapter on Progressivism and Urban Reform in Robert G. Spinney, *City of Shoulders: A History of Chicago* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2000); and William Bennett Munro, *Municipal Administration* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), 73.

[5] Maureen Flanagan, *Seeing With Their Hearts: Chicago Women And the Vision of the Good City: 1871-1933* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 4.

various lines of political power that affected residents' daily lives directly: they enacted and investigated the enforcement of ordinances, orders and resolutions; constructed and maintained streets and alleys; regulated garbage collection and disposal; provided fire, police, and health protection; and passed building and zoning codes.[6] Furthermore, as Harold Gosnell argued, "because of the powers of the city council to pass the city budget, to create new departments, to grant franchises, to reject appointments, and to pass local ordinances," the aldermen were "in a position to recommend certain appointments and to supervise the administration of city affairs within their respective wards."[7] Thus, ward-based politics functioned as a mechanism to give a political voice to foreign migrants as well as black migrants from the South. It also gave local politicians a potential power base when ethnic groups were concentrated in specific wards.[8]

At a time when Chicago politics was notorious for the political corruption of many of these aldermen, extra-governmental bodies were central to the story of citizen interaction with local government in Chicago. Voluntary citizen organizations such as the Municipal Voters League (MVL), organized in 1896 by representatives from various clubs and organizations "from the city at large, without regard to residence or political affiliations," were concerned about the future of the city. Tired of bossism and corruption, the MVL compiled information on the aldermen, and publicized it for the entire city. It kept detailed accounts of aldermen's actions. In the words of the League, the business problems aldermen dealt with alone were "gigantic" and many "unusually

---

[6] Purcell, *The Government of the City of Chicago: A Guide to Its Structure and Function With a Directory of Officers*, 8.

[7] Harold Foote Gosnell, *Negro Politicians: The Rise of Negro Politics in Chicago* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935), 73-74.

[8] John Allswang, *A House for All Peoples; Ethnic Politics in Chicago, 1890-1936* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1971); Joel Tarr, *A Study in Boss Politics: William Lorimer of Chicago* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971); Mel Holli and Paul Green, eds. *Ethnic Chicago: a Multicultural Portrait* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1994).

important questions" were brought before the council committees. Recognizing the significant decision-making powers of the aldermen, the MVL recommended that the voters "carefully scrutinize" the records of the aldermen in their respective wards, records that were provided by the very League itself, and advised readers to support "aldermen who have shown ability in committee work and on the floor of the council."[9]

By 1916, the was describing itself as an independent, nonpartisan and "intensely practical" voluntary organization, "the SOLE purpose of which" was "the election of honest and competent aldermen in Chicago." In its permanent headquarters the League worked constantly, between elections as well as before them, collected, recorded, filed and preserved information systematically that enabled it "to reach the voters promptly and efficiently." In its own words, the League did not aim to influence legislation but sent "a representative present at every session of the city council and at meetings of its most important committees" to be "fully and accurately" up to date on the "actions of the council." Once a candidate was named by others, the League investigated and reported on the nominees. Only when all nominations were made did the League take "an active part in the wards where there is danger of the election of unfit men." Then the League took upon itself simply to recommend "to the voters of Chicago that course which its investigations lead it to believe will be for their best interests." Its information collection and preservation gave the League the facts from which to draw and justify "concisely" its conclusions. It also prided itself over being effective in that out of the 38 elected aldermen in 1915, the League had specifically endorsed 24, preferred 6, and condemned only 8 of the elected aldermen. Making no pretense of infallibility, the League recognized

[9] "Twenty-Second Annual Preliminary Report of the Municipal Voters' League," published February 2, 1917, in Charles E. Merriam Papers, Box 73 Folder 11, University of Chicago.

that the candidates they endorsed might conduct themselves differently than they promised after being voted into office.[10] Thus in Chicago, residents were able to exercise both formal and informal means to influence political decision-making in the city.

Enter African American newcomers...

Such was the political culture that rural migrants encountered upon their arrival in the city. By 1919 African American newcomers had been in Chicago long enough to really matter in politics, to be regarded as a political power because of their growing numbers, but not long enough to really be trusted to practice the vote efficiently. It is evident in the way old settlers approached newcomers that they acknowledged newcomers' lack of political insight in Chicago city politics and felt the need to intervene, instruct and direct them so that newcomers would make informed decisions that would benefit the whole African American community. Because African American newcomers had been denied the right to vote in many areas they left behind and would need political instruction in their new community especially so that their ever-increasing numbers would not upset the hard-earned peaceful place of old settlers, the longtime resident had every reason to want to oversee and correct newcomers' voting habits. They were determined, therefore, to teach newcomers how to be active citizens befitting Chicago.

The Municipal Voters League's accounts, when used with the opinions published in the *Chicago Defender*, reveal the full meaning of aldermen for the African American community in the city. The League published three regular reports each year: the Preliminary Report, which contained a review of the records of outgoing aldermen; the

[10] "Twenty-First Annual Preliminary Report of the Municipal Voters' League," February 7, 1916, pp 29-32, in Ibid., Box 101, Folder 14. See also Douglas Bukowski, *Big Bill Thompson, Chicago, and the Politics of Image* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 13-14, 18, 50 and 110.

Primary report; and the Final report published shortly before the aldermanic election. The Preliminary Reports of the MVL gave both Oscar DePriest and Louis B. Anderson, the first black aldermen representing the largely black second ward who served in 1915-1918, a poor report. These aldermen may not have been the honest and competent aldermen that the League wanted, but they symbolized, for better or for worse, a way into the power structure of the city for African Americans.

In Dempsey J. Travis' words, Oscar DePriest "stumbled into the political arena by accident" in the opening years of the 20th century. By making himself indispensable to the right political people, he served two terms on the Cook County Board of Commissioners. In 1908 he was not renominated and over the next seven years DePriest sat on political sidelines while he operated decorating, contracting, and real estate businesses. In 1915, he returned to politics as the first African American alderman in Chicago. Until the beginning of 1917, DePriest was a political star in Mayor William Hale Thompson's administration.[11]

The campaign to send the first black alderman to the City Council is a good example of political mobilization of the African American community in the Second Ward. DePriest was not the only candidate to represent the ward in 1915. He was actually one of eight candidates, and including DePriest three of those candidates were black: Louis B. Anderson and Charles A. Griffin, both of whom had considerable political experience. The issue of multiplicity of black candidates was seen as a roadblock to ensuring one candidate did make it to alderman, so community leaders argued for the need to elect one Race leader in the primary to ensure that the black vote could carry that

[11] Dempsey J. Travis, *An Autobiography of Black Politics* (Chicago: Urban Research Press, Inc., 1987), 51-60.

leader, the first black alderman, to the City Council. "In the interest of arousing the colored people of the Second ward to the danger of a multiplicity of candidates for Alderman being prejudicial to the chances of procuring the nomination for one of the race," a mass meeting was held. The discussions in this meeting led to the formation of a committee which intended to invite the three candidates to a meeting in which committee members would draw suggestions from the candidates "looking to elimination so that colored people of the ward could go to the polls on primary day with one candidate for Alderman and to have their solid backing." The Committee invited all three candidates to meet at the Douglass Center where Louis B. Anderson revealed his plan of elimination. Anderson suggested that the community hold a pre-primary to determine which of the three candidates to send to the regular primary. The two other candidates refused to get involved in such a plan, which led to the Committee's decision that the plan could not be carried out but that Anderson's suggestion would be publicized. Anderson "considered the interest of the race in the matter as being of more importance than the ambitions of any individual." The publication of Anderson's suggestion gained him a large following among the second ward residents.[12]

The *Chicago Defender* used "voices of the people" to appeal to Chicago's second ward residents. In a section titled "The Voice of the People Being Some Letters Received By The Chicago Defender Relative to the Candidacy of Louis B. Anderson for Alderman of the Second Ward," the *Defender* published letters from residents who supported Anderson. After having read about Anderson's statement of elimination plan in the *Chicago Defender*, Mrs. William H. Montgomery wrote, "As one of the newly emancipated citizens of the second ward... I am forced to conclude that he [Anderson]

[12] *The Chicago Defender*, January 2, 1915.

alone has demonstrated the true race spirit." Montgomery had many women friends who were "as intensely interested in this fight as I am" and they agreed that "a man who is thus willing to sacrifice his personal ambitions for the good of his race should be given the highest opportunity to live for his race." Montgomery had been undecided as to which candidate she would support until she read the elimination plan.[13] She was not the only one. Mrs. E. V. Woodlee, too, confessed that Anderson's plan of elimination made "a convert" of her and she wanted "to go on record as favoring his candidacy and through the medium of your paper [*Chicago Defender*] to ask all the colored people who have the right to vote in the Second Ward to do likewise."[14]

"You can count on my support," William L. Anderson wrote, "and I will get all the employees that I can, of the firm for which I work to vote for you." He pledged the support of his wife and children and he promised that all of his personal friends in the ward would also support him because he would make it his "business to see them and if they do not know you I will tell them who you are and what you stand for."[15] "Eyes of African Americans everywhere are upon us," George Woodson's letter began, and he suggested that their actions regarding the aldermanic situation, or whether or not Chicago sent its first black alderman to the city council, would prove or disprove their intelligence. Woodson, precinct committeeman from the 6th precinct, who had served the

[13] "Women Favor L. B. Anderson in Aldermanic Race," Ibid., January 16, 1915. Women received the municipal suffrage by state law in 1913.
[14] "Too Many Candidates," Ibid., February 6, 1915.
[15] "William L. Anderson letter to L. B. Anderson," in The Voice of the People Being Some Letters Received By The Chicago Defender Relative to the Candidacy of Louis B. Anderson for Alderman of the Second Ward, Ibid., January 30, 1915.

second ward for 19 years, equated nominating Anderson with reflecting the wisdom of the Race.[16]

The examples can be multiplied because support for Anderson was great in the *Chicago Defender*. Yet, for all the campaigning, Anderson lost the primary. Once DePriest won the primary, the *Chicago Defender* felt the need to support him for the sake of the Race. "Now that it is all over the one central idea dominating the Afro-Americans throughout the ward is" 'Let us get together'" one editorial commented, "Let the rallying cry from this on be 'Unity.'"[17] Another editorial advocated that different factions in the African American community be brushed aside. Even though the *Defender* had originally supported Anderson, authors believed that "as servants of the public" that chose DePriest, they would "as vigorously and as persistently advocate the election of Mr. DePriest as we did the nomination of Mr. Anderson."[18] For the sake of having a race representative in the City Council, Anderson and Griffin had "laid down their arms," and came out in support of DePriest and they urged their followers to do the same.[19]

Oscar DePriest was the first black alderman in Chicago's City Council, and as such he began his term as the star of the community. Yet he failed to live up to expectations. He was not a candidate in 1917. The information provided in the MVL Preliminary Report that year said that DePriest was finishing his first term with a bad record. DePriest was "indicted January 18 on charges of being implicated with a graft

[16] "Veteran Politician Says That Second Ward Voters are for Anderson," in The Voice of the People Being Some Letters Received By The Chicago Defender Relative to the Candidacy of Louis B. Anderson for Alderman of the Second Ward, Ibid., February 6, 1915.
[17] "DePriest is Winner," Ibid., February 27, 1915.
[18] "For Alderman, Oscar DePriest," Ibid., February 27, 1915.
[19] "Protecting Our Interests," Ibid., March 6, 1915.

syndicate in his neighborhood."[20] DePriest was indicted for "conspiracy to permit gambling dens and houses of joy" along with the Chief of Police, three police lieutenants, and some underworld figures. In the trial that followed, clear and incriminating evidence was presented against DePriest, but in the end he was found "not guilty" on the grounds that the money he had accepted was campaign contributions and not bribe.[21] The MVL Report provided a list of DePriest's voting record:

> He voted against giving Finance committee an expert staff, against keeping city expenditures within income, against business methods of hauling ashes and garbage, against publicity on "sixty day" jobholders, against prohibiting aldermen soliciting jobs from public service corporations, against compelling school board to disclose facts about its finances and against nonpartisan organization of council; one of the budget aviators.[22]

As Harold Gosnell argued, the MVL was "interested in efficiency and economy and was not concerned with questions of racial representation. Aldermen DePriest, on the other hand, was interested in finding jobs for Negroes."[23] DePriest may not have commended himself to the MVL, but as the first black alderman in Chicago DePriest had introduced a civil rights ordinance as soon as Mayor Thompson took office in 1915, and he had looked after the interests of his constituents.[24]

---

[20] "Twenty-Second Annual Preliminary Report of the Municipal Voters' League," February 2, 1917, in Merriam Papers, Box 73 Folder 11.
[21] Travis, *An Autobiography*, 61.
[22] "Twenty-Second Annual Preliminary Report of the Municipal Voters' League," February 2, 1917, in Merriam Papers, Box 73 Folder 11. Likewise the MVL gave a poor report to Alderman Anderson in 1919. "Second Ward, Louis B. Anderson, 1919: Finished first term with bad record. Voted three times to sustain mayor's veto of proposed investigation of finances by Bureau of Public Efficiency; voted for solid six school raiders on every roll call. In License committee insisted upon modifying ordinance prohibiting owners and drivers of taxicabs from using them for immoral purposes; in same committee voted to strike out from cigarette ordinance the provision forbidding the sale of cigarette within 600 feet of a school; in council, voted against ordinance regulating dry cabarets which had been requested by the police department; has shared with Cullerton the office of floor leader for city administration in the past year. In his mellifluous way, quite as bad an alderman as was his predecessor, De Priest. "Twenty-Fourth Annual Preliminary Report of the Municipal Voters' League," published January 30, 1919, pp. 12-13, in Ibid.
[23] Gosnell, *Negro Politicians*, 171-172; and Travis, *An Autobiography of Black Politics*.
[24] Travis, *An Autobiography*, 56.

In 1917 Louis B. Anderson again had the support of the *Chicago Defender*, which reminded readers that even if many believed that Anderson was running unopposed without the active participation of all, the community would be in danger. Danger lurked, readers were reminded, in "overconfidence and corresponding inactivity." Therefore every man and woman in the Second Ward who were "registered and qualified to vote should make it his or her duty to cast their vote."[25] Louis B. Anderson was elected the second black alderman from the Second Ward in 1917 by an overwhelming majority and replaced Oscar DePriest.[26]

In 1918 the *Chicago Defender* agreed with the MVL's dissatisfaction with DePriest. In looking back, the paper actually condemned DePriest more harshly than the MVL. Whereas the MVL reminded its followers of DePriest's "notorious record" of indictments, the *Chicago Defender* judged him as a failure because he failed to live up to his promises and provided whites with a bad example of an African American in politics. The author of an anonymous editorial observed the importance of the impending 1918 aldermanic campaign, pointing out that it was to have far reaching consequences. So in order to inform the general public the weekly began a series of articles, "dealing with all the outstanding facts of the situation and the records of the two candidates for the information of the general public."[27]

Contemporary community leaders recognized the power of the African American vote in the second ward. As their numbers continued to increase and their housing perimeters clearly locked in place, African American newcomers became a political force

---

[25] "Entire Second Ward to Support Anderson Tuesday," *The Chicago Defender*, March 31, 1917.
[26] "Anderson Elected," Ibid., April 7, 1917.
[27] "Observer's Views on the political Outlook in the 2nd Ward," Carefully Surveyed by an observer, Ibid., January 5, 1918.

in the Second Ward. It was no coincidence that the election of a black alderman coincided with the growth of the Black Belt.[28] In 1918 African American leaders regarded the aldermanic election as a determinant of the "future status of the Race" and again felt "the eyes of the city and country" upon the Race. They also regarded Oscar DePriest as a danger and menace because he was associated with political bossism in the "Ward Republican Organization and used his influence on every occasion where he was not a candidate to retard the political progress of the Race." Leaders pointed out that in the eyes of foes African Americans were reputed to be "incapable of self government" so they would have to be careful in the aldermanic election. The aldermanic elections gave the community a chance to prove those foes wrong by "a wise and high grade selection." By practicing this wise and high-grade selection African American voters in Chicago would also "show that the disenfranchisement and political injustice so cruelly fastened upon the Race in the south is unjustified." In terms of the city, they could use this opportunity to "show that we can and will, when in control, use our political power and suffrage in the highest interest and welfare of our community and country." All of this could help "facilitate the opening of new places for our Race in the great industrial and social changes of the times."[29]

The *Chicago Defender* followed up with a series of observations in the next few weeks, that specifically linked World War I, migration from the South, and ward politics. In the eyes of some political observers, ward politics combined with the rapidly changing city population posed a threat for municipal elections.[30] The *Chicago Defender* agreed:

---

[28] Gosnell, *Negro Politicians*, 1-92.
[29] "Observer's Views on the political Outlook in the 2nd Ward," Carefully Surveyed by an observer, in *Chicago Defender*, January 5, 1918.
[30] Munro, *Municipal Administration*, 73.

increasing numbers of voters without the necessary information to make informed decisions was a threat to the entire African American community in Chicago. Authors feared that being new to the city newcomers did not know the events leading up to DePriest's public offenses. "The dangers are alarming," they warned, "because of the large number of strangers who have moved into the ward from other sections of the country." Ignorant of DePriest's record, newcomers might be inclined to believe when they were "told that DePriest is persecuted because he fought the battles of the Race, when as a matter of fact, DePriest sacrificed the interests of the Race for personal gain and by his selfish association and relations brought disgrace upon himself and discredit to his Race."[31] Even though this observer did not have exact figures, he evidently (and rightly) believed that "the population of the Race has so increased as to be decidedly in the majority in the Second Ward. The Race, therefore, is charged with the future political conduct of and general social conditions in the ward." The newspaper considered that old settlers had a "special duty to the new citizens" of Chicago, a duty that required receiving the newcomers as "brothers and friends and to help them establish themselves on a sound basis in the economic, social and political worlds." But the duty further required that "these new citizens be protected from the selfish and ambitious political and other schemes of self-appointed political fakers and pretended leaders." It was also a duty to show the rest of the United States that African Americans could be trusted to succeed in politics.

> DePriest is seeking to injure his Race in particular by playing upon the prejudice of our new citizens and urging them to unite with him in driving our white friends from the party and from the ward... We are about one eighth of the population of the country. In the North, aside from the

[31] "Race People Are Endangered; Observer's Observations Continued," *Chicago Defender*, January 19, 1918.

> Second Ward, we have control of no important political unit. If we are unjust in the Second Ward to the white minority how much more will we suffer in the countless units and states where we are in the minority, when the whites have a concrete example of what the Race does to the whites when it has the political power.[32]

Political Mobilization Around Electing A Mayor

Mayoral elections also provided Chicagoans a chance to politically mobilize locally. Much has been written about how the African American vote in the 1915 mayoral race. African American voters' efforts "gave Thompson the victory in a very close race."[33] Sources also agree that Thompson largely kept the promises he had made the African American voters and he had "rewarded" his constituents with so many appointive positions in the City Hall that the Hall came to be referred to as "Uncle Tom's Cabin" by 1919.[34] Thompson may have been the type of mayor that political reformers loved to hate, but the fact remained that he provided African American constituents unprecedented opportunity in City Hall.

The 1919 mayor campaign further illustrates popular political mobilization of Chicagoans and the importance they placed in the position of mayor. Charles E. Merriam challenged Thompson in 1919. Merriam was a progressive reformer, and a university professor who left a trail of documents from that campaign. These sources are biased in his favor, but they allow us a close look at how Chicago residents involved themselves in their local politics. This is especially important in that it reveals a political culture far

---

[32] "Danger in New Ward Conditions: Observer's Observations Continued" Ibid., February 2, 1918.
[33] (Both in the primary and the general election) Travis, *An Autobiography of Black Politics*, 56. See also Spear, *Black Chicago*, 187; Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 176.
[34] Travis, *An Autobiography of Black Politics*, 55; Gosnell, *Negro Politicians*, 202. For those who are not familiar with it, this was the title of a popular anti-slavery novel.

different from that of Istanbul residents' whose appointed mayor was also their regional governor in the 1950s.

Reinforcing the idea of the municipality as corporation, a pamphlet for William Hale Thompson's campaign for mayor read, "Citizens of Chicago, You are stockholders in the great municipal corporation known as the City of Chicago. Then you are interested in finding out how your affairs have been conducted during the past four years." Since the Mayor was the head of the municipal business, the Public Ledger underlined citizens' right to question and hold him accountable as stockholders. It was residents' responsibility to examine the accounts of the corporation in which they were stockholders.

> The condition of any business must be revealed by an examination of its accounts. The City of Chicago is not organized to make money but to safeguard the lives and property of its citizens, to furnish water, light, schools, police, fire and health protection, to maintain the liberty and happiness of its people, and to promote the general welfare...[35]

All campaign material, including the endorsements, read like a public civic lesson, encouraging political participation and responsibility through raising political consciousness.

As with other groups of citizens in Chicago, African American voters rallied around their candidates for the mayoral election in 1919. Mayor Thompson had been highly popular with the African American residents of Chicago, so Charles E. Merriam faced an uphill battle. While there are fewer sources available on the political response of Chicago's black residents as opposed to its white residents on Merriam, Merriam did have the backing of some, such as the Young Colored Men's Merriam For Mayor Club, the Second Ward Merriam for Mayor Club, and the endorsement of reform activist Ida B.

[35] "The Public Ledger," in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 3.

Wells-Barnett's, whose women's Alpha Suffrage Club had been largely responsible for forcing the election of the second ward's first black alderman. For example, using Wells-Barnett's name, the Young Colored Men's Merriam for Mayor Club sent letters to voters stating that they were appealing to young men as young men, "knowing that the responsibility for the future of our race rests upon our shoulders." Once again, as had been in the aldermanic elections, the future of the race was central to their appeal. "We must cleanse ourselves of the disgraceful reputation which spoils politicians have given us," the club continued. In the "interest of a better Chicago, and therefore better civic conditions for the members of the race to which we belong" the Club recommended Merriam for mayor.[36]

Rumors of his membership in a "segregationist neighborhood association" had cost Merriam African American votes in his previous campaign for mayor in 1911. With the help of the Club, Merriam hoped to erase that memory.[37] The Club publicly announced Merriam's denial of membership in the Hyde Park organization in the same letter, and highlighted Merriam's practice of clean politics, and good government, framing all of it in his principle that he would represent all citizens "without regard to race or creed." The Club believed that "the interest of our race will be best served by a just and honest administration of public affairs" and asked young men to help in Capt. Merriam's campaign.[38]

The Second Ward Merriam for Mayor Club presented reasons not to re-elect Thompson as a way to promote Merriam's candidacy. A typed script read:

---

[36] "Young Colored Men's Merriam For Mayor Club" in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 3. Club officers were: Herman K. Barnett, President. Richard T. Hill, Vice President. Phillip T. Jones, Secretary.
[37] Bukowski, *Big Bill Thompson*, 76-77.
[38] "Young Colored Men's Merriam For Mayor Club" in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 3.

> To the Colored Voter of Chicago: Mayor Thompson claims he owns the Colored vote. Have we gone back to the days that were before the Civil War? No! Do you want the world to know the Colored people of Chicago endorse this man who has disgraced our city all over the world? It is up to us to show that we deserve the respect of all fair-minded people by voting for Captain Charles E. Merriam.[39]

As a republican candidate, Thompson had been likened to Lincoln in 1915.[40]

Wells-Barnett, for her part, emphasized Merriam's expertise in civic affairs. "Our streets and alleys are filthy, our city blackened with smoke, our streetcar system the worst in history, our moral conditions and ideals at the lowest ebb," she pointed out. "We support him because we see that we need a business and civic rebirth and the change can only come by placing a man at the head of affairs who is an expert on the job." As an alderman of multiple terms Merriam knew "men and measures and can deal with every phase of our city's complex life at once without waste of time and money in experimenting." "When a business is failing to pay dividends," she argued, "the stockholders don't put a lawyer, judge or sportsman (however good he is in his line) but utterly ignorant of business or trade conditions on the job. They hire the best business expert they can get to cure business troubles." In matters of race, Ida B. Well's endorsement did not all together separate the needs of the African American voters of Chicago from those of other Chicagoans. She called "the best element of our citizens black and white in the second Ward" to "arise in their might and put an end" to the bad conditions "by going out to work for him and for civic consciousness." Only after she had

[39] In handwriting, it was added, "He will make you proud of Chicago. Second Ward Merriam for Mayor Club, in Ibid. A. L. Williams, Chairman. William Lloyd Jenkins, Secretary.
[40] Gosnell, *Negro Politicians*, 51; Travis, *An Autobiography*, 58.

made the appeal to all residents of the Second Ward did she appeal to her "race throughout the city to work and vote for Chicago's best interests."[41]

Wells-Barnett's focus on a broader civic consciousness—one that extended beyond the African American community itself to a sense of the city as a larger shared community—reflected another dimension to the political culture of Chicago, as well as cities across the country at the time. Her vision was shared broadly by many female reformers and activists in the city. While women's urban political activism has recently started to receive the attention that it deserves,[42] it is worthwhile here to explain briefly their role in the 1919 campaign as a way to further understand the comparison with the relationship of Istanbul residents to their city's political system. Even before Chicago women could vote in their municipal elections they had taken an active role in attempting to influence political decisions.

Merriam represented some of the political aims women espoused that they believed Merriam could best fulfill. The specific political concerns of women varied, but their general, common concern was to make a better Chicago, one that was "just to all its people," one that cared for the needs of all Chicago residents. From expecting him to represent and provide for the poorer districts of the city[43] to believing that he would

---

[41] Ida B. Wells Barnett's endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 5.

[42] Flanagan, *Seeing With Their Hearts*; Daphne Spain, *How Women Saved the City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870-1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

[43] Merriam's Republican Party candidacy for mayor made Mrs. Raymond (Margaret Dreier) Robins, a member of both the National Woman's Republican Committee and Merriam for Mayor Campaign Committee, a likely supporter. Her reasons for supporting Merriam included living in the "poorer sections." As someone who did, she could testify to "how intimately politics enters our homes and how it helps or hinders the health and welfare and happiness of the people." She listed water, milk, education, schools and parks and playgrounds for children, clean streets and alleys, lighted streets, electricity and gas, hot air in the homes, police protection and transportation service "with seats," hospitals as "simple human needs" that depended "upon the city administration." Because the residents of the poorer sections of Chicago lacked the private means to secure for themselves and children "decent social conditions of life," it was more pertinent to them who became mayor and that the city administration did not fail. They trusted Merriam."

finally solve Chicago's garbage and sanitation problems,[44] from voting for Merriam because of their disillusionment with Mayor Thompson to seeing him as civically superior in questions of public policy, women organized to campaign for Merriam.

Subsequently, it is no surprise that Jane Addams, the founder of Hull House Settlement House and social and political activist, and her colleague Mary McDowell endorsed Merriam. His actual practical experience in city administration after eight years as alderman, having served "continuously on important committees of the common council" coupled with his degree in "Municipal Science" gave Merriam the mastery of the working conditions of the municipal administration that political reformers regarded so highly. Addams believed that the election of Merriam as mayor would carry Chicago as a "pioneer in the scientific administration of American cities." Addams regarded Chicago's "public-spirited citizenship, her boundless resources, her many reform and civic organizations" highly and believed as mayor Merriam would enhance all of Chicago's good qualities.[45] Drawing on London's opposing political groups that united to have a "cleaner, sweeter, and more human London" as an example, Mary McDowell,

---

Mrs. Raymond Robins' endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, February 18, 1919, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 5.

[44] See also the endorsement from Mrs. Ella S. Stewart, of the 6th ward, who for many years served as the president of the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association. "Garbage has been more mixed up in politics than almost anything else," she pointed out, "and when one mentions the dirty pool of politics I always think of the garbage situation, and realize that is one place where we women do have to mix in if we are ever going to get sanitary conditions..." Mrs. Ella S. Stewart's endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, February 18, 1919, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 5. See also Flanagan, *Seeing With their Hearts*, 216. On the garbage issue see Miss Amelia Sears's endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 5. "Chicago women are not interested in who gets the city jobs, but in the kind of public service the next mayor can render to the city of Chicago. They want schools redeemed from the blight of political spoilsmen, they want streets safe from crooks and holdups and cleaned of the accumulations of dirt and rubbish left by a political street department. The old time bosses who sit in back rooms and trade jobs for the benefit of their respective machines will be surprised when the votes are counted on February 25th." Sears was a member of the Women's Campaign Committee for Charles Merriam for mayor in 1919. See Flanagan, *Seeing With their Hearts*, 208.

[45] Jane Addams' endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 5.

rallied for Chicago to do the same. This meant Chicago women would have to unite and vote for Merriam, the "loyal leader of the great democratic movement."[46]

Harriet E. Vittum's disappointment with Thompson drove her to rally for Merriam. Women, who wanted to "reclaim Chicago" and bring a "better day" for the city, she claimed, considered Merriam as the "best fit to translate the [Women's Municipal] Platform into a better Chicago, and the only man whose record measure plank by plank with the Platform is a guarantee that he will so translate it," as Merriam's MVL record testified. Merriam "led the fight and always voted for all public measures including garbage collection and disposal," and he also always voted to enforce the housing code without discrimination, which were the precise public policy questions that women wished to see addressed.[47]

Stressing that they would be empowered to make a positive change by organizing, a Committee of 100 women from opposing party affiliations, well known in civic work, in business, in the professions, in education, in social service, and in philanthropy, appealed to the women of Chicago to vote for Merriam.[48] They underlined that women voters constituted "the great reserve army of good government in Chicago," and that they

---

[46] Miss Mary McDowell's endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, February 17, 1919, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 5. See also Flanagan, *Seeing With their Hearts*, 207

[47] Harriet E. Vittum's endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 5. In explaining her stance against Thompson, she told the story of the Women's Municipal Platform for Chicago. Three years previously, thousands of women had met to protest "against certain abuse in the City Government for which they believed the city administration (Thompson Administration) responsible. They were women who had for years studied the civic life of Chicago and had high ideals of public service." The Women's Municipal Platform for Chicago resulted from this protest meeting as women wanted more than just protesting: they wanted to suggest remedies. If the administration undertook their suggestions, these women "offered to cooperate in any way with the administrator." These women then felt slighted when "Mayor Thompson's answer to this offer of platform and of service was to the effect of that if the women of Chicago wanted something to do they might reclaim the wasteland along the drainage canal." Furthermore, the mayor had broken pre-election promises. "The women have not forgotten this nor have they forgotten the Mayor's many pre-election promises very promptly broken after he became Mayor," Vittum concluded. Vittum was one of the women in the Women's Campaign Committee for Charles Merriam for mayor in 1919. See Flanagan, *Seeing With their Hearts*, 209.

[48] Flanagan, *Seeing With their Hearts*, 150.

wanted to make a better Chicago, one that was "just to all its people, a city which concerns itself with endless problems of right municipal housekeeping, a city which cares for the needs of the average man and woman and for the child of every family." Furthermore the women were yearning to "use the new power which suffrage has brought to them in the building of a fair Chicago."[49] This group of women was joined by The Think For Yourself Club, a third ward women's organization active in municipal affairs, who realized that women's strength in unity of numbers would "secure relief from the deplorable conditions of the last four years" if women made a "concerted effort in favor of one candidate." They rallied around Merriam's candidacy because embodied the spirit of their club motto: "non partisan, independent, but not neutral."[50]

Merriam lost the election, but the campaign epitomizes the nature of local politics. There were those Chicagoans whose interest in local politics was restricted to the narrow desire to advance their own gain; there were other groups whose local political activism centered around better government, and a more efficient city which addressed the city as a whole and had the well being of all citizens in mind. But in both cases, Chicago residents believed that their political activity entitled them to expect certain services from their elected officials. These Chicagoans' political participation stemmed from and raised further consciousness of the city as a community. The contents of the Merriam endorsements also highlight important differences between Chicagoans' and Istanbulites' approach to their municipality. Chicago voters were politically involved. They studied

---

[49] A Committee of 100 women's endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 7. These women were "anti-Thompson women... Progressive Republicans including Addams, Vittum, McDowell, Breckinridge... also Amelia Sears..." See Flanagan, *Seeing With Their Hearts*, 150.
[50] The Think For Yourself Club's endorsement of Merriam for Mayor, in Merriam Papers, Box 75 Folder 7. Signed by: Executive Committee: Mrs. Laura Lee Randall, Mrs. E. L. Murfey, Mrs. Frances C. Temple, Miss Ada L. Fletcher, Mrs. John R. Bensley, Miss Gertrude Nichols. See Flanagan, *Seeing With Their Hearts*, 158.

their candidates, and guided other voters to sway their votes towards the candidates they favored. Istanbul residents were given the right to vote but were not expected to be politically involved. Chicagoans united to direct their city government to do "for" them; Istanbulites did not have much pull to change political practices. They were, however, able to make demands on their local government regarding their daily lives and living conditions.

Istanbul

The roots of this local political ambiguity in Istanbul can be traced to the changing national political climate in Turkey. In the Ottoman Empire, Istanbul residents were subjects of the Empire.[51] The imperial Istanbul did not have a separate municipal body, but municipal functions, along with judicial, civil and religious matters were combined in the body of the kadı (qadi or kadhi). The kadı had various assistants who aided in the carrying out of different functions. Regulating basic consumer goods prices was one of the central concerns of the Ottoman administration. Officials directed the bazaars, regulated weights and measures, inspected production sites and stores. Following structural and functional reforms, these functions were passed on to different local administrative bodies throughout the first half of the 19th century, but they remained central to each. The various functions of local administration were not combined under one central body until the middle of the 19th century.[52]

---

[51] See Rustow

[52] Many of the local functions were carried out by the Kadılık, Ihtisab, Vakıf, Lonca (Artisans and Merchants Guilds), and Community Chests. See Bilal Eryılmaz, "Osmanlı Yerel Yönetiminde Istanbul Şehremaneti," 331-333; Ilber Ortaylı, "Osmanlı Belediyeleri ve Kent Hizmetleri," 396; and Davut Dursun, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Yerel Yönetim Anlayışı," 15, in *Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehremaneti ve Yerel Yönetimler* (Istanbul: Ilke Yayınları, 1996).

As a result of increasing Ottoman social and economic intercourse with Europe, and the presence of Westerners in certain parts of Istanbul, demands for Western styles of municipal organization and services grew. Consequently, as part of the larger institutional changes brought on by Tanzimat reforms and by the turn to "modernize" and "Westernize," the Şehremaneti (municipality) was established to undertake the provision of necessary goods, price regulation and inspections, city cleaning, and collection of taxes. This "local government" organization had a mayor, whom the Sublime Porte appointed, and a Council, the members of which were appointed from among the notables and prominent esnaf (small retailers). Including the Şehremini (Mayor) and his two assistants, the Council consisted of fifteen people.[53]

These initial (1854-1855) efforts failed to live up to expectations, but the administration was determined to establish a Westernized institution in Istanbul. Subsequently they experimented on a smaller scale. Taking the "Sixieme Arrondissment" of Paris as an example, officials named one of the first districts "Altıncı Belediye Dairesi" in the Beyoğlu-Galata district. This district was chosen because, as home to non-Muslims, it was already a window into the West socially and culturally. Altıncı Belediye Dairesi had a Council made up of 12 members, which included 4 foreigners and the doctor, engineer, and architect of the Altıncı Belediye Dairesi. Members were all property holders in the district and had lived in the vicinity for over a decade. They were elected by the Porte and appointed by the Sultan. Altıncı Belediye Dairesi, like the Kadı and his assistants and the Şehremaneti before it, regulated prices, weights and measures.

[53] Tanzimat period corresponds to the administrative reforms of the years 1839-1876. This period was followed by the First and Second Constitutional Monarchy periods 1876-1908, and 1908. See Eryılmaz, 334; Dursun, 15. Dursun argued that this local government bore no resemblance to any form of real local government since none of the officials were elected—denial of "the people's" participation in the government of their city continued.

In 1868 the Şehremaneti was reorganized and its Council became an official decision making and consultative organ composed of six members appointed by the central government. Throughout the 19th century price regulation and inspections remained central, and local government positions remained appointed.[54]

Through the succeeding political changes of the early 20th century the municipality became increasingly centralist, etatist, and authoritative even if elected Councils were instituted in the place of appointed ones. Further, starting with the Tanzimat period, the centralist turn removed all of the individual initiative from the people.[55] The modernization process that had been initiated during the Ottoman Empire's last century did not end when the Empire fell. Atatürk and his government took over and reinstituted modernization goals that stood for "westernization of institutions and of social features of the Republic." As Ulaş Bayraktar argued, Ataürk's government had initially planned to provide every opportunity for local governments to become democratic institutions. But when in the first few years of the new government it became clear that the "society did not seem to be quite encouraging these reform projects," the ruling elite then changed their populist ideals to long-term goals and for the time being concentrated on educating and modernizing the people. The people were "not able to distinguish its real interests and needs, due to the fact of being subjected for centuries to the absolute authority of Sultans." These concerns were poured into the universal law for

[54] Eryılmaz, "Osmanlı Yerel Yönetiminde Istanbul Şehremaneti," 335-336, 344.
[55] Eryılmaz, "Osmanlı Yerel Yönetiminde Istanbul Şehremaneti," 348-350; Dursun, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Yerel Yönetim Anlayışı," 15; and Recep Yazıcıoğlu, "Demokratik Katılım ve Yeniden Yapılanma," in *Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze*, 231-244.

municipalities in 1930, which, Bayraktar showed, made the municipality "an extension of the central government's responsibility for carrying out local public services."[56]

Even if the 1930 Municipal Law came soon after the establishment of "new" republican government, Hamza Al reminds us, the republic inherited a somewhat organized and institutionalized municipal government with basic legal arrangements.[57] Throughout the first two decades of the new republic, both national and local governments were imbued with the mission to reconstruct the populace. In this light, the officials of the new republic approached the local government and urban problems with an eye to the assimilation of republican ideals and spreading and protecting those ideals.[58] "The municipal framework was designed as an instrument of the national modernization process," Bayraktar agrees. This was established by placing local affairs under the direct supervision of the center, and by obliging the use of local resources in large scale public investments such as industrial development, or for building and improving transportation and communication infrastructure.[59]

The 1930 law, commonly referred to as Law Number 1580, itemized the duties of the municipal government. These were meeting basic communal needs such as provision and upkeep of urban infrastructure and basic urban services, etc. Most of these were duties of all municipalities across the nation, but the law also allowed for some additional powers that were not required but were left up to individual municipality's decision such as housing. Further, there were some exceptions to the universality of the law: Istanbul

---

[56] Bayraktar, "Turkish Municipalities," paragraphs 7-17.
[57] Hamza Al, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Belediyeciliğinin Tarihsel Gelişimi," in *Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze*, 21-22.
[58] Dursun, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Yerel Yönetim Anlayışı," 19-20
[59] Bayraktar, "Turkish Municipalities," paragraph 17.

and Ankara were treated a little differently in certain matters. Istanbul's governor was to also be Istanbul's mayor—hence appointed by the center.[60]

In the period under study here, the 1950s, Turkey had switched from a single party political system to a multiparty political system. Al argued that on the municipal level, changes in the national political system did not bring any changes to the regulations on municipalities, but that competition between political parties made them more sensitive to local needs. In this way, municipal problems began to receive increasing attention in the programs of the political parties. As many municipalities were transferred from the Republican Party to Democratic Party the main change revolved around no longer seeking to transform the populace but rather to have the municipality act in the direction of popular demand. Yet increased attention to local matters failed to bring about local democracy since many mayors were still appointed.[61]

Popular demand in 1950s Istanbul seems to have had a lot to do with regulating, standardizing and inspecting prices of foodstuffs. If Istanbul residents were unable to or did not actively participate in the political process of their local government, they were able to follow their municipality's actions in price controls over fruits and vegetables, bread, and meat. F. K. Gökay, the mayor/governor of Istanbul 1949-1957, ensured that Istanbul residents could follow every step of his administration and execution by using local newspapers as the public announcement mechanism of his station. Gökay personally worked with the newspapers and set up departments/sections within the municipality to work specifically with the media. He not only provided information on the undertakings of the municipality for the newspapers but he also followed the needs

---

[60] Al, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Belediyeciliğinin Tarihsel Gelişimi," in *Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze*, 24-25.
[61] Ibid., 33-36.

and wishes of the residents through what the newspapers published (such as interviews with residents, columns, editorials, etc.).[62] The Press thus became the conduit between the people and their government, publishing government reports on the one hand and on the other hand conducting and publishing interviews with residents of different sections of the city, which revealed that residents across the city suffered the lack of essential services communally. In different series the *Istanbul Ekspres* informed its readers about the activities of the city council and the municipality, discussed city-wide problems throughout 1952, interviewed and introduced Istanbul residents in different parts, noted their contributions to the city, and registered their expectations from the officials as well as their hopes for a more efficiently working city.

The news involving municipal decisions sometimes made front page news, but columns under "Şehir-Radyo-Telefon-Telgraf" ("City-Radio-Telephone- Wire"), and "Şehir Meclisi Istanbul'un Hizmetinde" ("The City Council at Istanbul's Service, 1952-1953) sections contained daily snippets. For example the columns under the "Şehir-Radyo-Telefon-Telgraf" section covered the miscellaneous activities of the municipality, with a special emphasis on the inspections. The prices of foodstuffs varied greatly across the city daily and, as an extension of the centuries long practice of regulating prices and performing inspections, the governor/mayor worked to standardize and regulate prices through these inspections. In the early 1950s Gökay made price checks inspections a priority.

The municipality daily sent out unannounced inspection teams all over the city. To assure that the inspections actually worked and that fruit and vegetable sellers were

---

[62] Rakım Ziyaoğlu, *Istanbul Kadıları-Şehreminleri-Belediye Reisleri ve Partiler Tarihi, 1453-1971* (Istanbul: Ismail Akgün Matbaası, 1971), 400.

not forewarned, the municipality even gave the inspection teams their assignment in officially sealed envelopes right before setting out to make inspections, any time of the day or night.[63] A newspaper reporter attested to the secrecy of inspections campaign. "To make the campaign more effective," he pointed out, "the governor/ mayor delivered the assignments to the team leader in sealed envelopes and the inspectors opened their envelopes at the same time," to be executed immediately.[64] Teams of inspectors would storm into a district and check prices and dole out tickets and fines. In the 1952-1953 year there were almost daily accounts of inspections that took place in various districts of the city. Hence the reference to them as "yıldırım ekipler" or "thunderbolt (lightning) troops," a tribute to the suddenness of the inspections and the swiftness of execution.[65]

The Turkish Republic recognized that proper nutrition was the best defense against disease, and that the people were the most important asset of the republic. Healthier people meant a wealthier nation.[66] The actions they took were quite different than those taken in Chicago: Chicago citizens wanted a healthy city and worked from the bottom up; Turkish government wanted healthy people and worked top down. In this, municipal officials gave much attention to regulating markets: they responded to the daily needs of residents across Istanbul who joined in the universal cry for price and quality checks of basic foodstuffs. Municipal inspectors worked to even out the differences between the wholesale (toptan) and retail (perakende) prices. A Bureau within the body of the municipality began work on the matter under the leadership of the governor/ mayor. The inspectors, removed from the service of the offices of the Kaymakam, would

---

[63] "Vali Gökay Istanbul şehrinin iktisadi durumunu Istanbul Ekspres'e açıkladı" *Istanbul Ekspres*, 24 Mayıs 1953.
[64] "Yıldırım ekip—belediye ve kontroller...Dikkat Yildirim Ekip Geliyor!" *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1952- 1953.
[65] "Yıldırım ekipleri bütün şehri baştan başa taradı" *Istanbul Ekspres*, 10 July 1955.
[66] Yıldırım, "Eski Istanbul'da Gıda Üretimi ve Satışı," *Istanbul*, 65.

be at the municipality's service from then on and they would be supplemented with motorcycle teams for speedier, more efficient, inspections.[67] The issue of foodstuffs affected the people's daily existence. Prices of all kinds of foodstuffs often fluctuated. There were many artificial, false (suni) shortages of goods. The quality of these goods was often suspect. As the municipality tried to regulate/standardize prices in the next few years a struggle ensued between the kabzımal (middle man), the esnaf (small scale retailers), the bakkal (small grocer) and the peddlers.

Small scale retailers blamed the middle men for the rising prices because the retailers could not but pass on some of their expense to consumers when the middle men charged high for the produce. Retailers requested that the municipality help them deal with the wholesalers more effectively rather than breathing down the retailers' back all the time.[68] Retailers argued that they were being unfairly singled out since the municipality's audits continually put them under the microscope but overlooked others like the bakkal (small grocery store owner), who were charging arbitrary prices for many different goods. An esnaf named Kemal argued that the lack of fixed prices for essential foodstuffs made some people "millionaires selling cotton, rice, paper, etc." Kemal continued, "if inspections are necessary in this county, then let inspections begin on these more essential goods." Others agreed that fixed prices and inspections should apply evenly across the spectrum of goods or be removed altogether.[69]

---

[67] "Belediye, fiat murakebe işlerine hız veriyor," *Hürriyet*, 6 June 1950.
[68] "Sebze ve Meyveci esnaf Belediyeden şikayet ediyor," Ibid., 7 August 1950.
[69] "If cotton prices go all the way up to seven, eight liras the government does not seem to care. If a kilo of onion goes from 5 kuruş to 50, the government does not seem to care. But if we dare charge 6 kuruş for parsley then we are required to provide receipts. Meanwhile the bakkal sells rice, oils, beans, etc. at arbitrary prices." "Meyva ve sebzeciler dün heyecanlı kongre yaptılar," Ibid., 19 February 1951.

The truth was kabzımal did deserve a lot of the blame: both for the fluctuation in prices and "shortages" of produce. The kabzımal argued that they raised prices for the producers' sake and that it was their duty to help economic development of the nation by increasing the value of the producers' goods. [70] They said that their prices were determined by the supply and demand mechanism, which somehow always worked to the benefit of the kabzımal, keeping the prices high. Wholesalers often did this by failing to provide fresh produce unless all the produce from the day before had been sold. In the absence of an efficient overseeing mechanism, the kabzımal had a lot of power over the Hal (covered wholesale food market): they determined the freshness of the produce, its price and they could cause a produce shortage at will.[71]

In the face of increasing protests from the people the municipality sped up and increased the number of inspections, and announced that it would reopen ten open bazaars across Istanbul to ensure that the people could easily and inexpensively buy fresh fruits and vegetables. Additionally, the municipality encouraged all sellers to sell their produce at these and other bazaars.[72] To eliminate any fraudulence at the market place, the municipality even placed a scale (set by the municipality itself) and a controller at bazaars, enabling the people to self-inspect weights and measures, and deal with questionable cases on the spot.[73]

Summer of 1952 brought more inspection teams to appease the almost unanimous wave of complaints against the fruits and vegetables' prices across the city. Prices had skyrocketed once again, and the offices of the governor/ mayor dispatched inspection

---

[70] "Sebze fiatı neden pahalı?" *Istanbul Ekspres*, 30 July 1952.
[71] Ahmet Kami Suveren, "Hal'in halini dün sabah seyrettik," Ibid., 10 January 1953.
[72] "Yeniden 10 Pazar yeri kurulacak," *Hürriyet*, 11 January 1951.
[73] "Pazar yerlerinde Belediye terazisi," Ibid., 13 January 1951.

teams all over the city, beginning with Fatih, Beyoğlu, Beşiktaş, and Eminönü districts. Inspectors identified the sellers whose goods were overpriced and wrote police reports on the spot. Additionally, the municipality decided to open some smaller local wholesale markets to ensure that prices would be more affordable for the people. The prices at these local wholesale markets would be slightly less than the actual Hal.[74]

Even as the municipality took the aforementioned measures, residents complained. A resident of Üsküdar pointed out that the prices of goods were very arbitrary in the bazaar and requested some form of control.[75] Another resident from Kadıköy complained about the peddlers' prices. Because this resident's street was relatively distant from bakkal and the bazaar, and because there was no control peddlers charged whatever they thought fit for the goods. Kadıköy prices were always higher than the rest of Istanbul anyway, so residents requested better price controls from the municipality.[76] An Aksaray resident pointed out that prices varied greatly in the marketplace (Pazar yeri) so much so that things were priced differently within 15 meters of each other.[77] Another resident of Kadıköy argued that the bakkal charged arbitrary prices.[78] A gardner in Beşiktaş pointed out that Dere sokağı was mainly a working class street and consisted of poor wage earners like himself who had difficulty affording the prices set by the neighborhood bakkal. He requested the newspaper's help in drawing the government's attention to the prices on his street.[79]

---

[74] "Sebze ve meyvalar ateş pahasına," *Hürriyet*, 22 June 1952.
[75] Gani Doğan Göksel, "Hergün bir Istanbullunun on derdi," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 15 July 1952.
[76] "Yaverbey Sokağı Sakinleri, Kadıköy. Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." Ibid., 28 July 1952.
[77] "Bir Memur, Hergün Bir Istanbulllunun 10 Derdi..." Ibid., 31 July 1952.
[78] Fulya Merey, Kadıköy "Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." Ibid., 4 August 1952.
[79] Ibrahim Kolgur, Balmumcu Dere Sokak Beşiktaş "Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." *Istanbul Ekspres*, August 1952. See also Ibid., 12 August 1952.

The HAL on one side of the Haliç (The Golden Horn) was a huge organization made up of directors, sanitary workers, guards, and porters. It worked non-stop from 4 in the morning until late at night. And wholesalers had many tricks. The men who transferred the produce from containers to boxes, for example, placed the worst of the produce at the bottom, and the best on top. In his haste the buyer, usually a manav (local green-grocer), would break top corner of the container to inspect the produce and would proceed with the purchase unawares.[80] But municipal authorities knew all the tricks played by the wholesalers and took measures that protect buyers. An article in the Hal regulations stated that "For all goods in containers it is essential that the top and bottom are of the same quality. It is compulsory for the wholesaler and commissioner alike to show the bottom of the container to the buyer except for goods that might spoil as a result of contact such as cherries, strawberries, grapes, peaches and pears." Buyers had the right to petition and demand their money back within 24 hours if and when the goods on the bottom turned out to be of lesser quality than the goods on top.[81]

When it became increasingly evident that the Hal was not functioning to the satisfaction of the people, unable to control the market, the municipality opened tanzim satış mağazaları (sale of foodstuffs directly by the municipality or indirectly through a firm awarded a contract by a municipality). Recognizing the need for providing a means for the producer to sell his own goods directly, without the meddling of the middlemen, the municipality opened large public stores throughout the city for the sale of fruits

[80] Ahmet Kami Suveren, "Halin halini dün sabah seyrettik," Ibid., 10 January 1953. A reader from the Hal area pointed out that the Hal lacked a public restroom. Burada kalabalık bir işçi kütlesi çalışmaktadır. Hale bir doktor da temini lazımdır. Belediyenin bu arzumuzu bilhassa dikkate almasını rica ederiz. Bir doktor hale iki bakımdan faydalı olacaktır. Bunlardan biri satılan malların sihhi muayenesi diğeri de burada çalışan birçok amele arkadaşın sıhhat meselesidir... Güvercinlerin halk ve malların üzerlerine pislemelerinin önliyecek tedbirler alınamaz mı?" See "Haldeki bir okuyucumuz konuşuyor. Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." Ibid., August 1952.

[81] "954/257 Umumi Meclis Kararı," *Meclis Karar Defteri* 1954.

purchased directly from the producer by the municipality, reducing the exchange of good from four times to one.[82] Within one month, one reporter confirmed that the direct sale of goods reduced prices immediately, and rejoiced in the happiness of the people.[83] A columnist attested to what he called the 90 percent success rate of the tanzim satış practice.[84] Perhaps because even the tanzim satış practice did not take root in all parts of the city at once, perhaps because the fear of prices lingered in people's memory, a cartoon published in July is interesting. In the cartoon a man is viewing an art exhibition. Next to the paintings there is a sign that reads "Do not touch!" The three paintings consist of fruits and vegetables, meat and bread.[85] This cartoon aside, for the rest of June and July municipal inspections, and penalties dominated city news.

Towards the end of summer 1953 the Migro Company of Switzerland expressed interest in operating the tanzim satış facilities by submitting a proposal package made up of brochures and photos. They proposed both stationary and mobile distribution ideas. Mobile distribution would be accomplished via vehicles that would drive to districts in urgent situations and serve as alternative lower cost sale centers in districts with higher prices. It was hoped that mobile distribution alone would regulate and help stabilize prices citywide. In Switzerland Migro established a formula in which the company could reduce prices by buying the goods directly from the producers, eliminating the middleman.[86] The proposal appears to have completed the municipality's plans, the first

---

[82] "Vali Şehrin iktisadi durumunu Istanbul Ekspres'e açıkladı," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 24 May 1953.
[83] Cihat Dilerge, "Muhtekir Esnaf Hezimete Uğradı," Ibid., 25 June 1953.
[84] Selahattin Karayavuz, "Yine Tanzim Satışları," Ibid., 25 June 1953. The columnist deducted the 10 percent because the goods did not arrive until after 9:00 a.m.
[85] "Yazısız," *Akbaba* No. 69, 9 July 1953.
[86] "Isviçre'nin Migro Firması şehrimizde tanzim satış mağazaları kurmak istiyor," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 29 September 1953.

steps for the future operation taken. After a winter marked by fluctuating prices,[87] Migro was ready to carry out the operations.[88]

Istanbul Ekspres joins inspections

Municipality could boast over a thousand inspections in a week, these "busts" and "raids" were soon referred to as a "war," the scale and scope of inspections grew, and efforts yielded some positive results.[89] In the closing days of 1952 *Istanbul Ekspres* joined the inspection of foodstuffs.[90] The first headline drew readers' attention to the contents of various goods. "What does the Istanbulite eat? What does the Istanbulite drink?" the newspaper asked, "only Allah and the salespersons know" came the answer. The newspaper purchased a bottle of water and sent it to the lab. The lab report that was also submitted to the municipality revealed it all! The Istanbulite was in a tragic state. "Residents know not what's in their drinks or foodstuffs, oil, bread, meat, water, milk! It

---

[87] In February 1954 prices were on the rise again, due partly at least to weather conditions (cold and snow). The tone of protest was changing: Prices were becoming "unacceptable." Prices also varied greatly from district to district. A comparison between Aksaray, considered the least expensive of districts, and Maçka revealed that prices in Aksaray were about 20 percent less than in Maçka: meat in Aksaray sold for 390 kurus, whereas the same meat sold for 450 kuruş in Maçka. Leak cost 40-50 kuruş in Aksaray and 60-65 kuruş in Maçka. Cabbage sold for 40-50 kuruş in Aksaray and 65-70 in Maçka. Spinach cost 70-80 kuruş in Aksaray and 100-110 in Maçka. "Gıda maddelerinin fiatları durmadan yükseliyor," *Hürriyet*, 7 February 1954.

[88] A flurry of activity followed. A major question involved how the company would operate in Istanbul. According to the initial reports to the press twenty two Turkish businessmen participated in the Türk Migro Anonim Şirketi (Joint Stock Company) and pooled one million lira capital for the operation. The Turkish government set aside a five-ten million lira credit line in the Ziraat Bankası (Government Bank) for the company's start-up expenses. The twenty two business men involved in the founding of the Company resolved to keep the development and progress of the Company above everything else, restricting their profit at no more than 10 percent. "Teşkilat nasıl çalışacak?" *Istanbul Ekspres*, July 1954. The president of the company, Duttweiler, was scheduled to arrive following the arrival of the vice president Hohstrasser.

[89] The municipality boasted inspections over 1,810 places in a week. *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1952. "Kadınlar Pazarına Dün Baskın Yapıldı," and "Kaçak et! Iki kasap basıldı" *Istanbul Ekspres*, Aralık 1952; and "Eminönü mıntıkasında dünkü ani kontüroller. Muhtekir esnafa karşı açılan savaş devam ediyor." *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1952. The inspections undertaken after the "gıda maddeleri nizamnamesi" (regulation of the foodstuffs) went into effect yielded positive results: the inspections had cut fraudulence ("hile" tricks?) by half in one year, and sanitized foodstuffs "the people" consumed. *Istanbul Ekspres*, Summer 1952.

[90] See Nuran Yıldırım, "Eski Istanbul'da Gıda Üretimi ve Satışı," *Istanbul*, 64-65, for more detailed information on the precautions dating back to the 19th century.

is all impure!"[91] Following the revelation about the contents of the water, a Councilman told the newspaper that, "yes, a new law has passed regarding the foodstuffs..." but what good was it? He continued, "if the lab work takes six months, then the seller will continue selling the offensive goods... and then... and then if the issue is taken to court after the report... then it takes another two years..." What needed to be done to ensure the quality and sanitation of the foodstuffs sold in the city was to come up with a law that did not take a long time to execute.[92] Try as they did to regulate certain things neither the newspaper nor the municipality completely eradicated the shame of the bottled water. Two and a half years later, the bottled water issue made another disgraceful appearance in headlines. "The loathsome state of the bottled water" the headline screamed. "Our stomachs are not garbage cans!" the story resounded the reaction of the reader that provided the bottle of water this time. The bottle contained sand, stones and some other unidentified particles.[93]

While the authorities busily reported their plans to improve conditions regarding water, water shortage continued in various districts of the city. In the summer of 1953, the newspaper continued its reports on water shortage. For example, the Solaksinan neighborhood went without water for two whole months in Üsküdar. Especially Gümüşarayıcı street suffered greatly. The story began with this particular area but

---

[91] "Kapalı Şişede Terkos Suyu," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 10 December 1952.
[92] "Gıda maddelerini Istanbul Ekspreste Kontrol ediyor," Ibid., December 1952.
[93] Ibid., July 1955. The problem of the "Bottled water" was far from being the only issue related to water. After the initial report on the bottled water in December 1952, the newspaper asked "What will the Water Management (Sular idaresi) do in the next four years?" A government report identified certain areas that needed attention: the need to improve the water pipes that brought water from Terkos pools (37 milyon sarfı ile terkos havuzlarından su getiren boruların islahı), the need to build storage facilities, to make additions to the facilities in the Anatolian side, and to supply areas without water. 37 million lira was already put aside for these activities. Additionally, water would be provided in areas where there are no water lines; areas such as Rami, Edirnekapı and Topkapı and a new water tower (reserve) would be built in Büyükada. "Sular Idaresi," Ibid., 25 December 1952.

pointed out that water shortage was a real cause of suffering in various districts of the city, especially in the summer. Unfortunately readers felt like all complaints went unheard and all petitions unresolved. The story meant to draw the attention of the Management of Water Works (Sular Idaresi) which kept announcing through the daily newspapers that Üsküdar would have running water. Üsküdar residents continued to wonder when they would finally have water.[94] In the summer of 1954 many districts were still without water. One cartoon displayed two men viewing a piece of art, discussing its high price. "Why is it so expensive?" one of the man asked. The other answered, "because it is in water color. That's why!"[95] Another cartoon depicted the Sular Idaresi at work. All the employees sat around at their desks with their palms pointed upwards suggesting they were communally praying. The caption read: "Dear God, Let us hope that you bestow rain upon us!"[96]

Meanwhile reports of price fluctuations and arbitrary pricing remained in the headlines. Gökay was determined to punish profiteers severely. He asked for the people's cooperation in notifying the governor of such profiteering persons in their vicinity.[97] Soon the summer would come to an end amidst expectations that the Migro activities would create competition, which it was hoped would lead to a price drop by about 20-30 percent.[98]

The fruit and vegetable story ended somewhat happily for the people. But fruits and vegetables were far from being the only story that made headlines regarding

---

[94] "Bir Mahalle Halkı 2 aydır susuz kaldı," *Istanbul Ekspres*, August 1953.
[95] "Sulu Boya Tablo: 750 TL" *Akbaba* No 125, 5 August 1954.
[96] "Sular Idaresi Çalışıyor," Ibid., No 129, 2 September 1954.
[97] Tomatoes could be 150 kuruş one day and 50 kuruş in "tanzim satış yerleri" the next day. Likewise lemons that cost 40 kuruş one day would be reduced to 15, and eggplants that brought in 75 kuruş one day would cost 30 the next day. "Yüksek sebze fiyatları dün düşürüldü," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 7 July 1954.
[98] "Migro çalışmaları rekabet yaratacak," Ibid., August 1954.

foodstuffs in the early 1950s. The price of bread had also been very much on the minds of residents in early April 1950. *Hürriyet* followed it closely every step of the way. The deliberations of the Standing Committee (Daimi Encümen) regarding the price of the new bread created a shortage, causing citizens to wait in line in vain.[99] While deliberations continued on the weight, quality and price of bread Hürriyet was hopeful that bread would taste better and cost less.[100] After the Municipal Directorate of Economy set new standards for bread loaves,[101] the "francala" loaf came into being: heavier, tastier, and pricier.[102]

For years, complaints poured in from many different parts of the city and from various different groups of people. For example a group of patients at the "Heybeliada Sanatoryum" went to the offices of *Hürriyet* and registered a complaint about the quality of the bread served at the Sanatorium.[103] As residents continued to register complaints about bread, the municipality began inspections. A team of inspectors (put together by the Kaymakam of Beyoğlu, Hayrettin Nakiboğlu) raided Beyoğlu bakeries in the middle

---

[99] In order to meet the bread shortage, the municipality met with the bakers. Bakers requested permission to make bigger loaves and adjust the prices accordingly, a request with which the municipality disagreed. "Yeni ekmek bugün çıkıyor," *Hürriyet*, 5 April 1950; "Ekmek darlığı devam ediyor," *Hürriyet*, 8 April. 1950; and "Ekmek darlığını önlemek için esaslı tedbirler lazım," *Hürriyet*, 9 April 1950.

[100] Bakers would now bake 900 gram bread loaves made of better quality flour and sell the loaves for 30 kuruş instead of the 22 kuruş charged for the 570 gram loaves. "Ekmek hem ucuzluyor, hem de beyazlaşıyor," *Hürriyet*, 8 July 1950.

[101] They established that the new bread could weigh 600 grams and sell at 20 kuruş a loaf. "Yeni tip ekmeğin çıkarılması gecikiyor," *Hürriyet*, 10 July 1950. Four days later new loaves weighed 900 grams and sold for 30 kuruş. "Yeni tip ekmek çıktı," Ibid., 14 July 1950.

[102] When it first came out "Francala" was a kind of status symbol. Not everyone could afford it. "Ekmek ve francala," Ibid., 21 July 1950. Price and weights regulations led to new concerns on the part of bakers. For example, bakers registered a complaint about the flour sacks used in the transfer of flour. According to city regulations a sack was to be used at most ten times, yet the mills used each sack about 60-70 times. Apparently sacks used in the transfer of flour from the mills to the bakeries were patched one too many times, which resulted in a loss of 600-1000 grams a 72 kilo sack. Bakers requested from the Municipality that it ensure the use of new sacks (or patch free sacks) by the mills. If the mill owners did not comply then bakers requested the payment of their losses. Losses were estimated at 15-20 kuruş a sack. Bakers requested this amount to be deducted from the price of flour. "Un çuvalları hakkında fırıncıların müracatı," Ibid., 13 May 1952.

[103] "Ekmeklerden bir şikayet," Ibid., 9 September, 1950.

of the night until the early hours of the morning and found that eight bakeries failed to follow regulations and 110 loaves of bread were confiscated.[104] Inspections brought about more complaints. As readers saw reports of such inspections they began to request some in their own districts when bread did not meet their satisfaction. One *Istanbul Ekspres* reader from the Fatih district said "the inspections we read about in the papers every day should come this way" as some bakkal owners charged exorbitant prices.[105] A reader from Samatya voiced the suffering of all the residents in the district: "We are the residents of Samatya. All of us would like to register a complaint about the bakeries. The quality of breads is one thing. But around 7- 7:30 pm, right at dinner time, we never find any."[106]

Another major issue involving bread was the contents of it. "Are we to eat bread with mucus now?" one story asked. Nails, thread, needle, fleas, nails, unidentified bug skeletons and coal pieces were only some of the objects which had already been associated with bakeries. One cartoon illustrated a hardware store where two men conversed. The buyer said to the storeowner, "You have rope, nails, sand... Why don't you open a bakery and make bread?"[107] A sample left with *Istanbul Ekspres* proved that some bakeries insisted in producing less than sanitary bread loaves. "The contents of this particular loaf of bread actually made us long for the bread made of spoiled flour" the

---

[104] "Beyoğlunda fırınların kontrolü," *Hürriyet*, 22 June 1952.
[105] Sabiha Tunçel, "Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." *Istanbul Ekspres*, July 1952.
[106] Yaşar Kumcu, Kunduracı, (Samatya) "Hergün Bir Istanbullunun 10 Derdi..." Ibid., 12 August 1952. It should not go without saying that bakers also complained about other bakers. "Ekmek mevzuunda halk şikayetinde haklıdır," Ibid., 29 September 1953. And of course, bakery employees complained about owners. In a telegram to (Devlet Bakanı, Devlet Vekili) Minister Dr. Mukerrem Sarol (the Fırın Işçileri Derneği) employees complained about the brutality of working conditions and the low wages they received. The telegram requested that the government refrain from letting the owners raise the price of bread if owners did not agree to raise the wages of the workers. The telegram ended on a threatening tone, "bakery owners are not justified in their request to raise prices. We are ready to testify and prove that owners never fail to profit from sales. We are ready to reveal all of their most delicate secrets." "Fırıncılar asla zarar etmiyor," Ibid., 6 July 1954.
[107] Orhan Enez, "Nalbur," *Akbaba* No. 139, 11 November 1954.

reporter stated. The municipal police force regulations specifically addressed the hygiene of the bakery workers. However, these regulations remained on paper only and instead of improving, the bakeries got worse. "It is a tragic truth that 80 percent of bakery workers are sick and some actually have tuberculosis. The dough for the bread is produced in unhygienic conditions, and yes sometimes the dough is kneaded by dirty feet."[108] The 334 bakeries employed about seven thousand workers across Istanbul. Not only did they produce substandard bread but working conditions hurt the health of the employees. Employers did not follow the work regulations. They denied their employees a day off, and did not pay them for working overtime.[109]

Like the fruits and vegetables situation, complaints about the bread quality and prices led to the municipal production and sale of bread. The governor/mayor announced that the bread shortage in the city was coming to an end and measures were being taken even as he made this announcement. Gökay also pointed out that he was always in cooperation with the newspapers and that he had asked the newspapers to publish only the truth.[110] Within two years of this announcement the municipality had 60 thousand loaves produced in a Şişli factory and sold them via Migros trucks across the city.[111]

Perhaps not as desperately chronic as fruits and vegetables and bread, but potentially more harmful to public health, the meat issue kept residents wondering as well. As part of the Marshall Plan, et kombinaları were being built in large cities such as

---

[108] "Şimdi de sümüklü ekmek mi yiyeceğiz?" *Istanbul Ekspres*, 25 December 1952.
[109] "7 bin fırın işçisi halinden şikayetçi" Ibid., 12 February 1953. Bakers created an "unjustified/false" bread shortage because they asked to be able to raise the prices many times and had yet to be allowed to do that. So if they could not sell bread for more then they would make less bread. Reportedly, one baker even buried his bread under ground. "Yeraltı Fırını meydana çıktı," Ibid., July 1954.
[110] "Istanbul'da Ekmek Sıkıntısı olmıyacak," Ibid., 25 July 1954. "Ekmek sıkıntısı alınan tedbirle hafifledi," Ibid., July 1954.
[111] Istanbul residents had suffered enough in the cold, waiting in lines that never ended only to go home empty handed. "Şehrin ekmek meselesi kati suretle halloluyor," Ibid., February 1956.

Istanbul, Ankara, Konya and Erzurum.[112] The price of meat was a source of disagreement between the wholesale butchers and the municipality,[113] but the quality of meat was more pressing. Istanbul butchers claimed that some of the unlicensed butchering involved butchering horses, and that the slaughterhouse provided spoiled meats. At the annual congress of the "Association for Retail butchers (perakendeci kasaplar ve mustahdemin dernegi)" Ihsan Keskiner, a member from Çengelköyü, expressed his frustration with the indifference regarding the slaughterhouse, that the meat provided to the retailers did not come from cold storage units, that these meats were spoiled on many occasions, that they were often covered in filth and weighed less than claimed. He went on to say that he had proof that the meat he obtained from the slaughterhouse was spoiled and filthy. He also said that they had registered a formal complaint with the municipality but that they met with the reply "take us to court then." Through *Hürriyet*, he requested officials' help. Wholesale butcher Hayri Yakar pointed out that unlicensed butchering had become commonplace, that areas like Küçükpazar, Küçükçekmece, Hadımköyü, Alibeyköyü had each become slaughterhouses. Right outside Edirnekapı serious numbers of horses were butchered everyday and distributed to makers of sausages and hot dogs. He even suggested that because of the unlicensed nature of such acts of butchering the treasury lost millions, but that Istanbul residents lost much more than millions in health since many of the unlicensed butchers actually cut up sick animals.[114]

---

[112] "Memleketimizde kurulacak et kombinaları," *Hürriyet*, 2 May 1950.

[113] The disagreement between the wholesale (toptancı) butchers and the municipality consisted of the issue of prices charged in the slaughterhouse. The wholesale butchers considered slaughterhouse prices set by the municipality based on the kilo of the live animals not only unjust but also unlawful. Butchers argued that the municipality's practice raised meat prices by 20-30 kuruş based on ("fire") weight diminution. "Toptancı kasaplarla belediye arasında anlaşmazlık," Ibid., 1 February 1951.

[114] "Istanbul kasapları Belediyeyi itham ediyor," Ibid., 12 February 1951. "Bu sene kasaplik hayvan telefati olmadi: Kisin hafif gecmesi dolayisiyle bu sene kasaplik hayvan telefati olmamistir. Bu suretle her sene vasati olarak soguktan veya yemsizlikten olen yarim milyon kucuk bas kasaplik hayvan kazanilmistir. Bu

The next year, shortly after the governor announced that he was aware of the increase in meat prices and that as soon as they had investigated the matter and identified what had caused the prices to rise they would take the necessary measures.[115] Shortly after this report, it was announced that the government was taking over the meat and fish issue, making it affordable for the people by establishing first a General Directorate of Meat and Fish. (Balık ve Et Sanayii Genel Müdürlüğü) This Directorate would work independently and oversee the existing facilities that process meat and fish products in various parts of the country. Once the Erzurum facilities were completed the Genel Müdürlük (General Directorate) would easily ship meats to large production centers via refrigerator cars. Seventy such refrigerator cars had already arrived for this purpose. The Et ve Balık Sanayii Genel Müdürlüğü promised to ease relations and transactions between production and consumer centers.[116]

At the close of 1952, meats butchered by unlicensed persons were still being smuggled into the city. The most alarming point in all of this was that some diseased sheep were butchered and sold without the municipal stamp and made its way into restaurant pots. Others made their way into student housing.[117] *Istanbul Ekspres* next took credit for the destruction of many kilos of spoiled meat. The newspaper claimed that their publication of the state of the meat coupled with a visit by the news editor to the management of the slaughterhouse stirred the officials and the people so much so that the meat sellers at the Küçükpazar Kadınlar Pazarı were busted and many kilos of meat were

---

vaziyet karsisinda sut istihsali (production) de gecen yillardan cok iyi oldugu gibi kasaplik hayvanlar da adetce artmis ve erken buyumus ve daha besili olmustur. Buna gore, bu sene gerek yag gerekse et fiyatlarinin gecen senelerden daha ucuz olacagi alakalilarca beyan edilmektedir." See "Bu sene kasaplık hayvan telefatı olmadı," *Hürriyet*, 28 March 1951.

[115] "Vali şehir işleri hakkında dün gazetecilerle konuştu," Ibid., 8 April 1952.

[116] *Istanbul Ekspres*, 19 August 1952.

[117] "Kaçak etler öğrenci yurtlarına da sokuluyor," Ibid., December 1952.

destroyed. Those "who threatened the health of the people will be taken to court" *Istanbul Ekspres* satisfactorily reported.[118] Like Department of Health bulletins did in Chicago, *Istanbul Ekspres* even published the names and addresses of the next few offenders. The Ankara Pazarı Butcher on Beyoğlu street, and Sabri Kılıç's butcher (#63 on Gümüşsuyu street) were busted, inspected and found guilty for carrying below standard meat. The Ankara Pazarı Butcher on Beyoğlu street was found guilty of selling beef that was butchered without a license. The one on the Gümüşsuyu street was found guilty of selling spoiled water buffalo meat. Their meats were confiscated.[119] By the end of summer in 1953, the municipality began selling meat in (Et tanzim satışları) various locations, which they hoped would stabilize prices citywide and would ensure that the people of Istanbul afford and eat better quality meats.[120]

Yet for all the precautions the inspectors took, *Akbaba* relentlessly made fun of how the inspections failed. In a series of three cartoons an inspection scene is portrayed. Scene one: the prices are high, the stores look idle (with cobwebs on the doors, probably due to the steepness of the prices on the windows). Someone on the street corner screams: the governor is coming!!! Scene two: frantic activity, as store owners erase the prices on the windows. Scene three: The governor/mayor walks by the stores that have a whole new set of (lower) prices printed on the windows.[121] *Akbaba* was right. It was only a matter of time until meat prices escalated again and further unlicensed butchering came

---

[118] "Neşriyatımızın meyveleri toplanıyor. Kadınlar Pazarına Dün Baskın Yapıldı. Kilolarca kokmuş ve kaçak et imha olundu," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 27 December 1952. Especially in Eminönü area.
[119] "Kaçak et: iki kasap basıldı," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1952.
[120] To reduce meat prices, the governor/mayor communicated with the central government and the municipality obtained permission to use the refrigerator cars purchased by the National Railways (Devlet Demir Yolları) during World War II years. With the help of these refrigerator cars animals slaughtered by the producers would be railed into Istanbul and distributed among the butchers who were involved in tanzim satış. "Belediye Ikinci Darbeyi Indiriyor: Et Meselesi de Hal Yoluna Girmek Üzere," *Istanbul Ekspres*, June 1953; and "Et tanzim satışlarına iki hafta sonra başlanıyor," Ibid., September 1953.
[121] "Teftiş," *Akbaba* 47, 5 February 1953.

back. By 1955, unlicensed butchering had come back and meats butchered without a license made their way into restaurants. Unlicensed butchers sold their products at lower prices, especially in less well-to-do areas of the city and especially favored by "kebapçı" and "ahçı" stores. (kebap restaurants)[122]

The City Council

As mentioned above, *Istanbul Ekspres* generally worked two ways. For one, it reported on the municipal activities so that residents were up to date about price and quality inspections, and two the governor/mayor was kept up to date about Istanbulites' concerns and needs. Further, the daily newspaper reported on City Council members' district visits throughout 1952. In the columns under Şehir Meclisi Istanbul'un Hizmetinde (City Council at Istanbul's Service), City Council members were photographed while walking around in their districts, observing the recent improvements. These improvements mainly consisted of street widening activities.[123] An editorial on the Fatih district revealed a beehive of road building activity in the area.[124] Another one happily reported the end of "district privilege," according to which the municipality was ending the practice of improving privileged districts at the expense of "less privileged" ones.[125] Yet another editorial column reported the developments in the Eminönü district: new roads, better street lighting, improved parks and playgrounds.[126]

As always, *Akbaba* had a different view of the developments. In a cartoon captioned "Some examples of the new varieties of roads" the "asphalt yol" is depicted as

---

[122] "Kaçak et kesimi başladı," *Hürriyet*, 17 January 1955.
[123] "Şehir Meclisi Istanbul Hizmetinde: Istanbul'un en büyük çocuk bahçesi Kadıköyde kuruluyor" *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1952-1953.
[124] "Şehir Meclisi Istanbul Hizmetinde: Fatih Büyük Sahibine Layık Olmaya Çalışıyor" Ibid.
[125] "Şehir Meclisi Istanbul Hizmetinde: Istanbul'da artık semt imtiyazı diye birşey mevzubahis değildir," Ibid., 10 June 1953.
[126] "Şehir Meclisi Istanbul Hizmetinde: Eminönü ilçesi gün geçtikçe imar görüyor" Ibid., 11 June 1953.

sticking to the shoes of the pedestrian; the car riding on the "parke yol" is depicted as splashing a lot of water; the "şose yol" is very bumpy; and then there is the (kestirme means shortcut—this is a play on words) "kestirme yol" on which a car falls off a cliff.[127] In another, road constructions were shown to be a nuisance for the pedestrians, who could not walk on the streets because wherever one turned there was a sign marked "closed due to construction" or "no crossing."[128]

Roads were a part of the universal cry for better services. In the columns titled "Adım Adım Istanbul" (Step by Step Istanbul, 1956) *Istanbul Ekspres* reported residents' needs and expectations from the city council along with residents' photos. From Kasımpaşa to Fener, Balat, Eminönü, and Fatih districts almost every resident interviewed first complained about the rising prices, followed by product shortages related to their livelihood, be their livelihood owning a coffee shop, a (photograph) studio, or a repair shop. A universal cry for "yol, su, kanalizasyon, çöpçü" (roads, water, sewer, garbage collector) usually followed. Residents across the city desired more schools and playgrounds, and better transportation services as well as roads: they wanted more buses, extension of the existing routes, addition of new routes, and more frequent bus services.[129] The desire for improved transportation services had been around for a decade, and rising city population turned that desire into a desperate need.[130] The

---

[127] "Yol çeşitlerimizden bazıları!..." *Akbaba* 48, 12 February 1953.
[128] "Istanbul ve Istanbullu," Ibid., 130, 9 September 1954.
[129] "Ekspres Röportajlarla Adım Adım Istanbul," *Istanbul Ekspres*, January 1956. In the series called "Istanbul'un halledilemeyen dertleri" (The headaches of Istanbul or Istanbul's Unsolved/Unsolvable Problems) the newspaper interviewed residents across the city and registered their complaints and wishes. "Istanbul'un halledilemeyen dertleri: Çöplerimiz var amma, evimizden alıp kapımızın önüne döküyorlar," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 1952; "Belediye, çöp imhası" *Istanbul Ekspres*, 14 August 1952.
[130] There were many different means of public transportation in Istanbul in the 1950s. One could ride on the tramway, on a bus, or a "dolmuş"; cross the Boğaz on a legitimate ferry or a not so legitimate "dolmuş" ferry. But no one could guarantee that these means of transportation worked efficiently, arrived on time, or arrived at all. (The public much desired the takeover the tramway companies by the central government and

municipality put in an order for the importation of new buses, repaired old ones in the meantime, and scheduled the "repaired" buses more runs on different routes.[131] But as is evidenced from the complaints of the people interviewed, buses broke down often, regularly showed up late and were uncomfortably crowded. When one missed the ferry, or during work rush hours, travelers could cross the Boğaz on the "dolmuş" ferries. Dolmuş the word translates as "that which is full." As is suggested in the meaning of the word, the dolmuş ferries were small motor boats that usually waited and did not leave until they were full. This fullness of the boats was often open to interpretation, and usually meant that they were overcrowded (just like the regular dolmuş cars), to the danger of tipping over.

In Chicago newcomers were viewed as an ignorant but powerful political force in ward politics and old settlers used the *Chicago Defender* to draw the migrants into the political process, and to help them make more informed decisions to benefit the whole African American community. Even though DePriest had not been the *Defender's* choice, when he won the primary election in the ward, the *Defender* emphasized the need for everyone in the community to endorse him so that he would be the first black alderman in the City Council. Through the political mobilization in various campaigns and by seeing instant results, newcomers to Chicago learned that they could affect their local government. In Istanbul newcomers were simply left on their own while attention was always drawn to general complaints that the government provide some services. As Ulaş

---

a transference over the municipality.) Residents also called for fixing public transportation stops. A humorous anecdote went: Question: "everyday we hear about the need to have covered tramway stops, why hasn't the municipality done anything about it?" Answer: "Well, because the tramway lines pass in front of the Haydarpaşa Nümune Hospital. That's why!" *Akbaba* 109. Since the Haydarpaşa Numune Hospital was municipally owned and managed, the municipality would benefit from not covering the stops, causing those who waited at these stops to suffer the weather conditions and becoming ill. Even though this anecdote is from 1946, complaints about bus stops persisted into and throughout the 1950s.

[131] *Istanbul Ekspres*, July 1955.

Bayraktar has recently argued, "although the 13th article of the 1930 Municipal Law provided the residents the rights to participate in local governments, this right remained on paper, without leading to any opportunities or instruments of citizens' participation in local politics."[132] Their voices mingled with the voices of other Istanbulites and could be heard through the *Istanbul Ekspres* interviews and reports, and some of their needs were met regardless, but lack of active local political participation was again a missed opportunity for newcomers to Istanbul to feel like they belonged in the Istanbul community. Local organization patterns would be hardly different.

[132] Bayraktar, "Turkish Municipalities," paragraph 50. "In the absence of adequate public policies to meet their urgent needs, the new residents of (big cities) built up their own informal solidarity networks and patronage channels that further strengthened... local political elite..." See footnote 4. "Citizens participation remained restricted to personal endeavors in order to solve their specific and personal problems through the hierarchical patronage networks." See paragraph 62.

Chapter 5

Organization

African American migrants coming to Chicago in the middle of the 1910s, entered a city whose residents were already thinking of themselves as members of a larger community. They had begun to develop their sense of the city as a community while responding to problems brought on by the modernization process. For several decades, as earlier chapters have detailed, various reform-minded groups had been confronting a wide range of urban problems in order to make their city a better and healthier place to live. Voluntary associations that helped immigrant workers' through the urbanization process while they addressed the foreigners' Americanization needs, were readily visible before the end of the nineteenth century. By the 1880s, a cadre of educated middle class women involved themselves in the problems of immigrants from abroad.[1] As the nineteenth century came to a close this group was joined by other professional women, professors and students in the University of Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. From social settlements to housing surveys, from health reforms to local political campaigns, Chicago's middle and upper class women played central roles in the creation of a sense of community and belonging that was to encompass newcomers.[2] The existence of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy in Chicago meant that many

---

[1] On social settlements see, Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House with Autobiographical Notes* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990); Allen F. Davis, *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967); Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform 1890-1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Domenica M. Barbuto, *American Settlement Houses and Progressive Social Reform: An Encyclopedia of the American Settlement Movement* (Phoenix: Orxy Press, 1999); Daphne Spain, *How Women Saved the City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001).

[2] For housing surveys see Chapter Two. For health activities see Chapter Three. For political campaigns see Chapter Four.

professionally educated women and men entered the scene at around the time urban problems such as housing and health became a great concern for the city's residents. Through canvasses, surveys, investigation, and conferences, these groups collected data on existing problems and studied them, proposed solutions, shared information and networked. Some of their efforts were directed specifically towards aiding newcomers both at their initial arrival into the city and then to help them survive in a new and often bewildering environment. Members of organizations such as the Travelers Aid met newcomers at railroad stations—the usual port of entry.[3] The purpose of these organizations was to ease the initial transition into the city by providing advice on agencies that could help them find shelter or employment. African American newcomers, however, were rarely the beneficiaries of such general efforts. To make up for that lapse, groups of African American Chicagoans worked assiduously to help newcomers adjust to the city.

Istanbul's vision of itself as a centuries-old place of high culture, a center of civilization and education, determined that its reception of newcomers would take an entirely different path. Rural migrants were distinctly out of place in this vision where they were an intrusion on the city's social order. Moreover, since modernization was a state-imported project, the older residents of Istanbul were far less interested in being part of that process than were the older residents of Chicago. As one participant in the recent campaign put it, there were two Istanbuls. One was the Istanbul of those from within, and the other was the Istanbul of those from without.

---

[3] Robert L. Buroker, "From Voluntary Association to Welfare State: The Illinois Immigrants' Protective League, 1908-1926" *The Journal of American History*, 58:3 (December 1971); James R. Grossman, *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 116 and 332; Arvarh E. Strickland, *History of the Chicago Urban League* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966), 44.

By examining how residents received rural newcomers in each city, it is possible to assess to what extent voluntary organization directed at urbanizing newcomers played a role in shaping the city as a whole, as well as in generating among newcomers the consciousness of living in a city as a form of community. Developing such a consciousness, or not, helps us understand whether, or to what extent, rural to urban migrants feel a sense of belonging in the city.

Chicago

Activities of many voluntary efforts that aimed to help foreign newcomers did not extend to African Americans as the Great Migration of rural African Americans from the south began during World War I. Chicago's existing African American community, which was already organized in clubs and societies for purposes of economic, social, religious, and civic progress, quickly reorganized to extend similar services to African American newcomers.[4] African American Women's Clubs were already numerous, and, as Anne Meis Knupfer had detailed, over one hundred and fifty such organizations were listed in the city's two Chicago African American newspapers. These clubs were

---

[4] Anne Meis Knupfer, *Toward A Tenderer Humanity And A Nobler Womanhood: African American Women's Clubs in Turn-of-the-Century Chicago* (New York: New York University Press, 1996); Chicago Commission on Race Relations (CCRR), *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and A Race Riot* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1922), 94. According to the CCRR African Americans established "their own churches, business enterprises, amusement places, and newspapers." (140) Four types of institutions within the African American community "developed to aid it in maintaining itself and promoting its own welfare: 1. Commercial and industrial enterprises; 2. Organizations for social intercourse; 3. Religious organizations; and 4. Agencies for civic and social betterment." (140) Examples of the Social and Civic Agencies are divided into two: agencies especially for the African Americans, and agencies convenient for African Americans. Agencies especially for African Americans included: The Chicago Urban League (CUL), Wabash YMCA (Promoted community work, 47-148), Chicago Branch of the NAACP, The South Side Community Service, Wendell Phillips Settlement (under the supervision of the CUL), Butler Community Center (offered classes in "citizenship, hygiene, African American history, sewing, china painting" 149), Phyllis Wheatley Home (provided wholesome surroundings for girls and women strangers in the city" 149), Home for the Aged and the Infirm, Indiana Avenue YWCA (Secured jobs and safe homes for girls, 149), Woodlawn Community Association (worked to make the neighborhood more desirable, "extended functions to include community activities and civic welfare programs," 150). Agencies convenient for the African Americans were: American Red Cross, United Charities, The Illinois Children's Home And Aid Society (helped find homes for dependent African American children and supervised their placing).

involved in a wide range of political, social, and cultural activities, some which included "suffrage, literary contests, municipal reform, philosophy, youth activities, child welfare, care for the elderly, safe lodging for working women, health care, orphanages, home life, and rotating economic credit."[5] These clubs also contributed to different community institutions such as the Provident Hospital, YWCA, and Urban League among others.[6]

Although historians have disagreed over the reasons that drove African American elites' actions,[7] the fact remains that "the old settlers" of elite men and women organized themselves and coordinated with prominent white residents to aid newcomers' adjustment into the urban setting. Historian Blaine Brownell has argued that in U.S. cities of this time period, middle and upper middle classes "thought of the city as a larger entity," that they shared an "urban consciousness, an awareness of the complex, interdependent world that is the city, the cognizance of the city as identifiable by qualities that were distinctly urban."[8] African American residents of Chicago had incorporated this sense of the city into their everyday lives. Along with issues of respectability and "racial destiny" this understanding pushed Chicago's African American elites to undertake actions and found organizations such as African American settlements, Colored Branches of the YMCA and the YWCA, and the Chicago Urban League, that advanced the process of "becoming urban" and belonging to the city for African American newcomers.

---

[5] Knupfer, *Toward A Tenderer Humanity*, 1.
[6] Ethel Chase, "The Negro In Illinois: The Story of the Illinois Federation of Colored Women's Clubs 1900-1922 by Elizabeth Lindsey Davis" Illinois Writers Project Box 38 Folder 10 Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection Of Afro-American History and Literature, Chicago Public Library.
[7] Some historians, recognizing that it was the elite African Americans who filled this gap, criticized the elite African American group as being driven by concern with their own place in society. Others have seen an extension and application of Booker T. Washington's self-help ideology in such efforts. Allan H. Spear, *Black Chicago: The Making Of A Negro Ghetto 1890-1920* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press); Grossman, *Land of Hope*; Anne Meis Knupfer, *Toward A Tenderer Humanity*.
[8] Blaine A. Brownell, *The Urban Ethos in the South 1920-1930* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1975), 46, and 63.

The availability of assistance for the newcomers helped them assimilate into urban life, easing their urbanization process if not the racial component of it. This was a complex relationship "between 'old settlers' and newcomers." Old settlers understood that the reputation of their community depended on assisting the newcomers so that they would not fall into degeneracy, that they would understand the implications of industrial labor, urban life, manners and mores, and northern racial patterns. Assuming that "the migrants had to be guided and controlled from the moment they stepped from the train" old settlers helped fashion "a variety of initiatives designed to help—and pressure newcomers to adjust." Institutions such as "the YMCA, the larger churches, and a corps of volunteers" assisted the Urban League and *the Defender* in such endeavors as "training peasant folk in the city ways and of trying to interpret them to the old settlers and to those sections of the white community which resented their presence."[9]

There is no denying the racism of a section of the white community, which resented the presence of the newcomers, but there was also a group of prominent white men and women who worked with African American leaders. Julius Rosenwald's role in the creation of the Chicago "Colored YMCA" also referred to as "the Wabash Avenue YMCA" has been covered in detail elsewhere, but as an interracial venture that specifically aimed to aid urban adjustment, it merits a short summary here. In 1910 Julius Rosenwald, president of Sears Roebuck & Co., and Jewish philanthropist, promised to donate $25,000 to any community that raised $75,000 towards an African American

[9] Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 7, 145, and Drake, *Black Metropolis*, 64. The examples drawn from the Chicago Defender for the purposes of this project deal mainly with the adjustment to "industrial work and urban life" and "behavior that would enhance the reputation of blacks in the larger (white) community." Adjustment to "the northern racial patterns" included issues such as dress, and public behavior which also fall under the issue of adjustment to "urban life." For further information on the functions of such organized institutions in helping rural African American migrants adjust to urban living see Grossman, *Land of Hope*, 116-160 and Spear, *Black Chicago*, 167-174.

YMCA, a promise that won him national prominence. While Rosenwald received criticism from opponents of segregation, Chicago residents mostly congratulated Rosenwald. Grover B. Simpson, a member of the board of managers of the Chicago YMCA, recognized that Rosenwald's donation would "unquestionably lead to" the uplift of African Americans, would "inspire them with new hope, and on the same principle of" the YMCA spirit, "mean the helping of those who help themselves," as it gave the African American community a task to do before they received Rosenwald's generosity. N. W. Harris, a prominent contributor to both YMCA and NAACP work, observed that Rosenwald's proposal "was only second in importance to the emancipation proclamation." Dr. Graham Taylor of Chicago Commons and professor at the University of Chicago saw this as a gift to the whole city community.[10]

As evidenced by the responses to Rosenwald's announcement, African American progress was being watched closely. Soon after this announcement, Booker T. Washington commented on the success of the fund raising campaign by which Chicago's African American residents "set an example to the entire race in showing how they could raise $67,000 within a few days toward the erection of a YMCA building." Further, Washington commended men such as Rosenwald, Harris, and C. H. McCormick for setting an example in "showing other white people ought to assist the colored race." Washington concluded that Rosenwald's offer gave "impetus here to the YMCA movement among colored people that nothing heretofore has done." Rosenwald himself stated that the race question was the greatest problem of the day and that it was the duty of this class of white Chicagoans to aid the African American community in its "struggle

[10] Pırıl Atabay, "Philanthropy and Race Relations in 1920s Chicago," (Unpublished MA Thesis, Bilkent University, 1999.)

for better things" because African Americans were part of the "commercial, national, and social institutions."[11]

Setting aside the negative racial implications of opening a separate African American Branch, the funding campaigns and the terms upon which the concept was framed, reflected the consciousness that more privileged groups ought to provide financial support and institutional direction to those who needed both. The need for the African American YMCA Branch was placed in terms of the increasing African American population "coming largely from the South which is unused for the most part to life in a large city." When a young man came to Chicago he faced "new conditions, as to climate and as to methods of labor" among other things and the YMCA building would "help the black race adjust to the new life." But most of all "this movement in Chicago has emphasized the fact that the Negro has a consciousness, that he has civic pride and that he will work as enthusiastically as the white man at tasks that assume his citizenship and manhood."[12]

It was the philosophy that participation of all citizens, and acceptance of responsibility by those who were better situated in society to integrate newcomers into the urban community that had led to the creation of the Chicago Urban League.[13] The *Chicago Defender* kept up with all the steps that led to the formation of the Chicago Urban League. From the initial visits of Mr. E. K. Jones, the head of the National Welfare League, to his meetings with various prominent leaders and prominent clubs and societies

---

[11] "Offers $50,000 As Start for YMCA Hotel," *Inter Ocean*, May 19, 1911 in O. Spencer, Illinois Writers Project: Julius Rosenwald Fund, IWP Box 38 Folder 8, Vivian G. Harsh Research Collection Of Afro-American History and Literature, Chicago Public Library.

[12] Ibid.

[13] See Nancy J. Weiss, *The National Urban League: 1910-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 9-33. The Committee on Urban Conditions joined with the National League for the Protection of Colored Women and the Committee for Improving the Industrial Conditions in New York in 1911 to form the Urban League. Strickland, *History of the Chicago Urban League*, 29-30.

in Chicago, from the opening, settling and the growth of the League to all of its activities in the city, the *Chicago Defender* did not miss a single beat. In October 1915 the weekly introduced the Chicago Urban League as an interracial effort that was interested in "securing co-operation among active organizations, securing and training social workers, making studies of conditions among Negroes in cities, and promoting agencies for social uplift in lines in which there is need for larger social service..."[14] Shortly after, Mr. Jones was in the city initiating these aims as the guest of the Chicago Federation of Colored Women's Clubs and the Chicago Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People "at a luncheon held at the (white) City Club."[15]

By January 1916 the *Defender* summarized the League's policy as "to show better relationship between the two races, secure better playgrounds and cleaner places for amusement for the children, besides forming girls' and boys' clubs."[16] Following the National Urban League (UL) conference, the League's migration resolutions were given wide coverage by the newspaper. The resolutions urged urban residents in northern cities to form organizations "to foster good feeling between the races, to instruct emigrants as to dress, habits, and methods of living necessary to withstand the rigors of Northern climate, as to efficiency, regularity and application demanded of workers in the North." Migrants would also benefit from organizations that acquainted them with "opportunities offered by towns and cities of the North in schools, hospitals, police protection, employment, as to facilities offered by the Church, YMCA, YWCA, and other organizations."[17] Shortly after the National UL Conference, the *Defender* reminded its

---

[14] "Mr. E. K. Jones Will Visit Chicago," *The Chicago Defender*, October 30, 1915.
[15] Ibid., November 13, 1915.
[16] "Hon. E. K. Jones in City," Ibid., January 15, 1916.
[17] "Urban League Adopts Migration Resolutions," Ibid., February 3, 1917.

readers that it supported the Chicago branch, and further listed the names of white supporters.[18]

The Chicago branch held its first official meeting in January 1917.[19] Once established, the Chicago Urban League (CUL) reached many people and raised interest in itself by holding meetings in various settings throughout Chicago, including the Grace Presbyterian church, the loop district, Phyllis Wheatley Home, the Young People's Lyceum, Hull House, the Chicago City Club, Bethel A. M. E. church, and Douglass Center. In such meetings T. Arnold Hill, executive secretary, Dr. Robert E. Park, president of the Board of Directors and instructor at the University of Chicago, and/or Dr. George C. Hall welcomed "all persons who have recently come to Chicago and all persons interested in them and in their welfare," made reports, outlined and explained in detail the work of the League, appealed to Chicago citizens to help with the work and campaigned for funds. For example, Hon. Edward H. Wright encouraged the community to "help the newcomers to become used to the actions and ways of the people of the north; such as good deportment in public places, on the street cars, etc." Horace J. Bridges, an active member, pointed out that African Americans were coming to Chicago because Chicago needed them. Therefore, it was "the duty of all people of Chicago" to see that they were justly treated. Those in the audience often varied as much as the different meeting places.[20] "The Race" was urged to cling together, to work together

---

[18] "Getting Together," Ibid., February 10, 1917.
[19] Strickland, *History of the Chicago Urban League*, 29-30.
[20] "Wright Addresses Lyceum," *The Chicago Defender*, January 27, 1917; "Urban League Holds Meeting," Ibid., April 21, 1917; "Club Women Meet," Ibid., April 28, 1917; "Urban League Work Explained," Ibid., May 19, 1917; "Editor Johnson Speaks At Hull House," Ibid., June 2, 1917. For other names that appeared in association with the League, such as Sophonisba Breckinridge, Dr. Arthur J. Francis, secretary of the Chicago Community Trust, Dr. W. D. Cook, pastor, William C. Graves, secretary to Julius Rosenwald and Miss Amelia Sears, Judge Sadler, Mrs. Joanna Snowden-Porter and Miss Moseley, "all members of the

"looking for the betterment of the newcomer." To this end, the League would establish a block system to instruct clubs in civic duty so the members could "teach newcomers deportment in cars and public places, economy housekeeping and efficiency methods..." Men who worked at the Stock Yards were urged "to go to and from their work clean; not only there but everywhere they work, cleanliness should be their motto."[21]

The *Defender* emphasized the importance of community help by underlining that it was no longer sufficient to expect matters to eventually adjust themselves. One editorial signaled that things were getting to a point where matters would no longer be safely ignored. "The rural south is moving into the urban north. The problem of the city is accentuated. This situation cannot be adequately met by palliatives," warned the *Defender*. As scientific methods were important to treat disorders, the Urban League believed it was important to treat newcomers' maladjustments. The National League on Urban Conditions Among Negroes was "in the field with this new ideal," one that would increase the number of specifically trained workers. "Its aim is comprehensive. It seeks to alter the environment which impresses maladjustments; to remove obstacles to social uplift." As such the League emphasized cooperation "with agencies devoted to welfare work among our people" and carried out many investigations. The author encouraged the community to heartily support the new emphasis "on constructive social work." Furthermore the League's "investigations and records" were open to public, and it was ready to meet "the long, necessary demand for a bureau of information and a clearinghouse through which the earnest but narrow efforts at social improvement may be

---

board." See "Urban League Secretary Makes Splendid Report," Ibid., June 2, 1917. "A Royal Welcome," Ibid., March 17, 1917.

[21] No Title, Ibid., March 31, 1917.

brought into harmony." But the League could not accomplish all of that without an extensive membership.[22]

In November 1917 the Chicago League on Urban Conditions Among Negroes held its first annual meeting. The *Defender* announced the meeting a week before it took place and covered it in detail after it ended. Following the meeting it was reported that "a large and enthusiastic audience of both races" attended the meeting and that Mr. Forrester B. Washington's address had drawn particular interest. F. B. Washington was the executive secretary of the Detroit Urban League, who was otherwise famous for the account he provided after "the East St. Louis disturbance" that demonstrated "how proper attitude and preventive measures toward the newcomers would make of them dependable and industrious citizens." He was recognized as "distinctly successful in corralling the potential strength of the newcomers and in turning to good account, by supervision and direction, energies and tendencies which otherwise might have created a menace in the community." The executive secretary, T. Arnold Hill, reported that the League had assisted about 7,000 persons and that "the work of the league has been presented before sixty-two public audiences and it has been called upon by all public and private institutions and social service groups to assist in matters touching the Race." It was happily reported that seven new members were added to the board: "Miss Jane Addams, Arthur T. Aldis, Miss Edith Reider, Judge Frank P. Sadler, Mrs. Theresa Macon, William C. Graves and H. D. Openheimer."[23] Within a year of its opening, the Urban League

---

[22] "Constructive Work," Ibid., September 22, 1917.

[23] "Urban League in First Annual Meeting," Ibid., November 17, 1917; "First Annual Meeting Chicago Urban League," Ibid., November 24, 1917. Authors took pride in the fact that the white press took notice of the League. "The Guide Post is the head under which William L. Chenery writes daily for the Chicago Herald (white) and on Saturday Jan 19 he gave three quarters of a column to a discussion on Southern Migration, Communal Neglect, and the work of the Urban League. Speaking of the league he said, it attempts to put at the disposal of the recent arrivals all of the private and public organizations which will

outgrew its initial headquarters and moved to "a new cleaner building at 3032 South Wabash Avenue," inside the Frederick Douglass Center, which gave it "office space also for meetings." The new space in the center was provided rent-free and was a further step in interracial cooperation as Mrs. Celia Parker Woolley, the founder of the Douglass Center, had been one of the first white women to take up residence among the African American community.[24]

From T. Arnold Hill's early operation out of the Wabash Avenue YMCA until the move into the Douglass Center, the League continued to grow in staff, budget, offices and members. A membership campaign would begin in March, proudly recognizing that in the previous year "Race memberships and contributions constituted 75 per cent of the league's donors."[25] Within a month the desire to increase membership was set at 500: "To extend the sphere of influence of its work, and make the organization more definitely an agency of the Race people of Chicago as well as for them, the Chicago Urban League has launched an organized membership campaign."[26] According to Strickland, the CUL historian, 75 percent "Race membership and contributions" had only contributed about 10 percent of the total donations to the CUL, so the membership campaign focused on increasing the responsibility of the community.[27] "Good will and kind wishes are excellent aids to the prosecution of the work, but the price of a membership not only expresses both of these, but actually helps to get things accomplished."[28]

---

assist them becoming acclimated to urban conditions. Obviously, Chicago failed to do this work, a well administered private agency such as the Urban League is needed." "Herald Comments on Urban League," Ibid., January 26, 1918.

[24] "Chapter V: Inter-Racial Co-Operation," in Elizabeth Lindsey Davis, *The Negro in Illinois: the Story of the Illinois Federation of Colored Women's Clubs 1900-1922*, Illinois Writers Project Box 38 Folder 10.

[25] "Urban League Moves," *The Chicago Defender*, March 2, 1918.

[26] "Chicago Urban League in Membership Campaign," Ibid., April 6, 1918.

[27] Strickland, *History of the CUL*, 34.

[28] "Chicago Urban League in Membership Campaign," *The Chicago Defender*, April 6, 1918.

The *Defender* operated on the understanding that what affected one affected all and addressed the old settlers to take responsibility. "Whether the colored man's conditions will be improved or not depends in a great measure upon our own actions," one editorial warned. Newcomers looked to the North as "an oasis in a desert of prejudice," but the editorial reminded that prejudice lurked everywhere in different degrees. Newcomers faced the danger of mistaking "privilege for right," and this might cause problems for the old settlers. "It is the duty, therefore, of every Northern organization, every pastor and every good citizen to guide and direct these newcomers so that their coming will prove an asset rather than a liability to the community they select for their future home." In this the author extended the recent resolutions of an uplift society urging that:

> ...In the North that similar organizations be formed, or existing organizations urged to take action, which in addition to the purposes already mentioned, shall seek to instruct the migrants. As to the dress, habits and methods of living necessary to withstand the rigors of the northern climate. As to the efficiency, regularity and application demanded of workers in the North. As to the dangers of dealing or going with unscrupulous or vicious persons and of frequenting questionable resorts. As to the opportunities offered by the towns and cities of the North in schools, hospitals, police protection and employment. As to the facilities offered by the church, Y.M.C.A and other organizations, Every Race man owes this to himself as well as to the newcomers, for what affects one affects all. A perfect understanding comes with contact. We were all put into this world for a purpose. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you is the keynote of the whole situation. It is your burden. Will you take it up?[29]

Ideas such as these, that "what one affected one affected all," and that community leaders had an obligation to guide and direct newcomers were core ideals of Jane Addams, Hull House, her colleagues, and other settlements in the city. Driven by her commitment to

[29] "Still They Come," Ibid., February 10, 1917.

democracy and her belief that active participation of all citizens could improve and save democracy from the over capitalistic turn it had taken, Addams became a prominent community leader and a bridge between the two economic classes of society. She defined the settlement as "an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city." The settlement reflected the idea that "these problems are not confined to any one portion of a city," residents pledged "to devote themselves to the duties of good citizenship" and they were "bound to regard the entire life of their city as organic, to make an effort to unify it, and to protest against overdifferentiation."[30] The *Chicago Defender* extended similar efforts and understandings to the African American community.

In stories specifically aimed at teaching newcomers the ways of the city *the Defender* imparted wisdom that underscored the vulnerability, but also the new freedoms, that they would encounter. For example, one story let them know that there was recourse to insult and injury inflicted on them. The story of the "Insulting White Conductor" told readers that the white conductor had carried passengers "past their place and then told them he would throw them off the car." The author explained that the Chicago City Railways did not tolerate insulting and bullying conductors, and if proper complaints were made to that office things would be remedied.

> Wednesday morning on a southbound State street car No. 6043, conductor 7703 got pretty abusive to cover up his mistake. Two newcomers boarded the car and asked to be put off at South Water Street. He evidently forgot or paid no attention to them. When they got to Ninth Street he told them they would have to get off. They explained that they wanted to get off at South Water Street and had paid their last 10 cents to go there. He became abusive and told them he would throw them off and call a policeman besides. At that moment A. E. Ballinger, 3432 Forest Avenue, stepped up

[30] See Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House with Autobiographical Notes* (Boston: Bedford/ St. Martin's, 1999), 95.

> and said 'We'll get off here. These men do not know this town and I'll pay their way back.' The conductor murmured something beneath his breath and slammed the door. The men told Mr. Ballinger they lived at 3313 Forest Avenue. Any member of the Race being denied courteous treatment on these cars should seek the companies office and make a written complaint.[31]

As the story of the "Insulting White Conductor" revealed, newcomers were susceptible to be taken advantage of. A similar story titled "Grocers Bunko Housewives: Latter Careless in Watching the Scales and Are Given Short Weight" advised householders to pay more attention to the storekeepers along the street that are near their homes and save their money. She had visited several stores in the previous week "all run by white men, in the Second Ward," and then went south and on the west side, where she was amazed to find conditions as they were. Customers were cheated many times over by dishonest grocers. They were treated with disrespect on top of it.

> Newcomers must learn when they leave articles like shoes and clothes to get something to show for it. Several cases have come to our attention where the storekeepers have claimed they didn't remember receiving such articles. One fellow, a newcomer, on last Saturday night went into a grocery store at Twenty-ninth and state Street and gave the owner a $20 dollar bill to keep for him until he returned an hour or two later. When he returned he couldn't get his money and had to go to the police in order to get it. Our advice is, to keep your money in your pocket or put it in a bank.[32]

In such stories newcomers were instructed that they had the right to expect, even demand, courteous and honest treatment and that they should be watchful. Newcomers also had the obligation to give courteous treatment. Authors for *the Defender* were very clear about this obligation. A story titled "Keep Your Mouth Shut Please" declared that there was entirely "too much loud talking on the street cars among our new comers.

---

[31] "Insulting White Conductor," Ibid., March 17, 1917.
[32] The Girl Reporter, "Grocers Bunko Housewives," Ibid., May 19, 1917.

Going to and from work the new comers are heard to tell where they were the night before and the kind of good times they had and talking about their business in public." This had to be stopped as such actions showed "low breeding." According to this city resident, people of Chicago did not engage in such loud talking. The author advised Chicago preachers to "take up a few minutes of Sundays and instruct these new comers on how to act in public places." Further, churches were encouraged to take a day off "and visit the plants, yards, and mills and tell them how to act." Newcomers were wanted in Chicago, but it was up to *Defender* readers to stop "their bad deportment on streetcars and L roads" because such behavior disgraced themselves and the good city. "Cut this out, dear reader," the author ordered, "and whenever you see one talking loudly hand it to him."[33]

The *Defender* tirelessly came back to the point of cleanliness and its power of image making. "The pulpit, press and various organizations" were doing their part in trying to teach the newcomers from the South the things that would "make for their best interest. One thing they sure must learn, and that is they must go clean. In the south they were taught that the dirtier they looked the better. In the south a premium was put on filth and uncleanliness." However, this was not the South, and in Chicago "a badge of honor" was put on the clean man or woman. The *Defender* urged "that all give attention to their clothes and body," and this advice was framed in logic that newcomers would benefit from doing so: "they can get a place to work quicker by looking clean and tidy than by looking dirty and disgraceful."[34] Authors' insistence on cleanliness, clothes, and body, and public deportment reflected the African American community's decades long interest

[33] "Keep Your Mouth Shut Please," Ibid., March 24, 1917.
[34] "Go Clean Up North," Ibid., August 4, 1917.

in respectability. Since Reconstruction, this was part of a larger project, in short, to look and act respectable to earn respect. Families were known to rear their children in this fashion, especially daughters, because "race" women were more susceptible to being made into sexual objects.[35] Increasingly more meaning was assigned to different forms of dress.

Throughout the summer and fall of 1917 migration was the topic in various meetings. At a Greater Hampton day in May, Mr. Joseph N. Fouchard, the speaker, "pointed out with emphasis that the newcomer must be treated as a brother and everything done to help make him a desirable citizen."[36] At another meeting in June, attendees discussed the influx as a "great help to the Race," and urged citizens "to aid the newcomers in every way possible."[37] In an October meeting old settlers were depicted as "thrifty, self-respecting, law-abiding citizens" whose behavior was to be emulated by newcomers.

> As far as we are concerned, conditions in every northern city are what we make them. It is expected that prejudice, to a greater or less degree, will be met with, and our advancement hinges on the methods employed to overcome it. Chicago is known as the most liberal city, and a Mecca for "brunette" people. This state of affairs didn't just happen—it is the result of years of careful nursing. The men and women who came in the early days and have grown up with the city, fortunately, are thrifty, self-respecting, law-abiding citizens. To such there could be no bar. Gradually they worked their way into the body politic, made good whenever and

---

[35] Stephanie J. Shaw, *What a Woman Ought to Be and to Do: Black Professional Women Workers During the Jim Crow Era* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996). On Washington DC domestic workers' work clothes and how they carried them in their freedom bags once they switched from "living in" to day labor, see Elizabeth Clark-Lewis, *Living In, Living Out: African American Domestics and the Great Migration* (New York: Kodansha International, 1994). On the rising African American consciousness and its ties to racial destiny see Michele Mitchell, *Righteous Propagation: African Americans and the Politics of Racial Destiny after Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

[36] "Hampton wins many friends at Grace Lyceum," *The Chicago Defender*, May 5, 1917.

[37] "Speaks at Bethel Literary," Ibid., Jun 9, 1917.

> wherever placed, received the confidence and respect of their fellowmen and acted as a balance wheel for the actions of all newcomers...[38]

By the end of October 1917, the *Defender* reported that reactions to the African American migration were souring. However, the situation could be faced head on and overcome with the help of the African American old settlers. "It is evident that some of the people coming to this city have seriously erred in their conduct in public places, much to the humiliation of all respectable classes of Colored citizens," one editorial expressed disappointment. In so doing, in their "ignorance of laws and customs necessary for the maintenance of health, sobriety and morality among the people in general have given our enemies ground for complaint." It was considered absolutely necessary

> That a united effort should be made on the part of all law abiding citizens to endeavor to warn and teach those, who by their acts bring reproach upon the Colored people of this city, to strictly observe the laws, city ordinances and customs and so conduct themselves by so doing it will disarm those who are endeavoring to discredit our Race. We Call Attention to Some Things Which Should Be Observed By Our People...(List of do's and don't's)[39]

Even while the *Chicago Defender* called for a united front in dealing with the instruction of the newcomers, authors took it upon themselves to remind newcomers in no uncertain terms that they were to live a certain way, leaving another behind: "With the arrival of the newcomers on 41st street, near Grand Boulevard, certain indiscriminate practices have begun to play prominent figures. The old can-beer degenerates are spoiling the decent appearance of the street by rushing the can whenever the spirit takes them. A certain

[38] "Camping Out," Ibid., October 6, 1917.
[39] "Things That Should Be Considered," Ibid., October 20, 1917.

house has been reported to the Committee of Fifteen and is to be watched carefully. No levee district out this side, Mesdames."[40]

The *Chicago Defender* continued to publish encouraging accounts of life in the North, assuring southern migrants that they would be welcome:

> When the sun begins to shine on both sides of the street up here where the snow flies the folks from down yonder will start up this way in droves, the same as they have been doing for the past few years and they will find just as warm a welcome awaiting them as did their predecessors. There is always room for honest working people in any section of the country. And Chicago will do her part in seeing that the newcomers are properly cared for.[41]

But there were conditions to this welcome. Newcomers would have to be honest and hard working and willing to leave their southern habits behind. "When the sun was out a few days ago some of the newcomers and old timers as well were seen with their heads out of the window. Stop this practice. Such customs belong down south in the backwoods towns. Help dignify your neighborhood by keeping the front and back yards clean and cease rushing the can. While this custom exists among a certain class, it should be abolished."[42]

As newcomers adapted to urban mores, the community grew stronger. One of the best examples of this was the support the community gave to R. W. Hunter & Co., bankers, whose new bank opened at 4747 South State Street, by helping the bank grow from a "small institution" to "two large banking houses, doing business among a multitude of people." While the community supported the bank, the bank aimed to serve

---

[40] "Heed This Warning or Suffer," Ibid., December 8, 1917.
[41] No Title, Ibid., March 23, 1918.
[42] "Keep Heads in Window," Ibid., April 6, 1918.

the African American community, "to encourage them to save, to enter business and be supported." Many attended the opening ceremony

> The exercises were conducted by President Hunter... Editor Owens of New York City brought the message of hope, seeing in the near future a greater solidification of our people, especially in business. President Hunter said the bank was under state supervision and urged that there be more faith and loyalty shown those true and tried in the business field... The bank is ready to do business. Its success is assured... The employees are highly educated and know the banking business... *Newcomers can find this institution able to give them information about the proper investment of their money.* This bank is another stroke for unity, progress and business thrift among the citizens on the South Side.[43] (emphasis mine)

As old settlers helped newcomers, it became a source of pride that other Chicagoans recognized African Americans as able to take care of their own. The *Defender* reported on a series of recent articles in the *Chicago News* in which a white reporter, I. K. Friedman, dealt with the "adjustment of Negro migrants." Mr. Friedman was "so correct in his statements," that *Defender* authors believed he must have gotten his data from the CUL, which had "the most complete collection of facts on the Negro migration that can be found anywhere."

> Mr. Friedman would have his readers know that the churches and associations have thrown out a helping hand to the new citizens. Though they have come to a strange land they have not come to strangers. This information should be told to members of the other race, as an instance of self-help, which the Race is sharing in its own problems. *It is also worthy of note that the writer takes the perfectly rational view and proclaims the Negro and his strivings as a national problem, and as such it becomes the duty of white and black alike to see to it that his rise is as sure as democratic and permanent as our boasted American ideals will permit...*[44] (emphasis mine)

---

[43] "R. W. Hunter Banking Co., Opens New Quarters," Ibid., August 31, 1918.
[44] "Friedman Concludes Articles on Race," Ibid., September 7, 1918.

Public Manners and Dress

The transformation into urban life was a gradual process. While the community was being drawn together, and learning to support one another, individuals could work to improve their public manners. Being loud and boisterous in any public setting was highly criticized in the *Defender* and seen as a sign of ruffianism as opposed to gentlemanly manners. Like "corner loafing," being "loud and boisterous" was equated with being a public nuisance. "Don't use vile language in public places" the paper further instructed, "Don't act discourteously to other people in public places. Don't use liberty as a license to do as you please. Don't make yourself a public nuisance..."[45] Refraining from loud and vile language in public places was also extended to behavior in and around one's house. A woman with "one spark of womanhood in her" would not "disgrace the neighborhood by hanging three-fourths of the way out of the window, shouting at friends or acquaintances passing by."[46] The *Defender* constantly reminded readers that "a little common politeness, a little of the old-time courtesy" went a long way. Saying "'excuse me' or 'I beg your pardon'" gave one "the stamp of good breeding" and attracted "favorable notice of the person using such civility," the underlying implication being that such gentlemanly and unobtrusive conduct made a favorable impression.[47]

Newcomers were given strict instructions not to be loud and to observe etiquette on buses. Loud talking on buses was a sign of "low breeding" and readers were instructed to "Cut this [column] out" and hand it to anyone talking loudly.[48] Being loud and

---

[45] "Some Don'ts" Ibid., October 20, 1717. (See also the same list on May 17, 1919)
[46] "War Declared on Aprons and Caps in Street Cars" by Betsey Lane, Ibid., May 25, 1918.
[47] "Where We are Lacking," Ibid., May 17, 1919.
[48] "Keep Your Mouth Shut, Please!" Ibid., March 24, 1917. "A great many people with unbalanced minds" were riding on the streetcars, one columnist argued. These riders acted as if they held "a controlling interest in the stock," as if one nickel entitled them "to sprawl out over two seats, to leave their luggage or perhaps their feet in the aisle for other passengers to stumble over, to abuse the conductor." Reminding readers that

boisterous, and insulting others on the slightest provocation while traveling were signs of ruffianism, and the *Chicago Defender* women added that the way streetcar employees were addressed was an evil. Instead of saying "give me a transfer," or as the writer often heard, "come on man, give me a transfer," or "Man give us a transfer; you'se spose to give every one one" the *Defender* women instructed riders to say "transfer please."[49] Further, practicing courtesy in getting on and off the streetcars reflected one's proper home training and *Defender* women advised giving preference to "women with babies in their arms and those carrying with them the weight of age" both on the cars and off cars, at intersecting street corners. And it appeared that "a well reared man would not jump on and off cars pushing others aside without giving them the proper consideration."[50] Taking up every chance to emphasize good manners authors further reminded readers to apologize if they steeped on someone's foot[51] to refrain from reviewing their private affairs in public.[52]

As unemployment rose in Chicago after the war, *Defender* editorials railed against "corner loafing" in which "a crowd of two or three hundred young and old" idly gaped about on the corners. These loafers, according to the paper, had become such a great "nuisance" that "respectable women and young girls" shrank from "running the gantlet of foul-spoken, leering loafers." Not only did corner loafing offend these ladies, but these "insects" also blocked the entrances to the offices and stores of professional and businessmen, "preventing ingress and egress." The *Defender* even called on the aldermen

---

"street cars are public carriers and every man is entitled to equal privileges," he asked riders not to do anything that would interfere with another man's privilege. "Street car Etiquette," Ibid., March 23, 1918.

[49] Ibid., March 23, 1918 and May 25, 1918.

[50] "Public Deportment Qualifies Your Training," Ibid., July 6, 1918.

[51] "Conduct on street Cars," Ibid., September 14, 1918.

[52] "Conduct on Streetcars," Ibid., September 14, 1918. Once inside the car, passengers were advised to "sit quietly and avoid loud talk" with their neighbor. "The other passengers are not interested in what you have to say, and the way you say it may give offense." "Where We are Lacking," Ibid., May 17, 1919.

to help them deal with this "intolerable nuisance."[53] Offenders were given a list of Do's and Don'ts: "Don't congregate in crowds on the streets to the disadvantage of others passing along. Don't spend your time hanging around saloon doors or poolrooms," especially if it meant that one had been drinking. "Don't get intoxicated and go out on the street insulting women and children and make a beast of yourself—someone may act likewise with your wife and children."[54]

Wherever newcomers were visible in Chicago, their behavior became subjects of concern for old settlers. Dancing pavilions, a new and increasingly popular site of urban leisure, were a source of dissatisfaction. One elite Chicago woman criticized the "disgusting standard of looseness in public dancing" witnessed in a recreation dancing pavilion on the Fourth of July. The object of disgust was dancing "entirely too close to her partner to be anything than vulgar" and she was further chastised for wearing "a very loose untidy middy blouse, head uncombed." The commentator went on to explain that this couple established nothing short of "resentment in the minds of the white people and disgust in the Race person's presence." Another offender at the dance, "danced with his hat on and had to be prompted to remove it by a hint from one of the musicians who happened to be a member of our Race." She was worried that if this kind of behavior was not corrected immediately, it would "bring great humiliation to the Race as a whole." The real issue seems to have been that this commentator knew the African American community was on trial. "We all know our faults weigh much more than our virtues, in

[53] "Where We are Lacking," Ibid., May 17, 1919.
[54] "Some Don'ts," ibid., May 17, 1919.

these times of battle. For recognition I appeal to the mothers, the girls, the men and boys, not to fall in that most important necessary success in Race uplift."[55]

Concern about public presence extended also to addressing migrants that they should dress appropriately. Migrants were warned "Don't appear on the street with old dust caps, dirty aprons and ragged clothes."[56] Women addressed the issue of dress more aggressively on the Women's page in 1918 when they announced that they declared war in bold capital letters: "WAR DECLARED ON APRONS AND CAPS IN STREET CARS." According to this column, the situation had become very alarming and began to hurt the "Race" so "the *Chicago Defender* declared war on boudoir caps, aprons and overalls in the street." Calling on the pastors, women stressed that African Americans in Chicago were no longer "in the Southland" and that there was "no mark of servitude that must be placed on a man or woman of color in these climes." These women told their newly arrived sisters that they must refrain from wearing a white or gingham apron and caps on street cars, or when shopping. It was "disgusting," "very vulgar," and "showed lack of breeding." Migrant women were also chided for wearing thin calico dresses and advised to wear underskirts. Being properly clad would be less inviting to grocery and store clerks who made advances. Any woman who had "one spark of womanhood in her" would never be seen on the street in such dress, nor sit on the porch in their stocking feet. The *Defender* women further chided Second Ward men for sitting on porches in their undershirts and reminded Stock Yard workers that they should change their overalls

[55] Mrs. B. S. Gaten, Member of the YWCA, "Standards of Looseness in Public Places" Ibid., July 13, 1918. For African American Clubwomen's "Race Uplift" efforts in Chicago see Knupfer, *Toward a Tenderer Humanity*.
[56] "Some Don'ts" in *The Chicago Defender*, October 20, 1717.

before leaving work and carry them "wrapped up in a neat little bundle," so not to offend anyone.[57]

Fear of racial backlash was at work here, of course, but instructions on public dress and behavior were also cast in terms of developing a sense of belonging to the city. Inappropriate behavior included sitting "beside a well dressed man or woman" when garbed in their dirty clothes, in which they had been "plastering, whitewashing or perhaps digging sewers."[58] "You must appreciate the fact that leaving your employment without removing the odor incidental to your line of occupation is an imposition on the people with whom you ride." Writers instructed that "no man should get on the car with his clothes filled with the Stock Yards aroma, or just from some white washing job and sit down beside a lady with her best clothes on."[59] There was neither excuse nor defense for this kind of untidiness, especially for those who worked for large corporations, because large corporations had "every facility for bathing, as well as protection for the change of clothes one may carry to make himself decent in appearance. Hence, there is no necessity for the offensive body odor so often discovered."[60]

Fear of being judged in the public eye by the poor deportment of rural African Americans and anxious to bring all African Americans into the urban community, stirred old Chicago settlers into action. "Original" Istanbulites had no such fears. They feared the damage that rural migrants would inflict on the "civilized," "cultured" status of their city. Imperial capital of the Ottoman Empire for many centuries, Istanbul was the center of power, authority, culture, and civilization. "Original" Istanbulites and those who

---

[57] Betsey Lane, "War Declared on Aprons and Caps in Street Cars" *The Chicago Defender*, May 25, 1918.
[58] "Streetcar etiquette," Ibid., March 23, 1918.
[59] "Public Deportment Qualifies Your Training," Ibid., July 6, 1918.
[60] "Conduct on street Cars," Ibid., September 14, 1918.

resided in Istanbul for official duty, education or training perceived and experienced their city as such. Even after the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the founding of the republic, Istanbulites saw themselves in the light of this inherited cultural heritage. In the minds and memories of those who were there prior to the rural influx, Istanbul was an exclusive community. People knew those with whom they came into contact and respected one another; people owned the houses in which they lived. Above all, Istanbulites were "cultured." Men could not be spotted on the street without ties. Women did not feel threatened when they walked on the street. They practiced "the art" of shared living.[61] As a cultural and educational center, Istanbul was "the preferred residence of Turkey's elite."[62] So it is no surprise that the "original" Istanbulites' reactions to rural newcomers centered on the implication that their rural characteristics hurt Istanbul's civilized status. Looking back on it, they called the migration "an invasion," and a "Plunder!"[63] Tanju Akerman, an "original" Istanbul resident, exemplifies the way Istanbulites conceptualized their past: "Istanbul herself was once an institution of higher education. One advanced himself by merely taking a walk on her streets."[64] This view of Istanbul was being undermined by the persistence of newcomers in the city and the rural habits they brought with them.

Istanbul

Tensions between those who considered themselves "original" residents and newcomers have existed almost from the beginning of the rural "onslaught." *My City Istanbul Campaign* has more recently exposed these deep-rooted tensions. Doğan Kuban,

---

[61] Eksen, *Dünkü Istanbul*, 85-97.
[62] Danielson and Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization*, 56.
[63] Doğan Hasol, *Yağma Var*! (Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 1997).
[64] Mehmet Tanju Akerman, *Istanbullu* (Istanbul: Elçi Yayıncılık, 2005), 43.

an active participant in this campaign and many other Istanbul projects as well as an author of many books on Istanbul, spoke of two Istanbuls. One was the Istanbul of those from within, and the other was the Istanbul of those from without. Those from without failed to see, treat and experience Istanbul within its historical significance. The problem with this group, be they gecekondu dwellers or company executives, was that they treated Istanbul as a market, as a tool for personal profit.[65] Writing almost concurrently with Kuban, Ilhan Eksen began his book by asking "how many Istanbul residents do you think are 'real' Istanbulities?" He distinguished those who qualified as an Istanbulite by having been born and raised in the city from those who defined themselves as Istanbulites. Those who defined themselves as being Istanbulities, he argued, were "conscious of living in such a city," and they understood and met the requirements of living in a "city," by striving "to live in harmony with the air, water, green, streets and residents."[66] Eksen argued that having been born in Istanbul did not make one an Istanbulite. It has become very fashionable in the last decade or so to write memoirs of growing up or living in Istanbul in the 1950s, a process that the campaign has sped up.[67]

---

[65] Even though the author recognized that cities could be perceived and experienced on many different levels and in many different ways, he eventually used these two broad categories. Doğan Kuban, "Istanbul Var Istanbul'dan Içeri Istanbul Var Istanbul'dan Dışarı" in *Istanbul*, Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, Quarterly, April 2001, No 37, 84-87.

[66] Ilhan Eksen, *Dünkü Istanbul: Çok Dinli, Çok Dilli Mozaiğin Dağılışı*, (Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2002), 11.

[67] Burhan Arpad, *Bir Istanbul Var Idi* (Istanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık A. Ş., 2003); Mümtaz Cankurtaran, *Bir Zamanlar Istanbul* (Istanbul: Erciyaş Yayınları, 2006); Mehmet Tanju Akerman, *Iki Avuç Istanbul* (Istanbul: Elçi Yayıncılık, 2004); Akerman, *Istanbul ve Değişim* (Istanbul: Elçi Yayınları, 2006); Cem Atabeyoğlu, *Bir Istanbul Vardı* (Istanbul: Kelebek, 2002); Ilhan Eksen, *Dünkü Istanbul: Çok Dinli, çok dilli mozaiğin dağılışı* (Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2002); and Orhan Pamuk, *Istanbul: Hatıralar ve Şehir* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003). See also interviews conducted with the "original" or "old" Istanbulites within the Kentim Istanbul Campaign. In June 2003 campaign organizers held a dinner that brought together "Eski Istanbullular" or "old Istanbulites" whom organizers considered to be living testimonies of the traditional urban social life befitting Istanbul. http://www.kentimistanbul.com/haber.asp?regno=148&p=13 (last accessed 11/29/2007). In December 2003 they brought together a famous actress fairly new Istanbulite, who had lived in the city for about five years, and a rather established Istanbulite, whose family lived in Istanbul for five centuries, to share their

These recent questions are echoes of earlier objections. The divisions between old or "real/original" and new and "pseudo" Istanbulities were being drawn as early as the 1950s. Kemal Karpat, one of the first historians of the gecekondu, defined the old city inhabitants as members of "established families with old middle-class value" who "regarded the migration as a peasant invasion." He pointed out that the established families complained about the "disappearance of city manners and of privacy." Feeling overwhelmed by the "rising tide from the countryside," they hoped to prevent it by every possible means. As a "venerable female descendant of one of the Ottoman aristocratic families" told the author, the regression of Turkey that began in 1909 "with the downfall of Abdulhamid II" accelerated with Atatürk. "The end came in 1950, with the introduction of 'democracy,' which spoiled the scum of the towns and the ignorant and hungry peasants." This venerable female believed that learned men should not "devote their time to studying these wretches," that they should rather expand their energies in a fight to preserve what she identified as having been "left of the civilization of our great peers."[68]

Initially, "original" Istanbulites only grumbled about the migrants. They imagined sending them back voluntarily and forcing them to go back in the event that they refused to volunteer to leave. Over time these "civilized" Istanbulites would begin to feel outnumbered; they became apprehensive and began to publicly ***protest*** migrants'

---

memories of Istanbul. See http://www.kentimistanbul.com/haber.asp?regno=233&p=6 (last accessed 11/29/2007).

[68] Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 62-64. Karpat also pointed out that the intellectuals and journalists identified the class to which this venerable lady belonged as "conservative bourgeois or decadent Osmanlı (Ottoman) aristocracy." Her response is typical of 1890s Ottoman elite, who among other reasons, were concerned about the tourists taking photographs of the paupers because they believed the paupers made Istanbul look bad and wanted paupers to be sent back to wherever they came from. For a detailed discussion of the Ottoman elite's desire to send paupers back to their towns see Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı Imparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, Iktidar ve Meşrutiyet 1876-1914* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayıncılık A. Ş., 2002), 79-81.

presence. Looking back, Turkish columnist Oktay Akbal exclaimed, "...all of a sudden, as a native of Istanbul, born and raised in this city, in this city I love so much, I felt a stranger. I was provincial, accidentally arrived in an unknown big city, left in the streets." Akbal was writing three decades after the first gecekondu had made its mark on the city, and the damage was already done. He asserted that old Istanbulites had become "ruralized" provincial residents. Whereas "a handful of" original Istanbulites lived in the "Istanbul of tramways with only a few taxicabs," and in which "people did not feel like strangers to one another," Anatolia soon "*conquered* Istanbul... Authors who wanted to write about Anatolia and Anatolians no longer had to travel there to write about its people for Anatolia had arrived in Istanbul."[69]

Because the initial wave of rural migration to Istanbul preceded large-scale industrialization, the newcomers initially arrived without much notice. Formal organization to receive the rural-urban newcomers and to help them urbanize, "civilize," or "modernize" was limited to a few voluntary associations that were both small in scope and short-lived. Some newspaper columns addressed the issue and some state action on the part of the municipality was taken largely in response to concerns raised by the newspapers. Migrants met their immediate needs by settling into a gecekondu settlement on the city's outskirts in areas that were considered villages or rural districts at the time. Many relied on kinship and communal networks (akrabalık and hemşehrilik respectively) to get settled.[70] Through the "kahvehane" (the coffee shop) association building followed:

---

[69] Oktay Akbal in Önder Şenyapılı, *Kentlileşen Köylüler* (Istanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1978), 73. Akbal wrote for another Turkish daily, *Cumhuriyet*. Here Anatolia by implication means "rural."

[70] For a detailed discussion of rural-urban migration to Istanbul preceding large-scale industry see Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık A. Ş., 1989), 188-190. On kinship ties and employment see Alan Dubetsky, "Kinship, Primordial Ties, and Factory Organization in Turkey: An Anthropological View," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7:3 (July 1976).

a leadership pattern emerged by which settlers organized from within their settlements. The significance of these primary organizations must not be overlooked. But in terms of helping migrants' integration into the city, where adopting proper deportment was concerned, these organizations did not open communication between the "original" Istanbulites and the newcomers.

The kinship and communal ties networks that brought rural people to Istanbul and provided them with some direction on shelter and also with the physical help necessary to build their individual units also provided mutual help and assistance in the traditional sense. The kahve, which at times served as an employment bureau, was also an important communication center where problems were discussed and informal decisions were made. Every hemşehri group had their own major coffee house.[71] Later these networks were formalized in the form of Hemşehri Dernekleri (Associations Based on Common Origins).[72] The gecekondu settlements in Istanbul with their coffee houses and common

---

[71] Akerman, *Istanbullu*, 46. The kahvehane served as "the center of employment," according to Akerman; or as a "communication center," according to Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 133.

[72] Ayça Kurtoğlu, "Mekansal Bir Olgu Olarak Hemşehrilik ve Bir Hemşehrilik Mekanı Olarak Dernekler," http://www.ejts.org/document375.html (last accessed 12/5/2005) The author (Bilkent University, Political science department) discusses "hemşehrilik as a social phenomenon and organized forms of hemşehrilik in particular." She suggests that "hemşehrilik should be analyzed by both paying special attention to its relation to physical space, and considering contributions of macro-political order and micro-sociological instances to the content and formation of hemşehrilik." Page 1 of 36. She conceptualizes hemşehrilik as 1. Hemşehri dernekleri are not homogenous and vary according to group; 2. Sometimes they compete for status; 3. That it is an understudied phenomenon; 4. That social organizations such as these are centered around physical space; 5. That hemşehri organizations are formed in the city because of the state of being in the city; 6. Beyond the process of migration and settlement in a new city, hemşehri dernekleri serve functions such as finding a doctor in the city, getting desired employment transfers, finding tenants, building careers. 7. Hemşehrilik networks are formed based on mutual trust mechanisms. 8. Outside of the kahvehane such networks enable those in them to exchange information informally at a hemşehri's market (bakkal), etc. 9. Sometimes hemşehri groups monopolize certain jobs—this shows that hemşehri organizations are not just adjusted to buffer the initial shock of coming to the city, but proves that they are of the lasting kind. 10. Hemşehri organizations are numerous—but this should not be interpreted as that they are all functioning—sometimes the mere title of hemşehri dernek is a status symbol.
Jeanne Hersant and Alexandre Toumarkine agree that hemşehri organizations should not be written off as transitional organizations by showing that these organizations appeared in the 1940s and grew "incessantly since then, even more so since the 1990s." Jeanne Hersant and Alexandre Toumarkine, "Hometown organizations in Turkey: an overview" http://www.ejts.org/document397.html

origin associations thus provided functions similar to the more formal, voluntary associations in Chicago. Yet the leadership of the hemşeri associations themselves had little understanding of the city as a community and their place in it. As Doğan Kuban would argue, they were Istanbulites from without.

Karpat's findings led him to conclude that the communal organization in the settlement was a "mediating, practical organization" that maintained "solidarity among migrants" and it "facilitated their integration into the city."[73] Other scholars agreed that informal, primary networks did play a significant role in migrants' initial survival in the city.[74] Kinship and communal ties did provide newcomers help and familiarity in a new setting.[75] What they didn't do, though, was that they did not help migrants' overall process of communicating with "original Istanbulites." Moreover, their "integration into the city" needs further elaboration. Karpat's view of integration was very specific and as such was very different from the kind of integration that the "original" Istanbulites expected of the migrants. By integration Karpat meant that the rural newcomers' would

---

[73] Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 137.

[74] In his study of the Korean city of Pusan, Dong Shik Hong argues that primary (kinship and neighborhood) relations not only survived but positively effected participation in "expressive" voluntary associations. (Expressive here is used to include social service associations such as the Red Cross and YMCA; art and leisure associations; fraternal associations such as the Rotary and PTA; and church organizations.) He further asserts that in developing societies "social participation is presumed as a supplement rather than a substitute for primary relations." See Dong Shik Hong, "Primary Relationships and Social Participation in a Korean Metropolitan City," *Sociological Perspectives* 30:3 (July 1987), 290, 306, and 293-294. These primary networks may have led to migrants' participation in other types of voluntary associations emphasizing cultural and sports activities. The following is a list of Formal Associations/ Organizations in Istanbul as identified by Yücekök: In 1946: Beautification; Social Aid, Sports, and Cultural for the year 1946; Religious (mosque building) category was added the following year; Vakıf was added as a category beginning in 1955; Religious groups were divided into two subcategories beginning in 1965 as those which built mosques, and those which spread religious ideology. See Ahmet N. Yücekök, "1946-1971 Yılları arasında Istanbul'da Sivil Toplum Örgütleri," in *Tanzimattan Günümüze Istanbul'da Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları*, 181-186. For the American case, this often meant through voluntary associations. Jacqueline Boles, "The Administration of Voluntary Associations: A Course for the 80s," *Teaching Sociology* 12:2 (January 1985), 193. In an African case study assuming urban norms, or adapting, was seen as "transition from status (kinship) to contractual relationships in associations." D. J. Parkin, "Urban Voluntary Associations As Institutions of Adaptation," *Man* 1:1 (March 1966), 93.

[75] Sema Erder, "Where Do You Hail From? Localism and Networks in Istanbul," in Çağlar Keyder, Ed., *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 1999), 166.

become politicized. In the process of settlement, migrants organized into more formal organizations called Gecekonduyu Güzelleştirme Dernekleri (Beautification Organizations). According to Karpat, as leaders in Beautification Organizations made demands on city and national politicians for the provision of basic city services, migrants became politicized.

The case of the Şişli Gecekondularını Ihya ve Güzelleştirme Derneği provides a good example. Founded 12 December 1951, the Association worked to ensure that the gecekondu settlers in and around Şişli "got their water, roads, sewage, electricity, mosque, and çeşme (water fountain); that their gecekondus were not demolished and that they received their deeds," in other words that "citizens could live in their homes in a *civilized* manner." According to Naim Tanyeri, the director of the association, they intended to cooperate with the municipality and other officials in remaking the gecekondus by following the proper methods. This intention included rebuilding the illegal buildings legally by following sanitary and other regulations. Members penned countless letters to the Grand National Assembly, representatives and the press and held press conferences. During one of the press conferences they warned that gecekondu owners and actually all of Istanbul was under the threat of infectious diseases. "It is not an exaggeration," a member revealed, "that when a settlement of one hundred thousand people goes without sewage, or when sewage water runs freely in the streets where little kids play; when seventy five thousand persons get their water from a water seller and are forced to use the same water for washing dishes morning, noon, and night--the threat is very real." Shortly after this press conference, a source revealed, the governor/mayor arrived at the settlement to "listen to the people and inspect the conditions personally." At

the end of his visit Gökay signed the association guest book acknowledging that "the voice of suffering was the voice of the people" and that it was his office's duty to solve such problems by using the proper channels. One month after Gökay's visit the association decided to take action against the slowness of the provisions by holding a demonstration in the Taksim Square. The preparations for the demonstration included making and distributing a proclamation and leaders took pains to ensure that the demonstrators "shaved, cut their nails, and dressed properly for the occasion so that no one could call them plunderers." When they were denied government permission to hold the demonstration, the association went ahead with it anyway which resulted in members being taken in by the police. The association was closed down more than a few times but each time it came back albeit under a different name.[76]

Beautification Organizations opened a political communication channel directly between the migrants and politicians through their leaders.[77] Under such leadership though, "urbanization" in the community did not necessarily include a "culture change."[78] *Istanbul Ekspres's* efforts to publicize conditions in the Zeytinburnu and Kazlıçeşme settlements presents another opportunity for observing how political ties were established directly between government officials and newcomers. *Istanbul Ekspres* established a very close and personal relationship with the gecekondu dwellers. In the

---

[76] Arus Yumul, "Kuştepe'nin Kuruluşu ve Kimliği," in Gülten Kazgan, Ed., *Kuştepe Araştırması 1999* (Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1999), 33-46.

[77] More recently, in their overview of hometown organizations in Turkey, scholars have reached the same conclusion about the hometown (hemşehri) organizations. Since 1983, they argue, hometown organizations have multiplied in number. According to authors the fact that such organizations have lasted into the 1990s and increased in numbers in the decade following 1990 shows that they were more than just a means of integration into the urban environment. They also acknowledge that hometown associations are "the point at which political and social networks fuse giving rise to a means of communication with the political-institutional system." The main offices located in or near administrative and economic centers, they argue, imply being in contact with political and economic authorities. Jeanne Hersant and Alexandre Toumarkine, "Hometown Organizations in Turkey: an overview," http://www.ejts.org/document397.html (last visited 12/5/2005)

[78] Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 42-43.

summer of 1952 when the newspaper was celebrating its first year, reporters looked back on the previous year and recounted their successes. The first of these was the attention they drew to the conditions in the settlements: populations in Zeytinburnu and Kazlıçeşme had reached tens of thousands and the people were suffering from lack of water, electricity, and road services. Residents of these settlements registered many grievances with the *Istanbul Ekspres*, which finally sent a photographer to the settlements in the middle of winter. The photographer, in knee-high boots, slogged through the mud and photographed the existing conditions. *Istanbul Ekspres* continued publishing similar stories and photographs throughout the year, and even sent the mayor/governor "boots" as a symbolic invitation to the settlements. The governor inspected the settlements and a delegation of gecekondu settlers was granted counsel with the Prime Minister during one of his visits to the city. The Prime Minister commanded the governor to take necessary action.[79] So the newspaper's efforts resulted in bringing much needed services to these areas. This type of political activity bypassed the "original" Istanbulites, and while migrants generally succeeded in gaining the city services they asked for, they also gained "original" Istanbulites' hostility. Although newcomers, or gecekondu dwellers as they were generically referred to at the time, may not have gone through a culture change in terms of learning the urban manners that original Istanbulites expected of "cultured," "civilized" urbanites, the sort of association building in the settlements and the types of demands made reveal a desire to live as "civilized people" in the city.

This desire to live as civilized people parallels Karpat's findings. Based on gecekondu settlers' answers, and in line with what he termed the third phase of migrants' urbanization, Karpat concluded that gecekondu settlers wanted to meet city people and

[79] "Işte bilanço," *Istanbul Ekspres*, August 1952.

desired contact with them "to acquire knowledge, manners, and ideas of the urbanites; to satisfy the yearning to become civilized," and "to become fully assimilated into the city." City residents, on the other hand, "blamed the squatters for undermining the established urban ways of life and manners and for spoiling the physical appearance of the city."[80] City residents' reactions that Karpat identified only worsened in the last four decades. Volumes have been published in the pages of newspapers and other publications, with increasingly insulting depictions of the migrants. The general inclination to view newcomers as naïve, poor, ignorant but well meaning rural citizens gave way to seeing them as leeches. Public criticism extended to the municipality and the central government simultaneously. Interestingly, for all their insults and their discomfort, it hardly occurred to "original" Istanbulites that they might have a hand in bettering conditions through taking some responsibility in aiding the migrants' adjustment to their city.[81]

What were middle class Istanbul residents doing at the time of the initial migration?[82] As Sema Erder pointed out, middle class help and leadership was closed as

---

[80] Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 139-140; 155. Phases of urbanization as identified by Karpat: 1. "Villager's decision to leave his community." In the city he establishes himself in the gecekondu. Adopts urban dress and some urban habits as preparatory steps toward assuming city views and attitudes. (city dress is a little superficial but symbolizes for the squatter his transition to a higher form of societal existence.) 2. "Migrants adopting and sharing of such city facilities as water, electricity, and transportation, and also regularly buying his food and clothing in shops." 3. Squatter's willingness "to establish relations with other city people." 4. "Squatter's full identification with the city—his personal conviction that he does not belong to the village but to the city."

[81] Hasol, *Yağma Var!*, 26. "Didn't the urbanites have any fault?" the author asked. He answered his own question by pointing out that the urbanites were somewhat responsible because "they put profit first."

[82] It has been recognized that "following World War II everyone was poor: the people, the government, everyone" so that much of what was "new for the villager in the city" was "also new for the urban dweller." According to Michael Danielson and Ruşen Keleş, this did not stop them from trying to preserve their dominance in the city. Highlighting the state's close identification with middle class values and needs, authors pointed out "most urban public resources were devoted to providing services to middle class neighborhoods." See Hasol, *Yağma Var!*, 45; and Karpat, *The Gecekondu*, 137. Michael N. Danielson and Ruşen Keleş, *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization: Government and Growth in Modern Turkey* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), 123. To be fair to the middle class though, the lack of voluntary leadership among this class of Istanbul residents cannot be blamed solely on their preoccupation with their own place in society. The level of centralized government power and control has been identified as one of the factors inhibiting the development of local organizations. See James E. Curtis, Edward G. Grabb, Douglas E. Baer,

an avenue to migrants' cultural adjustment in Istanbul.[83] Other scholars have shown that middle class Istanbulites were too busy looking after their own interests- trying to keep abreast of the economic changes and the political chaos the 1950s presented.[84]

Also between 1932-1946, the state took in its own hands the efforts to educate, revitalize, modernize, and assist 'the masses' through halk evleri (people's houses).[85] They wanted to instill in the people new values such as the ability to think and speak for themselves and to shed the Ottoman custom and expectation of being silent.[86] Halk Evleri existed in every major city. They functioned mostly as centers for civic inculcation and did not address the social issues relevant to migration or urbanization. Defined as "local clubs where literature, political ideas, manufacturing development, agricultural improvement could be discussed" Halk Evleri served as local community centers.[87] Chiefly the organs of the Turkish Republican People's Party, they created networks

---

"Voluntary Association Membership in Fifteen Countries: A Comparative Analysis," *American Sociological Review* 57:2 (April 1992), 150.

[83] Sema Erder, "From Where Do You Hail?" in Keyder, ed., *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local.*

[84] Oğuz Işık and M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu explain the middle classes' way of dealing with the pains of urban growth by employing the term "apartmanlaşma" or "apartmentization." According to these authors middle classes networked with a new class of builders wherein they traded their houses and the land on which houses stood in exchange for a share of the apartments in the new apartment buildings. Oğuz Işık and M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu, *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneği* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2001), 104. In this they were following the state's vision of modernization. See Kadıoğlu for modernization as state project. From the end of World War I until the 1930s, Atatürk's reforms insisted on seeing the Turkish nation as a classless society. With the population exchanges following World War I, Istanbul lost a big percentage of foreign (non-Muslim) elements who had constituted the merchant middle classes. Then again during World War II many non-Muslim Istanbul residents were financially forced to leave due to unjust taxes. Starting with the etatist period (1930s), perhaps even dating back to the founding of the Republic, government encouragement of private establishments and credits had privileged some citizens over others. So some people were getting rich but they did not yet define themselves as a class. They were still defining themselves by their relationship to capital accumulation... For more details on the lack of middle class leadership, see Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 1989), 101-195.

[85] One in Eminönü, see *Istanbul Ekspres*, 27 July, 1952.

[86] Although there were many associations at this time period, Yeşilkaya and Keyder's arguments strengthen my argument that the state's taking matters of modernization into its own hands slowed down the process of responsibility taking for the newcomers. Neşe Gurallar Yeşilkaya, *Halkevleri: Ideoloji ve Mimarlık* (Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 1999). Yeşilkaya also adds that people's houses were specifically conceptualized as part of the modernization project to bring the people an alternative to meeting as 'Muslim people/Muslim congregation' in the mosques.

[87] Douglas A. Howard, *The History of Turkey*, (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001), 106-107; and Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 382-383.

aimed to "make the [Atatürk/ Kemalist] Revolution reach the people, to inculcate patriotism and eradicate ignorance."[88] If they had worked as intended they would have modernized the rural citizens. Since original Istanbulites regarded "being modern" highly, since they equated it with their city, this process would have helped bridge some of the cultural gap.

In Turkey, beginning with the Constitution of 1924, laws regarding associations have undergone a series of changes. The central state has wavered between seeing the right to form associations as a natural right and freedom, to placing that right under strict administrative regulation, and/or supervision; from requiring associations to obtain permission (regulating them and their functions) to giving the administration power to close them down.[89] This was another fact that impeded organization to "urbanize"

---

[88] Geoffrey Lewis, *Modern Turkey*, (New York: PRAEGER Publishers, 1974), 121-122. Lewis argued that the activities of the People's Houses were to be organized in nine different sections: Language, literature and history; Fine arts; Dramatics; Sports; Social assistance; People's classrooms and foreign language courses; Library services and publications; Rural activities and museum and exhibitions. From their inception in 1931 until 1949 when they were closed down there were 478 People's Houses, later supplemented by the People's Rooms in villages, which reached an estimated 4,000 by 1950. Further research has revealed that People's Houses resumed their activities between 1961-1980, when they were closed once again by the Military intervention; and reopened in 1987-present. For further information see: http://www.halkevleri.org.tr/english/history.html

[89] See Keyder, 137-139 on the state's "on-again-off-again" attitude of allowing voluntary association to exist. See Özbek, 293 on the Late Ottoman roots of this mistrust. The 1924 Constitution recognized the right to association as a natural right and freedom, reversing the strict administrative regulation and supervision placed on association building in 1923. A 1938 law required that associations obtain permission, that their activities be open to administrative controls, and gave the central administration the power to close them down at any time. A 1946 law altered this attitude and restored the freedom of association, only to restrict it again in 1956. The requirement that associations obtain permission was removed in the 1961 Constitution only to be reinstituted in ensuing Constitutions and laws. Ahmet N. Yücekök, "Türk Hukukunda Tüzel Kişilik," in *Tanzimattan Günümüze Istanbul'da Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları* (Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1998), 149- 152. See also Jeanne Hersant and Alexandre Toumarkine, "Hometown Organizations in Turkey: an overview," http://www.ejts.org/document397.html (last visited 12/5/2005) Authors argue "the authoritarian and nationalistic character of the Turkish state can be emphasized for a better understanding of the hemşehri associative phenomenon." Cemiyetler Kanunu, first law under the Republic regulating associations, was "adopted under the provisions of the 1924 Constitution." In the 1950s, "the introduction of the multiparty system was accompanied by a significant growth in the number of associations in Turkey." But in the post 1980 coup Turkey, hemşehri associations "like many others, had to cease their activities, with the exception of those linked with the national cause (milli dava). From then on, under the emergency state, the creation of associations was subjugated to approval by military authorities." In the second half of the 1980s

newcomers, as it created fear and a certain level of apathy in the citizenry who came to depend on the state for the solution of all of their problems.

In July 1954 Turkish women who belonged to the Kadınlar Birliği (Women's Association) announced that the new administrative committee had met and discussed what direction their activities were to take. Before they made their final decision they asked the newspaper and the people for their input. They asked the people to take part in their ongoing survey (12 July-15 August): What should the Women's Association do to better benefit the nation? They even offered a gold watch to the male or female participant who gave the best answer. The administrative committee asked the editors to dedicate a leading article on the matter. The women asked the editors: "do you find the existence of this association necessary? Why? Or Why not?"[90]

Mithat Perin, a male editor, answered with a public call for the women to begin work in the daily matters. He began by pointing out that Turkish women were far from being organized successfully. This was a gap hanging over the Turkish society, one that he hoped a future or forward looking Women's Association would fill. He used the example of centers in Europe where women played leading roles in urging the people to struggle against rising prices and against those who were in charge of raising such. Women in various European centers, he argued, personally fought with the profiteers. "A woman," he wrote, "is a major constructive element in society who protects herself, her children and her husband from the parasites to the end." The author was witness to a

---

associations increased, as political parties and trade unions folded into hometown associations and then towards associations for mosque building. Vakıf, or foundations, were subjected to a different set of laws. "Articles 73 to 81 of the Turkish Civil Code, 'medeni kanun' of October 4, 1926... became a legal means of bypassing the restrictions on the freedom of association." In 1995, "by law number 4121" and by modifying "article 33 of the 1982 Constitution," prohibitions were extended to foundations (Vakıfs).

[90] Nazlı Tiabar, "Kadınlar Birliği Genel Başkanlığından," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 12 July 1954.

stirring among the Turkish women, who had gained their political rights and freedoms a long time before women of the world's most civilized nations. He hoped that the women would fight the deceitful (celep: drover, dealer in sheep and cattle), the profiteering vegetable provider/seller, and the opportunist seller of fabrics (kumaşçı).[91] In August 1954 when Türk Kadınlar Birliği announced their decision to open three Sosyal Himaye Evleri (Public Houses of Protection) in Eyüp, Şile, and Alibeyköyü where (köylü vatandaşlar) citizens from the villages would receive free physical examinations and care, they also hoped to begin the process of helping village women progress (köy kadınlarının kalkınması).[92]

It was not that Istanbul did not have institutions by which to help those who needed it. Istanbul had its formal institutionalized charities as well as philanthropists. Some of the institutions had been inherited from the Ottoman Empire, and modernized to serve continued needs of the urban poor such as the Darülaceze and Darüşşafaka, both of which had been founded in the late 1870s.[93] There was at least one association formed by

---

[91]Mithat Perin, "Türk Kadınlarını Bekleyen Vazifeler," Ibid., 12 July 1954. This is again an example of the state's modernization project: taking Western women as the ideal for Turkish women and the Turkish Women's Association to follow. This was actually done in many areas, especially in new institutions where modern skills were necessary, the government sent many men and women to the West, including the United States, with the intention of topping off their education. This example also shows that obviously some women were concerned but I haven't been able to find anything more about the issue.

[92] Here the women they refer to as 'village women' are both women in distant villages and the village women in the city. Within the name Alibeyköyü for example 'köy' means village. Ibid., August 1954.

[93] Özbek, *Osmanlı Imparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet*, 195-216. See also "What to do with orphans?" *Istanbul Ekspres*, September-October, 1952. Darülaceze was established to help "the paupers and orphans who roamed the streets aimlessly, and to help those who slept in the mosque yards" due to migration from the lands lost during war. It was the first official welfare institution in Istanbul: as an effort to look and be modern. In 1924 it was placed under the municipality; in 1998 it was placed under the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Darüşşafaka began operating in 1873. It began as an educational facility for the training of orphans (boys without fathers, fatherless boys) and poor boys (Muslim in conception and origin). Many cemiyet (associations) opened in association with the facility to promote sports, etc. Darüşşafaka shouldered all of the clothing, shelter, nutritional and school supplies expenses for its students... There was the Istanbul Yardımseverler Derneği, which was generally mentioned unfavorably in the newspapersbecause the Association allegedly spent more on the fund raising activities than it collected through those activities. Vakıflar (vaqifs) varied in nature; summer camps for poor students were one example. There were various

the Istanbul residents specifically to deal with issues of becoming urbanized and modernized.

Historians like to focus on formal associations because "traditional sources and methods provide little information on informal group life," and because they think these groups played a diminished role in the city.[94] In the case of Istanbul, many organizations that did exist failed to leave traditional records. For example, the few mentions of the existence and the activities of the Istanbul Hemşeriler Cemiyeti (The Association of Those From Istanbul) prove that certain formal organizations regarding specifically the protection of the city existed in Istanbul, but information on them is scarce. In 1953 a story in the *Istanbul Ekspres* quoted one of the members of the Istanbul Hemşeriler Cemiyeti briefly as having said, "things do not happen quickly. It takes a long time to see the fruits of our labor. But this does not mean that we should give up. Rather, we cannot quit! (ipin ucunu bırakmaya gelmez) The Saygısızlıkla Savaş Cemiyeti (The Association to Fight the Disrespectful) was short lived, it dried up, because they quit! We must join forces with the Municipality and we must not expect the state to do all. We must become *civilized.* (medenileşmek gerek)."[95] A few months later, a reporter who had attended the Congress of the Istanbul Hemşeriler Derneği, authored a short story on "The duty of being urban" in which he reported briefly what had transpired in the meeting. "Members of the Association discussed and analyzed in detail the duty of equipping the urbanite."

---

camps in Büyükçekmece, Yeşilköy, Küçükyalı in the summer of 1952. See *Istanbul Ekspres*, August 1952. (Also there were scholarship/funding opportunities for students, as well as free meals, provided in cooperation with Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Müdürlüğü) Ibid., March 1953. And there were other less visible occasions for charities such as religious holidays and duties. Nevertheless, none of these associations/opportunities aimed to help the rural newcomers' urbanization process.

[94] James Borchert, "Urban Neighborhood and Community: Informal Group Life, 1850-1970," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 11, No. 4 (Spring, 1981), 607.
[95] *Istanbul Ekspres*, April 1953.

Satisfied with the discussion and resolutions the author concluded "but before anything else we each have to fully comprehend and digest the requirements of city life. Otherwise efforts like the Hemşeriler Derneği will not bear fruit."[96]

Public Manners and Dress

If records of associations are hard to come by, public records of "original" Istanbulites reactions to newcomers are not. Starting in 1950, Istanbulites noticed a decline in the use of proper language and manners in public, which they directly associated with newcomers' influence. For example, in one story passengers reported on the issue of improper language and impolite manners they witnessed on public transportation. "We are at the platform of the tramway right?" began one passenger observer. At the instruction of the ticket seller to purchase tickets, "one of the passengers said 'stop yelling! You half portion! We are going to purchase the ticket.'" The observer asked "'half portion?' What kind of language is that?" and commented that the ticket seller was probably twice this disruptive passenger's size. "It was obvious that the ticket seller was an experienced man, he let it go." The observer pointed out that he had detected an increase in such language on the streets. He did not approve of the young calling older gentlemen "old man!" He called for street discipline as the way to national discipline.[97]

In another story that summer, another passenger reflected on the work of a ticket collector on the bus. "Such 'intimacy' (used negatively) on the public buses, such overly familiar behavior!" the writer complained of the behavior of a ticket collector, whose shirt was inappropriately unbuttoned at the collar. The young employee constantly

[96] Selahattin Karayavuz , "Şehirli Olmak Vazifesi," Ibid., 2 June 1953.
[97] Tahsin Öztin, "Sokak Terbiyesi" in *Hürriyet*, July, 18, 1950.

muttered to himself and grumbled at the driver and the passengers, addressing them inappropriately as "old man," "mister uncle," "old lady," and "friend." "Move further on...Move up...You will be crowded over there, come nearer..." he instructed passengers respectively. "Brother Hasan, municipal workers are on our tail..." he notified the driver. He muttered to himself "where to find the proper change now?" He continued to serve the driver like a side view mirror as he shouted out directives such as "taxicab on the left," "Slow down," and "Two beards on the left." The observer continued with his complaints: "We became friends, relatives, neighbors all gathered on the same bus, even though we didn't know one another," he explained. "But the young employee, without constraint, added new aunts and uncles to this family at every bus stop. You would think this was not a bus but a neighborhood coffee house."[98]

Fears about diminishing the "cultured" city were becoming increasingly apparent in protests of the language being heard in the streets. "Pay attention to the language used in public places" another observer protested. "The Turkish language has been reduced to five, ten words." He was complaining about the "rowdy jargon (Tulumbacı argosu), swearwords and words which should only be used 'privately'" all lined up one after another. He pointed out that this kind of language showed no trace of respect for the elderly and courtesy for the ladies. By such language "the elderly are referred to as 'old men' and I dare not repeat how the ladies are addressed, and children are addressed so as to suggest that they are illegitimate!" He argued that those with courtesy no longer knew how to behave at the face of such behavior and language. "Those who assault women and bump into others with their shoulders as they walk on Beyoğlu Street even go as far as claiming that democracy has given them the right to act in such a manner." He then

[98] "Yabancı Dostlar," Ibid., August 16, 1950.

recounted a story he had heard from an acquaintance: "While he was getting on a bus some ruffian grabbed him by the shoulder and got in front of him. Before my friend could get a word out the ruffian sized him up and said 'there's democracy now.'" The observer went on, "we cannot overlook such behavior. A society's strength depends on discipline in good manners."[99] Five months later, the same observer argued that the formerly proper urban citizens had begun to adopt this kind of crude language, becoming vulgar people. "Like our proverb goes," he continued, "a person who falls in with bad companions gradually acquires their bad habits."[100]

In 1951 suggesting that some social requirements in public behavior were universal one Istanbulite argued that "sitting, eating, traveling in public areas" had rules every civilized person had to obey. "Unfortunately," he lamented, "90% of our population, most enlightened persons included," neglected them in "play and movie theaters and concert halls" as well as other public places. "We must enlighten such disruptive persons" he continued "as well as expect the Municipality to fine institutions that allow this kind of behavior."[101] The turn to the municipality as the authoritative figure with the power to fine institutions that allowed inappropriate behavior in Istanbul is very different from the assertive attitude of old settlers in Chicago who instructed and taught newcomers appropriate manners and dress. Perhaps the municipality could do little about the manners of such persons who attended public events, but they would later do something about the dress in which such persons attended public events.

"All traces of manners and courtesy have disappeared," one observer lamented. "What will become of us?" he asked, simultaneously pointing out that these were

[99] Selcuk Çandarlı, "Sopalı Terbiye" Ibid., September 13, 1950.
[100] Selçuk Çandarlı, "Terbiyesi Bozulan Şehirler," Ibid., February 21, 1951.
[101] Hasan Bedrettin Ülgen, "Sosyal kaideler," Ibid., March 23, 1951.

statements and questions one heard all together too much in the last couple of years. He revealed that a few years previously an association had been established with the specific aim of fighting with such disrespectful behavior. The observer continued regrettably, "we never hear the name of the association any more. Perhaps once it realized how much work there had to be done, it dissolved under the pressure."[102]

In 1952 a columnist registered his disgust with the many idle people loafing around all day long in public places during work hours. This columnist had gone to the harbor to see the contemporary Prime Minister of Turkey, Adnan Menderes, off and saw crowds of people loafing around on the balconies overlooking the pier, the pier itself and the street at 10:30 in the morning. "Who were those people?" the observer asked, "what were they doing there at this time of the day?" Stretching this evidence, he commented that the similar crowds could be seen on the Beyoğlu Street in front of store windows, chatting on the crosswalks all day long, blocking the streets and on park benches, coffee houses and pastry shops. "Seeing such idle crowds have always made me sick to my stomach," he continued, "making me sad about the days spent doing nothing."[103]

In February 1956 an editorial recognized that Istanbul's population had increased and was increasing at an astonishing rate as revealed by a recent population census. The author argued that population increase was a desired matter, however such large scale localized increases were objectionable and even dangerous, because they were draining city services. "Especially if the city happens to be Istanbul," he continued, "what they think, what they expect, what they gain from crowding in Istanbul, no one knows. What are these people doing on Istiklal Street, wondering around idly, in attire that almost

[102] Samih Tiryakioğlu, "Nezakete Dair," Ibid., June 23, 1952.
[103] Tahsin Öztin, "Kalabalık" Ibid., April 29, 1952.

mocks the clothing reforms? Of course this nation belongs to all of us. However, the villager who loves his nation is one that works hard to succeed in his own village. If the villager does not comprehend this sacred duty and we don't have the means to send him back to his village, we need to consider other solutions. Otherwise we will no longer find bread in the bakeries, prices will continue to rise, and robberies will increase."[104]

Newspapers generally made little mention of the rural migrants' dress, except in terms of disrespecting the law. A long tradition of state legislated dress reform continued when Atatürk banned the *fez* during the republican period under the 1925 "Hat Law."[105] That is what led one contemporary author to exclaim that lately on trains, ferries, and in parts of the city which fell out of the city's control it had become common place to come across old men in black skullcaps, or in turbans and with prayer beads in their hands. "How dare they walk around in such apparel? It is illegal! What do such persons mean to do?" he asked. "I know what it is" he answered his own question, "this is open hostility to dress reform."[106]

Women's magazines addressed issues of dress as it related to fashion or good manners. For example, *Hanımeli*, a popular women's magazine of the time, provided advice on how to be "görgülü" (or courteous/ decorous/ well-mannered). In August 1950 *Hanımeli* discussed what to wear on the streets. This column continued with various

---

[104] Selman Edis, "Istanbul ve Köylülerimiz," *Istanbul Ekspres*, February 1956.
[105] Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, pp. 100-102; and 266-271. The "Hat and Attire Reform" was "no mere external change. It was a step symbolizing and reinforcing the efforts towards catching up with the times, assuming a place within contemporary civilization." "...By adopting a modern and international mode of attire the Turkish nation would have a better opportunity to display the great merits it possessed." Turhan Feyzioğlu, "Cornerstone of the Turkish Revolution" in *Atatürk's Ways*, (Istanbul: FORM Advertising and Public Relations, 1982) p. 226.
[106] Hasan Bedrettin Ülgen, "Kıyafet Düşkünlüğü," in *Hürriyet*, August 26, 1953.

advice on being public: how to act in the theater, at the dinner table, how to sit properly, and how to act on public transportation.[107]

Over time, Istanbul writers found increasingly more to be criticized about both the manners and dress of migrants. "Far be it from us to advise anyone but" started one columnist "it is our job to be the translator of an Istanbulite's feelings upon having to briefly passing through Topkapı." Topkapı, being one of the main entrance points into Istanbul, was a visitor's first experience with the city. Sarıer categorized the migrants as "savage" Native Americans, who did not let the "civilized" white men pass. "The errand boys to the transportation companies" were Mohicans; "the drivers of the minibuses" were the Apaches; and the street peddlers were Comanche. After pointing out that no one wanted these people to lose their jobs and starve, the author demanded they be more orderly and leave Topkapı in peace. They had to learn to act according to city life, be polite and respect the rules. "Mohicans should be clean in dress, well-shaven, and not speak unless spoken to first," and be civilized in the way they addressed people. Apaches, too, he continued "should be well dressed, shaven and polite. They should drive their minibuses more carefully and admit no more than 14 passengers on the minibus." And the Comanche "should only peddle in areas pre-designated by the Municipality." They, too, were advised to be well dressed and polite. And they were asked to refrain from waylaying their customers.[108]

---

[107] *Hanımeli*, August 1950- 1951.

[108] Ilker Sarıer, *Istanbul'un Son Kullanma Tarihi*, 35. (This is a compilation of the columnist's work as they appeared in the *Sabah*, another Turkish newpaper.) The issue of commenting on migrants dress, and hygiene only intensified over time, especially once migrants began to move into middle and upper middle class apartment buildings as workers in the basement. See Gül Özyeğin, *Untidy Gender/Başkalarının Kiri.*

By April 1958, an editorial in *Istanbul Ekspres* was publicly thanking the municipality for outlawing the attendance in the theaters by people in dirty clothes.[109] *Havadis*, too, congratulated and thanked the municipality for restricting entrance in movie theaters. The municipality had passed a resolution to prohibit the entrance of persons who wore clothes dirty enough to disgust the other attendees. "We were in need of such a law against those who do not know how to respect the people," *Havadis* proclaimed, "it is partial but it deserves our thanks. It is partial because unfortunately such persons that offend others with their disrespectful attire attend more than theaters. They are on public transportation, on buses, on tramways, on dolmuş (shared taxis). This law should be extended to all public places, including streets themselves." The author ended with "every civilized city has a set of public good-manners (umumi terbiye) and citizens owe each other that much at least."[110]

On 23 April 1958, the day of the National Turkish Children's Holiday/Festival coincided with the religious Ramazan Bayramı. An author took the opportunity to recognize that the religious tradition of gift giving to the less fortunate had been extended to the Children's Holiday as a national custom, fulfilling the requirements of being Muslim and Turkish. This was a week of "kılık kıyafet" (or outward appearances). He wanted to touch on a point that he considered a source of national pride: "In our cities, in our towns, even in our remote regions no one's barefoot anymore... Our people also pay more attention to cleanliness, which we owe largely to the wider availability of water. Our public appearance has been rescued from the inferior eastern appearance."[111]

---

[109] "Belediyeye Teşekkür: Pis kıyafetle sinemaya girmeyi yasak etti," *Istanbul Ekspres*, 3 April 1958.
[110] Havadis, 3 April, 1958.
[111] "23 Nisan, Kılık Kıyafet Haftası," *Havadis*, 23 April 1958. All of this was also in line with the turn to West, to modernization- the different meanings associated with dress in Turkey.

Commentary on educating and training the youth and "the people" increased by 1958. One author warned against the 'Don Juan' types. "Occasionally, yes, some come into view. But if they increase in number, if they get braver... We have to pay attention to this in raising our youth."[112] On the need to train the people, another author pointed out that the enlightened people of Istanbul had a series of duties because the people were getting to think too much of themselves. Paralleling the attitude of the venerable Ottoman lady, who held 1950s leaders and their 'democracy' responsible for spoiling the peasants, this author addressed the enlightened people of the city. "Our leaders told the villager that he was the 'effendi' of the nation. Politicians told the masses that they would remain in power only if the masses wanted them there, and they stayed. Enlightened citizens told the illiterate that they would learn the language from them. In short, democracy stood ready to take orders from the masses, and treated them in a way that would please each and everyone. In this case masses of undeveloped peoples came to consider themselves as infallible..." What the enlightened persons had to do was bring the masses down easy. If this were to hurt their pride, then to do it with skill, compassion, and courtesy. "Our half enlightened citizens who have turned fully idealist need to take things from 'well, this is what the public wants,' to 'well, this is what is good for the public.'"[113]

[112] "Don Juanlarımız," Ibid., 4 April, 1958.
[113] "Halkı yetiştirmek," Ibid., 8 May, 1958.

Conclusion

In 2003 Ali Müfit Gürtuna, the mayor of Istanbul at the time, regarded migration to Istanbul that resulted from "flawed modernization politics" as one of the reasons why an urban culture in which the traditional and the modern generally overlaps, failed to take shape in Istanbul. From a municipal financial perspective this meant that half a century of migration continually undermined the municipality's efforts to improve Istanbul. He argued that "Istanbul was being demolished at the same time it was being built up; the city was being won back at the same time it was being devastated." In order to preserve the existing progress and to win back all that had been lost, he continued, everyone who lives in Istanbul has to be brought to a certain level of consciousness—one that requires residents to feel like Istanbulites so that they can attend to the future of their city and claim their city back.[1]

This dissertation agrees with those involved in the Kentim Istanbul Campaign. It shows that in order to attain that level of consciousness, that sense of belonging to the city, it is important to guide newcomers during the "modernization process." As the examples of Chicago and Istanbul have shown, the process of guiding can be varied due to differences in time and place, but it is when residents are able to be actively involved in solving their local housing, health, and political problems that they are more likely to attain and sustain that level of belonging to their city. Economic opportunity was an important factor in drawing rural migrants to the city, but it was not the ultimate defining

[1] "Istanbul'un yanlış modernleşme politikaları sonucunda aldığı göç, yatırım planlarındaki düzensizlik ve fiziki varığı ile tarihi, tabii, ve kültürel yapısı arasında baş gösteren marazi durum, gelenekle modernliğin örtüştüğü yeni bir kent kültürünün teşekkül etmesini önleyen önemli bir faktördür... Son elli yıldaki göçler ve hızlı nüfus artışı, Istanbul'da yenilenen ve çoğalan sorunların doğmasına yol açmıştır; yani, Istanbul bir taraftan yapılırken diğer taraftan yıkılmakta, bir taraftan geri kazanılırken diğer taraftan tahrip edilmektedir... Yapılanların ve halihazırda varolanların korunması, kaybedilenlerin geri kazanılması için Istanbul'da yaşayan herkesin Istanbullu olma ve Istanbul'a sahip çıkma bilincine varması gerekmektedir." Ali Müfit Gürtuna, "Sosyal Yatırımlar," www.kentimistanbul.com (Accessed December 5, 2007).

factor in how newcomers fare in these two cities. Both African American and Turkish rural migrants were drawn to their respective cities because of the possibility of a better future, and once in the city both groups realized that this would take longer than they expected. In Chicago, kinship and communal ties that contributed to the migration patterns intersected with the industrial companies' increasing need for laborers. In addition to kinship and communal ties, factories and the *Chicago Defender* together actively recruited laborers from the south. Chicago's recruitment drive gave old settlers time to reflect on the present and the future of their group in the city and contemplate the best ways to speed up the process of urbanization of rural newcomers so as to keep friction to a minimum, which resulted in the founding of a Chicago Branch of the Urban League.

This cooperation between the industrial plants and the newspaper was very different from the recruitment patterns in Istanbul. Recruitment for small scale manufacturing establishments did not translate into any systematic campaigns to encourage large-scale migration to the city in Istanbul. Rapid industrialization was part of the central state's project to modernize the nation after the founding of the Turkish Republic, but a worldwide economic crisis and World War II slowed down the potential for as rapid an industrialization as planned. Following the end of the war, funds were poured into the construction of nationwide roads and agricultural advances, which further directed funds away from the rapid industrialization as an integral part of the modernization project. Yet migrants continued to pour into Istanbul becoming increasingly underemployed and socially marginalized.

Access to housing, health, and other municipal services also defined whether, and it what ways, rural migrants were incorporated into the city with a sense of permanence and belonging. To belong to that community it makes a great difference in whether housing is perceived as more than a dwelling in the city, but rather as an investment, and a way to create stability. In Chicago, the profit seeking nature of real estate agents coupled with the financial concerns of homeowners in the value of their private property (investment in housing), led to a ghettoization process, which confined the majority of African American community in the Black Belt. Most of the housing in the Black Belt were already old and dilapidated. Being restricted to this part of the city, coupled with taking in lodgers to be able to afford the high rents or house payments demanded of African American dwellers, caused over-congested living conditions, which further depreciated property; a self-fulfilling prophecy for property owners elsewhere in the city. Old settlers, aware of such misconceptions in Chicago, began advising newcomers how to best handle this situation. For example, the *Chicago Defender* advised newcomers to become property owners and keep their property clean inside and outside. Leaders even went so far as to instruct newcomers on proper behavior on porches and doorsteps. The *Defender* published information about city regulations on housing, instructed newcomers to insist their landlords obey these regulations, and make official complaints when they did not. Housing itself was not a legal problem here, conditions in housing were.

In Istanbul, on the other hand, newcomers' housing itself became a legal problem. Gecekondus were built illegally on land that did not belong to the persons who built the gecekondu. Since it was the state's "modernization project" that brought newcomers to the city, the state had to shoulder the housing problem. Local and national debates

centered on how best to deal with the gecekondu, or gecekondu settlements, legally. The municipality tried to meet the existing housing shortage by building low cost housing (which is different from the way housing was initially handled in Chicago. The local and national government did not cooperate to solve the city's low cost housing problem until the 1930s in Chicago), and by providing cheap land and low-interest long-term credit for private builders. But these efforts did not materialize quickly enough to end the housing shortage. So the gecekondu became tolerated as a temporary measure until construction of new legal housing could catch up with ever increasing demand. Throughout the 1950s, the national government passed a series of laws, which attempted to outlaw the further construction of gecekondu even while it answered the demands of gecekondu dwellers by bringing basic services to the existing settlements. Istanbulites, themselves facing the housing shortage and increasing rents, watched and waited as the national government decided the fates of "original" Istanbulites and newcomers alike. Meanwhile, some profit seeking gecekondu dwellers, seeing their chances in the wavering ways governments dealt with the housing issue, began to build or to add on to their existing gecekondus with the intention of collecting rents from other newcomers. Contests over existing housing conditions and the future of the newcomers' legal place in the city were marked by chaos.

Less chaotic for Istanbul was the provision of health facilities that would protect the entire city. Health can be used as an arena on which to build a sense of belonging to the city as well. Yet, unlike in Chicago, where residents' concerns to make their city healthier led to persistent campaigns, the state centered approach to increasing the number of curative facilities and incorporating newest technological and medical advances into the training of doctors that were logical first steps in a growing nation like

Turkey, contributed little to raising consciousness about living in a community in Istanbul. In the process of explaining to newcomers in detail why they should do certain things and not do others, Chicago leaders imparted information related to diseases as well as why it mattered for the whole community that each urban resident lived healthily. They may not have called it modernization, but the way newcomers were directed to leave certain remedial practices behind and adopt new ones such as seeing a doctor played a significant role in the way Chicago was experienced by newcomers who had come from rural shacks to urban tenements.

The role of local politics in creating a sense of belonging to the city also demonstrates the possibilities for rural newcomers to become part of the urban community. Here, again, Chicago and Istanbul present us with two comparative venues. In Chicago, the long standing practices of ward politics guaranteed that newcomers would be politically involved if they so desired, and here again old settlers and the *Chicago Defender* assumed responsibility for explaining to newcomers the process, the actors, and the potential of newcomers' votes to make a difference for themselves and their community. African American residents of the Second Ward were politically incorporated into the city in a way that proved their votes made a local difference, a process similar to that which incorporated foreign ethnic immigrants into the political process as other scholars of Chicago ethnicity and politics have explained.

The "modernization project" of the Turkish state had included a level of mistrust of local politics early on. Therefore, even the local governments, which had been conceptualized as bastions of democracy, remained dependent on the center for the time being. Dependence on the central state restricted the municipality's local powers, reduced

its efficiency, and provided no inroad into the political life of the city for rural migrants. The municipal practices of regulating prices and foodstuffs in Istanbul, and providing a few other basic services gave Istanbul residents a way to keep track of the local government's actions in these regards, but this gave the residents no real local political power-- through which they may have become more invested in their local politics-- since the mayor/governor was appointed by the center.

Even though national leaders had planned to institute a more democratic political system that would include the active participation of citizens on the long run, in the 1920s it was decided that the citizens first had to be educated on how. The people's houses had been instituted nationwide with precisely that aim. But the single party rule throughout the 1930s and 1940s gave the people's houses the reputation of being centers of inculcation to the ideals of the single party, CHP (Republican People's Party). When the DP (Democratic Party) came into power, this switch from a single party rule to a multiparty system resulted in the closing down of the people's houses. The DP did not replace the centers with new ones; instead the rhetoric of the national agenda offered that nationwide democracy now gave citizens, urban and rural alike, the same power. This meant that the newly empowered rural political allegiance was with the nation, its leaders and the party that they helped bring into power, DP. (As the way the central government dealt with the housing problems showed, newcomers' allegiance to the center also meant that their expectations were from the center.) Were the citizens ready for this? As is evident in their increasingly acerbic reactions to continuous streams of newcomers, "original" Istanbulites believed that rural newcomers were not socially, politically, or

culturally equipped to be considered a part of Istanbul; were regarded as too culturally and socially backwards to appreciate Istanbul's essence and significance.

Ultimately, residents' willingness and ability to help each other in all of these processes played a significant role in creating and maintaining a sense of belonging to the city. Voluntary association/ civil society activity aimed to urbanize newcomers has transformative powers. When Istanbulites announce that their city has been sacked, that their city has been the victim of a "cultural, civilizational genocide," without the understanding of the historical context and how Istanbul saw itself for centuries, this has elitist implications. But when Istanbulites discussed newcomers in terms of "civilization" in the 1950s, when they began to notice a change in the character of their city, they meant they wanted city residents who did not spit in the streets, who did not walk around in their dirty clothes, who did not loaf around aimlessly, who did not scream to sell their wares as peddlers did. Chicagoans registered similar complaints, too, yet the way Chicagoans dealt with city manners and dress differed. Old settlers, who wanted to help newcomers urbanize and become Chicagoans accordingly in the 1910s, undertook campaigns to instruct newcomers, explaining the whys and the hows of their efforts and what they wanted to accomplish. A group of reform minded and forward looking Chicagoans understood that they had to act before problems caused by modernization worsened in their city.

It was the cycle of turning to the central state to solve local issues that the Kentim Istanbul Campaign aimed to break. The main idea underlying the Kentim Istanbul Campaign, which seems to have been incorporated into the mainstream municipal activities since 2004, is that by raising consciousness about Istanbul's historical value and

potential future significance, newcomers will learn to respect the city and understand their individual roles in how to contribute to its progress. The Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality has become a clearinghouse for various activities aiming to improve the city, which are very much like the civic efforts undertaken by voluntary associations and citizens' groups in the Chicago of the Progressive Era. Because of the differences in the time and place in undertaking these similar efforts, the Istanbul Municipality campaign is able to utilize various mass media sources and personalities. The website for the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality proudly updates its activities daily. In the beginning of the campaign, enlisting the cooperation of famous actors, actresses, authors, and businessmen, Istanbul historians and sociologists, and journalists, the municipality:

1. Surveyed, investigated, and questioned citizens to determine how they felt about the city in general, and about their place in the city more specifically;
2. Organized conferences across the city, in coffee shops (kahvehane), in meeting halls, at the universities, in elementary schools, etc.;
3. Organized free informational and educational tours for school age children and working class mothers to teach them about Istanbul;
4. Interviewed "old" or "original" Istanbulites.
5. Began training municipal staff to work more efficiently, and
6. Began publishing books on Istanbul.[2]

The investigation that lay at the root of the Kentim Istanbul Campaign was undertaken in 2001 among 2300 subjects, combining desk research, quantitative and qualitative research methods. Its results were shocking to officials, who found out that only 33 percent of those interviewed said they were Istanbulites, followed by 43 percent who said "felt" like they were Istanbulites. 17 percent of the residents interviewed revealed that they liked "nothing" about the city, followed by 48 percent who said they lived in Istanbul out of "absolute necessity." In order

[2] Kentim Istanbul Tanıtım Kitapçığı, http://www.kentimistanbul.com/download.asp (Accessed December 5, 2007).

to correct some these conditions, the municipality sent groups composed of officials, scholars, and journalists to kahvehanes (coffee houses) to educate residents about the historical significance of the city. They designed educational field trips for school age children and their mothers, who have had no contact with the rest of the city, to historical sites. Campaign workers interviewed "original" Istanbulites and collected oral histories. The Campaign also initiated the publication of various kinds of books and collections on Istanbul—ranging from history books to brief community studies, from statistics to memoirs, from city guides to conference proceedings.[3] One type of book is especially interesting, and that is the "traveling," or "the mobile" book titled *Istanbullu Olmak* (Being an Istanbulite) that aimed to transform Istanbul into one big "open air library." 10,000 copies of this book were published and dropped off in public places such as the buses, metros, ferries, sea buses, park benches, and cafes so that all Istanbulites would have the opportunity to read it and pass it onto others.[4]

More recently, through "Projem Istanbul" (My Istanbul Project), based on the understanding that the university constitutes a venerable shareholder in the city as the center of science and investigation, municipal officials have been working in cooperation with 21 universities across Istanbul, drawing on scholarly expertise in order to strategize and carry out new projects more systematically.[5]

---

[3] For further details on the investigation that initiated the Kentim Istanbul Campaign, See "Istanbullu Olma Bilinci Tam Araştırma," http://www.kentimistanbul.com/download.asp (Accessed December 5, 2007).
[4] Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, *Istanbullu Olmak*, (Istanbul: 2006).
[5] "Projem Istanbul," http://application2.ibb.gov.tr/pmsite/default.html (Accessed December 5, 2007) Bilgi University, which defines itself as a private "city university" established in 1994, opened the first Center For Migration Research in Turkey in 2005. The mission of the University is "to strengthen institutional co-ordination among researchers through several networking activities, support new research and joint projects, and produce reliable information based on research findings that can contribute to realistic policy and decision-making processes." See http://goc.bilgi.edu.tr/ (Accessed December 5, 2007).

Another activity, "1 Projem Var" (I Have A Project), has been designed to involve the participation of all who want to be involved, in finding solutions to the city's problems, in developing the socio-cultural life of the city, and in raising the standards of life.[6] The Youth Assembly, which has been serving Istanbul since 2005 with 347 representatives from all districts who serve on 22 Commissions, was brought about in order that city officials could benefit from the youthful population of Istanbul through avenues by which this population can display its capacity to generate alternative solutions to its own problems and design youth projects.[7]

The Kentim Istanbul Campaign and the municipally-directed contemporary activities, are in the process of creating a new generation of Istanbulites, who are armed with the necessary knowledge and consciousness of their city to make due improvements. The citywide investigations that initiated citywide conversations and pushed for citywide solutions to economic, social and

---

[6] "1 Projem Var," http://www.ibb.gov.tr/tr-TR/Pages/Haber.aspx?NewsID=14847 (Accessed December 5, 2007). "İstanbul'un problemlerinin çözümü, sosyal kültürel hayatın geliştirilmesi, hemşehrilerin hayat standartlarının iyileştirilmesi, katılımcı belediyecilik anlayışı çerçevesinde İBB çalışanlarının, İstanbul'da ikamet eden gerçek kişilerin, faaliyette bulunan tüzel kişilerin, orta öğretim kurumları veya öğrencilerinin ve sivil toplum örgütlerinin İstanbul'un yönetimine katılımını sağlamak, bu yönde projeler üretilmesini teşvik etmek, çalışanların performansını artırarak, üretebilirlik özelliklerini ortaya çıkarmak ve kendi işlerinde profesyonel bir ekip anlayışının oluşumunu desteklemek ve ödüllendirmek üzere İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi tarafından 1 Projem Var sistemi geliştirilmiştir."

[7] http://www1.ibb.gov.tr/GenclikMeclisi/misyon_vizyon.asp (Accessed December 5, 2007). Some of the commissions are: AB Uyum, Takip ve Izleme Komisyonu (Commission to Observe the Accommodation to the EU); AR-GE (Araştırma-Geliştirme Komisyonu, or the Investigation and Improvement Commission); Dış Ilişkiler Komisyonu, or the Foreign Relations Commission, which communicates with international youth commissions; Meclis Izleme Komisyonu, or the City Council Observation Commission, which attends City Council meetings to observe the workings of the Council as well as coordinates and establishes communications between the City council and the City Youth Assembly; Health Commission, which has brought a new approach by generating projects that would directly affect residents' daily habits such as providing information about how to deal with urban stresses and opening "stress parks" and which aims to help students live more healthily; Sosyal Dayanışma-Yardımlaşma Komisyonu (Commission for Social Solidarity and Mutual Aid); Şehir ve Kentlilik Bilinci Komisyonu (the City and the Consciousness of Being Urban Commission.)

political problems ("social dislocation") faced by residents of the modernizing city ("to achieve an urban equilibrium") that were hallmarks of Progressive Era Chicago are being undertaken by Istanbulites today. As the urban populations continue to grow, especially in the developing countries, it is important to pay attention to this line of activity which manifested itself at different times under two different settings. A city that is aware of the kinds and depths of its own problems can solve those problems more efficiently with the cooperation of all who live in it.

In both of its manifestations, whether citizen-driven in Chicago of the 1910s, or the municipally-initiated in the Istanbul of the early 21st century, a city that works for all of its residents is possible through the active participation of its residents and the cooperation between residents and local governments. Enabling residents to direct the future of their city by helping to define its problems clearly—in other words, by the collecting data, information sharing through public campaigns, and consciousness raising activities-- encourages cooperation among city dwellers by opening communication channels. Being thus actively involved, newcomers attain a sense of belonging in the city. Jane Addams called it the mutual dependence of classes on each other. Historians of African American migration have called it social uplift. Istanbul municipality now calls it urban consciousness. These are all principles by which the residents of large cities have sought, or now seeking, to make their city a community, as they confront the challenges of modernization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Collections

University of Chicago:

- Charles E. Merriam Papers
- Edith and Grace Abbott Papers
- Ernest W. Burgess Papers
- Julius Rosenwald Collection

Chicago Public Library:

- *City Council Proceedings 1916-1919*
- *Department of Health Bulletins*

Carter G. Woodson Library, Vivian Harsh Research Collection of Afro-American History And Literature, Chicago:

- Illinois Writers Project

Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi:

- Encümen Karar Defterleri
- http://www.kentimistanbul.com/index.asp

Newspapers and Periodicals:

Chicago Defender, 1916-1919

Istanbul Ekspres, 1950-1958
Hürriyet, 1950-1955
Havadis
Akbaba, 1946-1961
Kızılay Dergisi, 1951-1953
Kadın Gazetesi

Books and Articles

Chicago, Books:

Abbott, Edith. *The Tenements of Chicago, 1908-1935*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Addams, Jane. *Twenty Years at Hull House with Autobiographical Notes*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990.

Allswang, John. *A House for All Peoples; Ethnic Politics in Chicago, 1890-1936*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1971.

Baldwin, Davarian L. *Chicago's New Negroes: Modernity, the Great Migration, and Black Urban Life*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Barbuto, Domenica M. *American Settlement Houses and Progressive Social Reform: An Encyclopedia of the American Settlement Movement*. Phoenix: Orxy Press, 1999.

Barrett, James R. *Work and community in the jungle: Chicago's packinghouse workers, 1894-1922*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

Bukowski, Douglas. *Big Bill Thompson, Chicago, and the Politics of Image*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998.

Brownell, Blaine A. *The Urban Ethos in the South 1920-1930*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1975.

Chicago Commission on Race Relations. *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and A Race Riot*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.

Clark-Lewis, Elizabeth. *Living In, Living Out: African American Domestics and the Great Migration*. New York: Kodansha International, 1994.

Cronon, William. *Nature's metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1991.

Curry, Lynne. *Modern Mothers in the Heartland: Gender, Health, and Progress in Illinois, 1900-1930*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1999.

Davis, Allen F. *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Deutsch, Sarah. *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870-1940*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Drake, St. Clair and Horace R. Cayton. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*, Vol. 1. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1945.

Einhorn, Robin L. *Property Rules: Political Economy in Chicago, 1833-1872*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Flanagan, Maureen A. *America Reformed: Progressives and Progressivisms 1890s-1920s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
———. *Seeing with their hearts: Chicago women and the vision of the good city, 1871-1933*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002.
———. *Charter Reform in Chicago*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

Garb, Margaret. *City of American Dreams: A History of Home Ownership and Housing Reform in Chicago, 1871-1919*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Gilmore, Glenda Elizabeth, ed.. *Who Were the Progressives?* Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002.

Gosnell, Harold Foote. *Negro Politicians: The Rise of Negro Politics in Chicago*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Green, Paul M., and Melvin G. Holli, eds. *The Mayors: The Chicago Political Tradition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.

Gregory, James N. *The Southern Diaspora: How the Great Migrations of Black and White Southerners Transformed America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Grossman, James R. *Land of hope: Chicago, black Southerners and the great migration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991, 1989.

Holli Melvin G, and Peter d'A. Jones, eds. *Ethnic Chicago: A Multicultural Portrait*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
———. *Biographical Dictionary of American Mayors, 1820-1980*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Hudson, John C. *Chicago: A Geography of the City and Its Region*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Hunter, Robert. *Tenement Conditions in Chicago: Report by the Investigating Committee of the City Homes Association*. Chicago: City Homes Association, 1901.

Knupfer, Anne Meis. *The Chicago Black Renaissance and Women's Activism*. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 2006.
———. *Toward A Tenderer Humanity And A Nobler Womanhood: African American Women's Clubs in Turn-of-the-Century Chicago*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Link, Arthur S., and Richard L. McCormick. *Progressivism*. Arlington Heights: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1983.

McCarthy, Kathleen D. *Noblesse Oblige: Charity and Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago, 1849-1929*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Melosi, Martin V. *The Sanitary City: Urban Infrastructure in America from Colonial Times to the Present*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Merriam, Charles Edward. *Chicago: A More Intimate View of Urban Politics*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.

Merriner, James L. *Grafters and Goo Goos: Corruption and Reform in Chicago, 1833-2003*. Carbondale: Southern University Press, 2004.

Miller, Donald L. *City of the Century: The Epic of Chicago And the Making of America*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Mitchell, Michele. *Righteous Propagation: African Americans and the Politics of Racial Destiny after Reconstruction*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Monkkonen, Eric H. *America Becomes Urban: The Development of U.S. Cities and Towns, 1780-1980*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Muncy, Robyn. *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform 1890-1935*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Munro, William Bennett. *Municipal Administration*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935.

Philpott, Thomas Lee. *The slum and the ghetto: immigrants, Blacks, and reformers in Chicago, 1880-1930*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1991.

Pierce, Bessie L. *As Others See Chicago: Impressions of Visitors, 1673-1933*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933, 2004.

Reed, Christopher Robert. *Black Chicago's First Century: Volume I, 1833-1900*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005.

Rogers, Daniel T. *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Rosen, Christine Meisner. *The Limits of Power: Great Fires and the Process of City Growth in America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Sawislak, Karen. *Smoldering city: Chicagoans and the Great Fire, 1871-1874*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Shaw, Stephanie J. *What a Woman Ought to Be and to Do: Black Professional Women Workers During the Jim Crow Era.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Smith, Susan Lynn. *Sick and Tired of Being Sick and Tired: Black Women's Health Activism in America, 1890-1950.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Spain, Daphne. *How Women Saved the City.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.

Spear, Allan H. *Black Chicago: the making of a Negro ghetto, 1890-1920.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Spinney, Robert G. *City of Shoulders: A History of Chicago.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2000.

Strickland, Arvarh E. *History of the Chicago Urban League.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001.

Strickland, Arvarh E and Robert E. Weems. *The African American Experience: An Historiographical and Bibliographical Guide.* Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001.

Tarr, Joel. *A Study in Boss Politics: William Lorimer of Chicago.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Travis, Dempsey J. *An Autobiography of Black Politics.* Chicago: Urban Research Press, Inc., 1987.

Tuttle, William M. *Race riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996.

Upson, Lent D. *Practice of Municipal Administration.* New York: The Century Co., 1926.

Washington, Sylvia Hood. *Packing Them In: An Archeology of Environmental Racism in Chicago, 1865-1954.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 2005.

Weiss, Nancy J. *The National Urban League: 1910-1940.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

White, Dana F. *The Urbanists, 1865-1915.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Wolf, Jacqueline. *Don't Kill Your Baby: Public Health and the Decline of Breastfeeding in the 19th and 20th Centuries.* Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2001.

Chicago, Articles :

Barrett, James R. "Unity and Fragmentation: Class, Race, and Ethnicity on Chicago's South Side, 1900-1922." *Journal of Social History* 18:1, Autumn, 1984.

Blumin, Stuart M. "City Limits: Two Decades of Urban History in JUH." *Journal of Urban History* 21:1, November, 1994.

Breckinridge, Sophonisba P., and Edith Abbott. "Chicago's Housing Problem: Families in Furnished Rooms." *The American Journal of Sociology* 16:3, November, 1910.
———. "Housing Conditions in Chicago, III: Back of the Yards." *The American Journal of Sociology* 16:4, January, 1911.
———. "Chicago Housing Conditions, IV: The West Side Revisited." *The American Journal of Sociology* 17:1, July, 1911.
———. "Chicago Housing Conditions, V: South Chicago at the Gates of the Steel Mills." *The American Journal of Sociology* 17:2, September, 1911.

Buroker, Robert L. "From Voluntary Association to Welfare State: The Illinois Immigrants' Protective League, 1908-1926." *The Journal of American History* 58:3, December 1971.

Canaan, Gareth. "Part of the Loaf: Economic Conditions of Chicago's African American Working Class During the 1920s." *Journal of Social History* 35:1, Autumn, 2001: 149-150.

Collins, William J. "When the Tide Turned: Immigration and the Delay of the Great Black Migration." *The Journal of Economic History* 57:3, September 1997.

Comstock, Alzada P. "Chicago Housing Conditions, VI: The Problem of the Negro." *The American Journal of Sociology* 18:2, September, 1912.

Doreski, C. K. "From News to History: Robert Abbott and Carl Sandburg Read the 1919 Chicago Riot." *African American Review*, 26:4, Winter, 1992: 639.

Hawkins, Homer C. "Trends in Black Migration from 1863 to 1960." *Phylon*, 34:2, Second Quarter 1973: 142-143.

Hunt, Milton B. "The Housing of Non-Family Groups of Men in Chicago." *The American Journal of Sociology*, 16:2, September, 1910: 145-170.

Hughes, Elizabeth. "Chicago Housing Conditions, IX: The Lithuanians in the Fourth Ward." *The American Journal of Sociology* 20:3, November, 1914.

Marullo, Sam. "The Migration of Blacks to the North: 1911-1918." *Journal of Black Studies* 15:3, March, 1985: 298-299.

Norton, Grace Peloubet. "Chicago Housing Conditions, VII: Two Italian Districts," *The American Journal of Sociology* 18:4, January, 1913.

Street, Paul. "The Logic and Limits of Plant Loyalty: Black Workers, White Labor, and Corporate Racial Paternalism." *Journal of Southern History* 29:3, Spring 1996: 600.

Tolnay, Stewart A. and E. M. Beck. "Black Flight: Lethal Violence and the Great Migration, 1900-1930." *Social Science History* 14:3, Autumn, 1990: 365.
Walker, Natalie. "Chicago Housing Conditions, X: Greeks and Italians in the Neighborhood of Hull House." *The American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 21:3, November, 1915.

Wilson, Helen L. and Eunice W. Smith. "Chicago Housing Conditions, VIII: Among the Slovaks in the Twentieth Ward." *The American Journal of Sociology* 20:2, September, 1914.

Young, Jr., Whitney M. "The Urban League and Its Strategy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 357, January 1965.

Istanbul, Books :

Akerman, Mehmet Tanju. *Iki Avuç Istanbul.* Istanbul : Elçi Yayıncılık, 2004.
———. *Istanbullu.* Istanbul: Elçi Yayıncılık, 2005.

Arpad, Burhan. *Bir Istanbul Var Idi.* Istanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık AŞ, 2000.

Atabeyoğlu, Cem. *Bir Istanbul Var Idi.* Istanbul : AB Kitapçılık ve Dağıtıcılık Ltd. Şti. 2002.

Avcıoğlu, Doğan. *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün ~ Bugün ~ Yarın.* Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968.

Aydın, Zülküf. *The Political Economy of Turkey.* London: Pluto Press, 2005.

Belediyelerde Arsa Üretimi ve Kooperatifler. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1998.

Beyoğlunda Beyoğlunu Konuşmak: Salı Toplantıları 2000-2001. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.

Bozdoğan, Sibel and Reşat Kasaba,eds. *Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik.* Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998.

Cankurtaran, Mümtaz. *Bir Zamanlar Istanbul.* Istanbul: Erciyaş Yayınları, 2006.

Çeçener, Besim. *Istanbul'un Kültür ve Imar Sorunları.* Istanbul: TMMOB Büyükkent Şubesi Yayınları, 1995.

Çelebi, Funda. Ed. *Yerel Tarihçilik, Kent, Sivil Girişim: Yerel Tarih Grupları Deneyimi.* Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2001. (*Conference Proceedings*)

Danielson, Michael N., and Ruşen Keleş. *The Politics of Rapid Urbanization: Government and Growth in Modern Turkey.* New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985.

Delon, Jak. *Balat ve Çevresi.* Istanbul: Can Yayınları, 1991.

Ekinci, Oktay. *Dünden Bugüne Istanbul Dosyaları.* Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1995.
———. *Istanbul'u Sarsan On Yıl: 1983-1993.* Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1994.

Eksen, Ilhan. *Kebabistanbul.* Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2004.
———.*Dünkü Istanbul: Çok Dinli, çok dilli mozaiğin dağılışı.* Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2002.

Erder, Sema. *Istanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye.* Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 1996.

Erkün, Safa. *Türk Imar Hukuku'nun Ana Çizgileri.* Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 1999.

Gecekondulaşmanın Önlenmesi, Kentleşme ve Planlama. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1994.

Gönel, Aydın. *Önde Gelen STK'lar: Araştırma Raporu.* Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998.

Gülten Kazgan, Hasan Kirmanoğlu, Çiğdem Çelik, Arus Yumul. *Kuştepe Araştırması, 1999.* Istanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1999.

Gülten Kazgan. *Kuştepe Gençlik Araştırması, 2002.* Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2002.

Güzel, Şehmus M. *Türkiye'de Işçi Hareketi: 1908-1984.* Istanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1996.

Hacısalihoğlu, Yaşar, *Küreselleşme Mekansal Etkileri ve Istanbul.* Istanbul: Akademik Düzey Yayınevi, 2000.

Hasol, Doğan. *Yağma Var.* Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 1997.

Heper, Metin. *Gecekondu Policy in Turkey: An Evaluation with a Case Study of Rumelihisarüstü Squatter Area in Istanbul.* Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications, 1978.

Howard, Douglas A. *The History of Turkey.* Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001.

Işık, Oğuz, and M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu, *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneği*. Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2001.

Islam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehremaneti ve Yerel Yönetimler. Istanbul: Ilke Yayınları, 1996.

Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi APK Daire Başkanlığı Araştırma Müdürlüğü, Sosyal Doku Projesi Araştırmaları 1, *Istanbullu Olma Bilinci*. Istanbul: 2004.
———.Sosyal Doku Projesi Araştırmaları 2, *Bayanlar*. Istanbul: 2004.
———.Sosyal Doku Projesi Araştırmaları 3, *Gençlik*. Istanbul: 2004.
———.Sosyal Doku Projesi Araştırmaları 4, *Işportacılar Pazarcılar*. Istanbul: 2004.
———.Sosyal Doku Projesi Araştırmaları 5, *Yaşlılar*. Istanbul: 2004.
———.Sosyal Doku Projesi Araştırmaları 8, *Sokak Çocukları*. Istanbul: 2004.
———.Istanbul'u Bekleyen Sosyal Riskler Araştırması- 1, *Kent ve Deprem*. Istanbul: Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2004.
———.Istanbul'u Bekleyen Sosyal Riskler Araştırması- 2, *Istanbul'a Muhtemel Göç Dalgaları*. Istanbul: Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2004.

Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Işleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları 67, *2010 Yılının Istanbul'una Doğru Kent Zirvesi*. Istanbul: Erkam Matbaacılık, 1998.

Istanbul Külliyatı Cumhuriyet Dönemi Istanbul Istatistikleri 6: Inşaat, Inşaat Ruhsatnamelerine Göre 1, 1963-1996. Istanbul: Istanbul Araştırmaları Merkezi Kültür Yayın Danışmanlık Ltd. Şti., 1998.

Istanbul Külliyatı Cumhuriyet Dönemi Istanbul Istatistikleri 7: Inşaat, Inşaat Ruhsatnamelerine Göre 2, 1963-1996. Istanbul: Istanbul Araştırmaları Merkezi Kültür Yayın Danışmanlık Ltd. Şti., 1998.

Istanbul Külliyatı, Cumhuriyet Dönemi Istanbul Istatistikleri: Sağlık 1927-1996. Istanbul: IBB Yayınları, 1997.

Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Işleri Daire Başkanlığı, *Istanbul'un Semtleri*. (*Kentim Istanbul series*)

Istanbul'un Yönetimi. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1998.

Izberk, Mustafa. *Dünya Mirası Istanbul "Bir Uygarlık Soykırımı."* Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1998.

Kağıthane Belediyesi, *Kağıthane Rehberi*. Istanbul: Promat Matbaacılık San. Ve Tic. AŞ., 1998.

Karpat, Kemal H. *The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Kaya, Erol. *Kent Yönetimi Dizisi: Yerel Yönetimler Reformu ve Belediyelerde Yeniden Yapılanma*. Istanbul: Ilke Yayıncılık, 2003.

Keleş, Ruşen. *100 Soruda Türkiye'de Şehirleşme*. Gerçek Yayınevi, 1972.

Kemal, Orhan. *Istanbul'dan Çizgiler*. Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 1998.

Kent Yönetimi Insan ve Çevre Sorunları Sempozyumu, 1999, *Cilt 1: Kent ve Insan*. Istanbul: IBB, 1999. (*Symposium Proceedings*)
Kent Yönetimi Insan ve Çevre Sorunları Sempozyumu, 1999, *Cilt 2: Kent Yönetimi ve Çevre Politikaları*. Istanbul: IBB, 1999. (*Symposium Proceedings*)

Keyder, Çağlar. ed. *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.
———. *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. Istanbul: Iletişim Yayıncılık A. Ş., 1989.

Kuban, Doğan. *Kent ve Mimarlık Üzerine Istanbul Yazıları*. Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 1998.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Mahalli Idareler Eğitim Araştırma Geliştirme Merkezi, *Imar ve Gecekondu Affı*. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1996.

Mango, Andrew. *The Turks Today*. New York: The Overlook Press, 2004.

Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce 7: Liberalizm. Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 2005.

Nayzi, Leyla. *Istanbul'da Hatırlamak ve Unutmak: Birey, Bellek ve Aidiyet*. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

Özbek, Nadir. *Osmanlı Imparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, Iktidar ve Meşrutiyet 1876-1914*. Istanbul: Iletişim Yayıncılık A. Ş., 2002.

Özyeğin, Gül. *Untidy Gender: Domestic Service in Turkey*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Pamuk, Orhan. *Istanbul: Hatıralar ve Şehir*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003.

Sağbaş, Isa and Muhlis Bağdigen. *Local Government Finance in Turkey: Theory and Practice of Municipal Revenues and Expenditures, Municipal Budgeting and Central-Local Fiscal Relations*. Istanbul: Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality Department of Research, Planning and Coordination Directorate for Research, 2003.

Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Bakanlığı, Sağlık Propagandası ve Tıbbi Istatistik Genel Müdürlüğü. *Sağlık Hizmetlerinde 50 Yıl*. Ankara: Akyıldız Matbaası A. Ş., 1973.

Sancak, Jale. *Kenti Dinlemek: Büyülü Kent Istanbul'dan Öyküler.* Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2002.

Sarıer, Ilker. *Istanbul'un Son Kullanma Tarihi.* Istanbul: Pera Orient, 1993.

Sevindi, Nevval. *Kent ve Kültür.* Istanbul: Alfa Yayınları, 2003.

Sivil Toplum Kuruluşlarında Gönüllülük ve Gençlik. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2002. (*Symposium Proceedings*)

Sivil Toplum Örgütleri ve Yerel Yönetimler. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1997.

Sönmez, Mustafa. *Istanbul'un Iki Yüzü: 1980'den 2000'e Değişim.* Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınları, 1996.

STK'lar, Yerelleşme ve Yerel Yönetimler. Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 2002. (*Türkiye'de Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları Sempozyumu- XI; Symposium Proceedings*)

Şenyapılı, Önder. *Ne Demek Istanbul; Bebek, Niye Bebek*!? Ankara: METU Press, 2003.

———. *Kentleşemeyen Ülke, Kentlileşen Köylüler.* Ankara: Odtü Mimarlık Fakültesi Ara Yayınları, 1981.

Tatar, Mehtap and Fahreddin Tatar. *Yerel Yönetimler ve Sağlık.* Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1998.

Tanyeli, Uğur. *Istanbul 1900-2000: Konutu ve Modernleşmeyi Metropolden Okumak.* Istanbul: Akın Nalça, 2004.

Tekin Akgeyik, Arif Yavuz, Halis Yunus Ersöz, Süleyman Özdemir, Hasan Şenocak, *Istanbul'da Efnormel Sektör: Işportacılar, Eminönü Ilçesinde Bir Alan Araştırması.* Istanbul: Erguvan Yayınevi, 2004.

Tutel, Eser. *Istanbul Istanbul Iken.* Istanbul: Oğlak Yayıncılık, 1999.

Türk, Ömer. *5216 Sayılı Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kanununun Getirdiği Yenilikler*, 2004.

Türkdoğan, Orhan. *Istanbul Gecekondu Kimliği.* Istanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2006.

Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908 ~ 1980. Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 2002.

Türkiye'de Içgöç. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998. (*Türkiye'de Içgöç, Sorunsal Alanları ve Araştırma Yöntemleri Konferansı- 1997. Conference Proceedings*)

Üç Kuşak Cumhuriyet. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998.

Üç Sempozyum, Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları. Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1998. (*Symposium Proceedings*)

Üniter ve Federal Devletlerde Yerel Yönetimler. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1995. (*Uluslararası Yerel Yönetimler Semineri/ International Local Governance Seminar Proceedings*)

Wedel, Heidi. *Siyaset ve Cinsiyet: Istanbul Gecekondularında Kadınların Siyasal Katılımı*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2001.

Yerel Yönetim Organlarının Seçim Sistemi. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1997.

Yerel Yönetimler ve Sosyal Hizmetler. Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1998.

75 Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1999.

Yerel Yönetimler Kongresi: Dünden Bugüne Yerel Yönetimlerde Yeniden Yapılanma Bildiriler Kitabı. Çanakkale: Pozitif Matbaacılık, 2004. (*Congress Proceedings*)

Yeşilkaya, Neşe Gurallar. *Halkevleri: Ideoloji ve Mimarlık*. Istanbul: Iletişim Yayınları, 1999.

Yücekök, A. N., I. Turan, M. Ö. Alkan. *Tanzimattan Günümüze Istanbul'da STK'lar*. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998.

Ziyaoğlu, Rakım. *Istanbul Kadıları-Şehreminleri-Belediye Reisleri ve Partiler Tarihi, 1453-1971*. Istanbul: Ismail Akgün Matbaası, 1971.

Istanbul, Articles:

Acar, Erhan. "Türkiye'de Konutun Evrimi: Gecekondulu Tarih." *Milliyet Sanat Dergisi*, 160:510, 19 Şubat 1987: 24-26.

Alacadağlı, Esmeray. "Kent Suçu, Kente Karşı Suç." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 637:53, Kasım 1998: 665-672.

Alexander, Alec P. "Industrial Entrepreneurship in Turkey: Origins and Growth." *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 8:4, Part I, July 1960: 350.

Altun, Muhsin. "Avrupa Birliği Direktifleri Karşısında Kamu Ihale Kanunu'nda Yapılması Gereken Değişiklikler." Mali Hukuk, 18:103, Ocak-Şubat, 2003: 112-117.

Avcan, Ali Rıza. "Kentleşme, Gecekondu ve Göç." *Belediye Dergisi* 5:12, Haziran 1999: 37-39.

Aydın, Ahmet Sezai. "Belediyelerin Sağlık Konusunda Görev ve Yetkileri." *Iller ve Belediyeler*, 622-623, Ağustos Eylül 1997: 467-473.
———. "Şehir Meclisi ve Yöneticisi Illişkileri." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 414:36, Nisan 1980: 108-113.
———. "Türkiye'de Gecekondu Tipleri ve Amerika Birleşik Devletlerindekilerle Basit Bir Karşılaştırma." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 281:26, Mart 1969: 105-108.

Aydın, Mehmet H. "Kentleşme ve Insan Ilişkileri." *Antropoloji* 12, 269-283.

Başcı, Emel. "Gecekondu Bölgelerinin Sorunları ve Toplum Kalkınması." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 251:22, Eylül 1966: 409-410.

Bayraktar, Nuray. "Toplumsal Değişim Sürecine Konut ve Gecekondu Sorunu, Yasalar ve Belediyeler." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 631:53, Mayıs 1998: 294-300.

Bayraktar, S. Ulaş. "Turkish municipalities: Reconsidering local democracy beyond administrative autonomy." *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, (2007). http://www.ejts.org/document1103.html (accessed December 2, 2007).

Bekman, Asım Kaya. "Gecekondu Kanunu Hakkında Bir Inceleme." *Ankara Barosu Dergisi* 6, 14 Aralık 1967: 943-946.

Bostanoğlu, Özer. "Türkiye'de Planlı ve Gecekondu Alanlarda Kira Politikası." *Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi* 21:83, 1986: 49-59.

Bozoğlu, Osman. "5216 Sayılı Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kanunu'nun Getirdikleri." Mali Hukuk, 19:113, Eylül-Ekim, 2004: 27-41.

Çankaya, Şükrü. "Kanun Meclise Verilirken Gece Kondu Davası." *Iktisadi Yürüyüş* 284, 6-7.

Cemaligil, Sadettin T. "Devlet Yapılarının Proje Sorunları." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 251:22, Eylül 1966: 392-393.

Çoker, Ziya. "Belediyelerimizin Görev ve Yetkileri." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 245:22, Mart 1966: 56-64.

Çoruh, Selahattin. "Turizmde Maddi Hazırlık." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 251:22, Eylül 1966: 400- 405.

Demircan, Mehmet. "Türkiye'de Gecekondu Sorunu." *Harita ve Kadastro Mühendisliği* 14-15:5, Nisan-Temmuz 1969: 30-35.

Dubetsky, Alan. "Kinship, Primordial Ties, and Factory Organization in Turkey: An Anthropological View." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7:3, July 1976.

Erman, Tahire. "Gecekondu Çalışmalarında 'Öteki' Olarak Gecekondulu Kurguları." *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue N°1 , 1. Gecekondu, (2004). http://www.ejts.org/document85.html (accessed December 2, 2007).

Fenik, Mümtaz Faik. "Kızılay'ın çok hayırlı çalışmaları." *Kızılay Dergisi* 43, August 1952.

Fırat, Serap A. "Yeni Belediye Yasaları Neler Getiriyor." *Mali Hukuk*, 19:112, Temmuz-Ağustos, 2004: 40-59.
———."Yeni Belediye Yasası ve Hemşehrilik Kavramı." *Mali Hukuk*, 18:116, Mart-Nisan, 2005: 29-40.

Geray, Cevat. "Kooperatifçilik Açısından Toplu Konut Uygulaması." *Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi* 20:80, 1985: 15-21.
———."Amme Idaresi Bakımından Şehir Planlaması ve Belediyelerimiz." *Idare Dergisi* 28:246, Mayıs Haziran 1957: 54-65.

Güneş, Saim. "Emlak Vergisi ile Ek Emlak Vergisinden Pay Ayrılması ve Belediyelerin Sorumluluğu." *Mali Hukuk*, 18:108, Kasım-Aralık, 2003: 18-20.

Gürlük, Mahmut Kemalettin. "Gecekondu Meselesi ve Kağıthane." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 239:21, Eylül 1965: 469-471.

Karaboran, Hilmi. "Yeryüzünde Kontrol Altına Alınamayan Yerleşimler." *Coğrafya Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9:9, 1980: 81-94.

Karpat, Kemal H. "The Genesis of the Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization (1976)." *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue N°1 , 1. Gecekondu, (2004). http://www.ejts.org/document54.html (accessed December 2, 2007).

Keleş, Ruşen Y. "Belediyelerimizi Yakından Tanıma Ihtiyacı." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 251:22, Eylül 1966: 390-391.
———. "Gecekondu Kanunu Tasarısı ve Belediyelerimiz." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 245:22, Mart 1966: 49-52.
———. "Gecekondu Affında Amaç ve Yöntem." *Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi*, 20:77, 30-33.
———. "Gecekondu Meselesi." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 147:13, Ocak 1958: 41-44.

Kıray, Mübeccel. "Gecekondu: Az Gelişmiş Ülkelerde Hızla Topraktan Kopma ve Kentle Bütünleşememe." *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 27:3, Eylül 1972: 561-573.

Köktürk, Erdal. "Türkiye'de Kaçak Yapılaşmanın Kaynağı: Özel Parselasyon ve Hisseli Satışlar." *Mali Hukuk*,18:107, Eylül-Ekim 2003: 28-47.

Nalçacı, Ahmet H. "Gecekondu Kanunu Tasarısi Hakkında Bir Konuşma." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 245:22, Mart 1966: 53-55.

Oksal, Mustafa. "Kentleri Tehdit Eden Iki Olgu: Göç ve Geckondulaşma." *Belediye Dergisi* 6:4, Ekim 1999: 24-29.

Okyar, Osman. "Development Background Of the Turkish Economy, 1923-1973." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 10:3, August 1979: 325-344.

Önür, Nimet. "1951 ve 1968-1978 Yıllarında Bulgaristan'dan Türkiye'ye Gelen Göçmen Aileler ile Türkiye'de Kırdan Kente Göç Eden Ailelerin Kantleşme Süreci." *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 1, 1987: 169-183.

Örnek, Sevim. "Sağlık Yönünden Gecekondu Problemi." *Sosyal Hizmet Dergisi* 1:9, Temmuz 1963: 3-7.

Özer, Emin. "Belediyeciliğimizin Tarihi." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 251:22, Eylül 1966: 411-413.

Öztürk, Mehmet. "Altyapılı Arsa Üretimi ve Bu Arsaların Tahsis Yoluyla Satışı." *Mali Yönetim ve Denetim*, 5:25, Mart-Nisan 2004: 67-75.
———. "Türk Sinemasında Gecekondular." *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue N°1 , 1. Gecekondu, (2004). http://www.ejts.org/document94.html (accessed December 2, 2007).

Robinson, Richard D. "Turkey's Agrarian Revolution and the Problem of Urbanization." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 22:3, Special Issue on Attitude Research in Modernizing Areas, Autumn 1958: 398.

Şahin, Yusuf. "Gecekondu Alanlarında Kentsel Hizmetlerin Sunumu- Siyasal Davranış Ilişkisinin Irdelenmesi." *Belediye Dergisi* 5:8, Şubat 1999: 9-15.

Saran, Nephan. "Çağlayan: Istanbul'un Bir Gecekondu Bölgesinin Tarihi ve Gelişimi." *Antropoloji* 12, 17-33.

Şenyapılı, Tansı. "Charting the '*Voyage*' of Squatter Housing in Urban Spatial '*Quadruped*'." *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, Thematic Issue N°1 , 1. Gecekondu, (2004). http://www.ejts.org/document142.html (accessed December 2, 2007).

Tamer, Mustafa. "Belediyeler, Yerel Yönetim Sisteminin Mevcut Durumu ve Geleceği: Bir Model Önerisi." *Iller ve Belediyeler* 622-623, Ağustos Eylül 1997: 491-506.

Tatlıdil, Ercan. "Göç ve Kentleşmenin Sosyal Boyutu." *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 3, 1992: 45-54.
———."Kentle Bütünleşmenin Bir Yolu:Gecekondulaşma" *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 1, 1987: 45- 76.

Tekeli, Ilhan. "Gecekonduları Planlama Yolları ve Sorunları." *Harita ve Kadastro Mühendisliği* 19:5, 1970: 38-60.

Tortop, Nuri. "Belediyelerimizin Güçlükleri Belediye ve Köylerin Ana Problemleri." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 251:22, Eylül 1966: 394-397.

Yalçındağ, Selçuk. "Mahalli Idarelerin Milli Kalkınmadaki Rölü Konusunda Bir Seminer." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi*, 251:22, Eylül 1966: 398-399.

Yasa, Ibrahim. "The Gecekondu Family." *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 27:3, Eylül 1972: 575-584.

Yıldırım, Nuran. "Evvel Zaman Istanbul'unda Sağlık." *Istanbul*, January 2004, 57-63.

Zengin, Eyüp. "Türkiye'de Konut Açığı ve Gecekondu Sorunu." *Iller ve Belediyeler Dergisi* 637:53, Kasım 1998: 673-676.

Dissertations/MA Theses (Chicago and Istanbul Combined):

Arıtan, Mehmet. "Distribution and Characteristics of In-migrant Neighborhoods Within Selected Gecekondu areas in Istanbul, Turkey." (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Geography Department, Lexington Kentucky 1983).

Çelik, Hüseyin. "Türkiye'de Gecekondu Sorunu." (Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kamu Yönetimi ve Siyaset Bilimi Anabilim Dalı. Ankara, 2000).

DeSantis, Alan Douglas. "Selling the American Dream: The Chicago Defender and the Great Migration of 1915-1919." (Indiana University, 1993.)

Düzköylü, Ahmet. "Kırsal Alandan Kente Göç ve Gecekondu Gençliğinin Sorunları, Istanbul Sultanbeyli Gecekondu Bölgesi." (T. C. Mimar Sinan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı Genel Sosyoloji ve Metodoloji Programı. Istanbul, 1995).

Işler, Belgin. "Yerel Yönetimlerde Belediyecilik ve Istanbul Belediyesine Genel Bir Bakış." (T. C. Istanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kamu ve Yerel Yönetim Bilim Dalı . Istanbul, 1991).

Kaplan, Leyla. "Cemiyetlerde ve Siyasi Teşkilatlarda Türk Kadını (1908-1960)." (Ankara Üniversitesi Türk Inkılap Tarihi Enstitusu, Ankara 1992).

Koçyıldırım, Şener. "Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Faaliyetleri ile Sosyal Refah Hizmetlerine Halkın Katılım Eğilimleri." (Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Hizmetler Anabilim Dalı. Ankara, Eylül 1987).

Narin, Mete Sinan. "Bir Sosyal Siyaset Vasıtası Olarak Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Vakıfları." (T. C. Istanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Siyaset Anabilim Dalı. Istanbul, 2001).

Rüstem, Erkan. "Istanbul Şişli Yayla Mahallesi Gecekondu Bölgesinin Kentle Bütünleşme Eğilimleri." (T. C. Mimar Sinan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı Uygulamalı Sosyoloji Programı. Istanbul, Kasım 1989).

Şenol, Semra. "Istanbul Kentinde II. Dünya Savaşından Sonra Gelişen Yasal Olmayan Konut Tipleri ve Oluşum Nedenleri Üzerine Bir Inceleme: Zeytinburnu Örneği." (T. C. Mimar Sinan Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Şehir ve Bölge Planlama Anabilim Dalı Kentsel Tasarım Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul, 1996).

Sevinç, Bekir. "Sosyo-Kültürel Değişim Sürecinde 1950 Sonrası On Türk Romanında Göç ve Gecekondu." (T. C. Harran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı Yeni Türk Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı. Şanlıurfa, 1998).

Tekçe, Belgin. "Urbanization and Migration in Turkey 1955-1965," (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Princeton University 1974).

Tuncel, Gökhan. "Sosyal, Kültürel Dayanışma ve Yardımlaşma (Hemşehri) Derneklerinin Türkiye'nin Sosyal, Kültürel ve Siyasal Yaşamına Etkileri ve Malatyalılar Dernekleri Örnekleri." (Inönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı. Malatya, 1998).

Tutan, Hızır. "Türkiye'de Gecekondu Sorunu." (T. C. Istanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Iktisat Fakültesi Sosyal Siyaset Anabilim Dalı. Istanbul, 1995).