

A Study on Hierarchical/Normative Order, Marriage and Family Patterns in Bin Yousuf Tribe of Southeastern Turkey

Tülin G. İçli¹, Şevket Ökten², Aslıhan Ögün Boyacıoğlu¹

¹Department of Sociology, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

²Department of Sociology, Harran University, Şanlıurfa, Turkey

Email: ticli@hacettepe.edu.tr, sevketokten@harran.edu.tr

Received January 30th, 2012; revised February 27th, 2012; accepted March 12th, 2012

Ashirat (tribe), an Arabic-origin word, defines the first and the most important community among the small groups, constituting a tribe and it refers to a big family. The aim of this study is to describe hierarchical order and social status, normative/legal order and marriage and family patterns in Bin Yousuf *ashirat* settled in Harran valley of Şanlıurfa province, Southeastern Turkey. Naimi and Bradat are the two clans loyal to Bin Yousuf *ashirat*. In this study, by using techniques of in-depth interview, observation and focus group interviews, a qualitative research was carried out upon the members of the Bin Yousuf Tribe. Results of the study revealed that the basic feature of this social structure is the loyalty to the introverted institutions such as the tribe and *aghaism*, which are interlaced with each other through the very long history. *Ashirat* as an institution in the area where there is no strong governmental organization or security over any matter, maintains its function in overcoming difficulties and solving the problems such as the need of getting and using bank loans, establishing security and solidarity. This situation considerably maintains the loyalty of the members to the *ashirat*.

Keywords: *Ashirat*; Tribe; *Ashirats* in Turkey; Social Structures of *Ashirats*

Introduction

A societal organization primarily depends on the thoughts, beliefs and emotions of its members. In this sense, in regional communities where tribal organization is effective, the kinship system which embraces economic, social, political and moral dimensions, largely defines the place of the individual in community and specifies the proper behavioral codes as well. In other words, economic, social and political aspects of daily life is dominated by the ideology of the tribe.

Tribal identity is just one of the identities in the region that people may acquire and although losing its effect there are always people being a member of a tribe. According to Heckmann the tribal ideology is primarily constituted through a form of patriarchal type of solidarity, which is based upon patrilineal ancestry, common culture and history. At the central core of this interdependence and solidarity we see close and strong bonds between patrilineal kins and these bonds weaken in the peripheries of tribal kinship (Heckmann, 2002: p. 146).

Ashirat (tribe), an Arabic-origin word, defines the first and the most important community among the small groups, constituting a tribe and it refers to a big family. On the other hand, the words of *kabila* (clan) and *ashirat* are used in this region differently from their standard use in the Turkish language. While the word *kabila* is used for family in the Arabic language, being not used in the meaning of big family, the same word in Turkish refers to “*oymak*” (tribal subdivision) or “*boy*” who lives a nomadic or semi-nomadic life (Yinanç, 1995: pp. 709-710).

There is no other term than “tribe” to describe such a complex organization type in English. Given the geographical characteristics of the region, this conceptual contradiction or reduction seems to be accounted for. Orientalists firstly studied the northern Africa where Arabs and Bedouin groups were

living. The type of organization that is described as *Ashirat* in Turkish is called “*Kabila*” (*qabilah*), whereas sub-units in this organization type is called “*Ashirat*” (*ashirah*) in Arabic. Therefore, the identification of tribe with *qabilah* became dominant in previous studies on the topic and then, all similar organizations have been covered and analysed under the concept of tribe (Aydın, 2004: p. 12).

The term tribe in Social Sciences Dictionary is defined as “a society basing its membership on kinship” (Reading, 1978: p. 223). Therefore, *ashirat* nearly in all related research has been regarded as a kinship group based on blood relation.

This orientalist view can be seen both in Durkheim’s model of solidarity, Maine’s theory of social contracts, and in Weber’s typology of traditional authority. According to this view, these types of communities form the basis of rural organization in closed societies where the primary type of social relationships based on kinship is prevalent. However, when we look closer, it can be seen that the central importance given to blood ties in *qabilah* disappears in tribal organizations. Relationships based on blood ties in the sub units of the tribe are usually constituted through marriage and they are temporary. In fact it is quiet possible that social units within the tribal community may join other groups as well as new units from different social groups may join the tribal community.

Theoretical basis of the definition of *ashirat* as a group depending on blood relation is mostly the analyses of Henry Lewis Morgan and of Engels. When a deeper approach is adopted, it is seen that the principle of blood relation becomes vague and insignificant in the *ashirat* type of organization. In fact, *ashirat* is a type of organization that units around “common interest unity” and is a political entity in nature. “Common origins” and “common lineage” that are regarded as a dominant and basic

quality in regard to *ashirat* organization are significantly fictive (Aydın, 2004: p. 12).

Today, the concept of *ashirat* is perceived in different ways with different perspectives. Very common of this perception, which is the most erroneous is describing tribes romantically as nomadic shepherds. This perception is completely incorrect. In the past, although the number of real nomads was much more than today, they were not even the half of the population living in the region. For this reason, regarding the *ashirat* and *asiratchilik* (tribalism), it is necessary to avoid the unrealistic view of 'nomadic tribes'. Since "the factor which distinguishes tribes from the other groups is not being nomads or shepherds, but existence of powerful relations between its members" Another erroneous evaluation is to undoubtedly assume the people who live in the region as members of a tribe. Here there have always been people living out of tribes. These people are called *Kirmanj*, qualifying them as belonging to no tribe (Bruinessen, 1992: p. 205).

The other misconception about this topic stems from the reductionist perspective that is dominant in the Western anthropology. In accordance with this perspective, *ashirat* organizations represent a common type of organizations for all societies of the Central Asia, Asia Minor, Africa, South America and Oceania that are based on common lineage and underdeveloped in contrast to feudal organizations of modern states. One of the disagreements about the concept of *ashirat* is the use of *kabila* in the same meaning with *ashirat*. The uncertainty around the term of *qabilah* which cannot be classified among the standard concepts of anthropology, resulted in its common use as implying nomads. On the other hand the use of the term *kabila* meaning as lineage groups implied in the concept of "segmentary lineage", which is borrowed from anthropology is largely accepted among many historians and writers (Aydın, 2004: p. 27). In this sense, Crone, a writer studying the early Islamic period defends *qabilah* as being "exclusively and absolutely a rural concept" (Crone, 1986: p. 55).

It is significant that studying human groups based on the findings of ethnographic studies or studying history of these groups require to take into consideration the cultural differences and to avoid ethnocentrism and anachronism. In other words, such studies should consider cultural differences at the dimensions of place and time among societies. This is particularly evident in the studies on tribes and *ashirats*. As stated earlier, using the findings of the studies regarding African and American societies are not so much functional for the studies of Turkish *ashirat* and tribe facts. Because the economical and political systems as well as geographical position of societies are very significant.

In this region, the term *kabila* is used for sub-branch of an *ashirat*. During our study, we found that the biggest community in this kind of social organizational hierarchy is called *ashirat*, and other families constructing the tribe are called "*kabila*". Gokalp also specifies the same structure. He stated that the tribe consists of a few clans and the clans include families. According to Gokalp's description, "the tribe is a community in which there are members having common ancestors or kinship relations and it is governed by their own leaders (rais)" (Gokalp, 1992: p. 159).

Bruinessen who made research upon the tribes living in the Eastern and South Eastern regions of Turkey, defines the tribe as "a socio-political and in general, territorial (and as a result of this, economical) unit based on actual or close family rela-

tions" (Bruinessen, 1992: p. 77).

Clan communities, *ashirat*, in Arabic mean "big families" coming from the same source (from one grandfather, his son and grandsons) and it is regarded as the first and the smallest unit. On the other hand, the concept of tribe does not mean a big family in Turkish; it is used in the meaning of *oymak* or *boy* living nomadic or semi-nomadic life. According to Yalkın, the word "*oymak*" is used in Turkish for *ashirat* in Arabic, and "*oba*" is used for *kabila* (Yalkın, 1997: p. 18).

All the terms translated into English as "tribe" (*kabile*) are vague (for instance, *kabile*, *il*, *aşiret*, *taifa*) and therefore, assigning definite meanings to these terms will lead to misconceptions. It is argued that the term "tribe" as an analytical concept should be defined as a type of social organization that is a thinking style and an action model that is against the public institutions (Tapper, 2004: p. 31).

Historical Process

With its own historical conditions and different social and cultural characteristics, the Southeastern Region of Turkey depicts a specific social structure distinguishing it from the other regions of the country. The economy in the region is mainly based on stockbreeding. As a result of this, the nomadic and semi-nomadic life style has been dominant in this region until recently. Even today, the tribal order, which is regarded as a typical organization that is characterized by a nomadic life, is prevalent in almost every kind of social institution or relation. The main reason for this is that, in the tribal structure, the strong relationships among the members of the tribe, not the nomadic life, is the distinguishing factor. The origin of the tribal order goes very far back in the history. The distinctive structural feature of the region is based upon the *beylik/aghalik* order (local, big landownership order). And the tribe relations are interlaced with this order. Whether sedentary or semi-sedentary, the tribal organization in this region is balanced with the order of local big landowners. The most significant factors that affect the development and continuation of the tribal organization in the region are as follows: the difficulties in the administration of the area is directly related to its geographical location (being at the border line) and in being a buffer zone between two or more countries.

Ziya Gokalp, the Turkish sociologist who conducted the first systematic study on clans and tribes in Turkey, indicates that both geographical and political factors are effective in the development and maintenance of the tribal organizations in the region. Gokalp (1992: p. 45) states that people living in deserts and mountains are faced with threats of consecutive attacks and accordingly, they have to be organized and armed perpetually against potential enemies. This organization is generally constituted under the leadership of one person or by coming together with other members of the same family or different families.

According to Bruinessen (1992: p. 208), the administration of the Southeast Region of Anatolia has generally been provided by leaders (*rais*) of the tribes; a situation, which still is the case today. Tribal relationships have been very influential upon the social structure of the region. Apart from this, countries that are geographically close to each other have provided power to the personalities who are leading the political activities in the area.

This situation continued from the time of the Ottomans until the foundation of the Turkish Republic and it can still be ob-

served today. In 1517 during the invasion of Ottoman Empire, the Southeast Anatolian Region and some parts of the East Anatolia were considered as a buffer zone against the Shiite State in Iran and the administration of this area was organized in this sense. "At the time of Yavuz Sultan Selim, some places were given to the leaders of tribes as *yurtluk-ocaklik* and *Sanjak* due to their loyalty to the Empire, their success won against Shah Ismail and their contribution to the invasion of the area by the Ottomans in 1517" (Sencer, 1997: p. 595).

Although the actual conditions that caused the emergence of the tribes no longer exist, they are still influential at political, economic and social levels. Today, due to the progress in industrialization, urbanization, communication facilities and transportation, the structure of the tribes has changed. Most of the factories and commercial enterprises in this area belong to landowners and noblemen of the tribes. Landlords who employed the villagers as shareholders or tenants of their lands have turned to be the 'bosses' of factories and workplaces in urban areas.

The findings of recent studies carried out on this Region indicate that the rate of people who specify themselves as being members of a tribe and report that this membership is very important for them is very high (Baran vd., 1998). According to the findings of a research conducted by Sencer (1993: p. 38) including the provinces of South Eastern Anatolia Project (GAP), nearly half of the families (47.3%) stated that they belong to a tribe. This ratio increases up to 57.2% in rural settlements and decreases to 33.3% in urban areas. When the province of Sanliurfa is considered alone, the ratio of family members belonging to a tribe is 80.9% in urban settlements and increases to 92.6% in rural settlements. Since 1995, when effective irrigation started, a great increase in the agricultural production is recorded in the GAP region.

One of the significant problems experienced in the region is unequal distribution of the ownership of agricultural fields and of the running of these fields. Majority of the agricultural business have non-productive fields that are not enough to have high levels of profits. Therefore, such economical activities provide the people with only income levels for their living. Majority of the agricultural fields are controlled by minority. The rate of the people without any land ownership is higher than that of those who are owners of fields (For details, please see Sencer 1993, Ökten 2006, GAP Bölgesinin Sosyo-Kültürel ve Yapısal Özelliklerinin Aile Yapısına Etkileri, Aile ve toplum dergisi yıl: 8. cilt: 3. sayı 9, T. C. Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara: 2006). In order to improve this unequal distribution, a series of arrangements has been realized. However, it may be argued that such arrangements have not solved the problems, but increased the inequalities (Aksoy, 1992: p. 53).

The land ownership order in the area has been dominant for a very long time and people earn their living from agriculture and livestock rising. In fact, most of these lands belong to the leaders of tribes. Deputies of the area and other important political figures coming from this region are either leaders or noblemen of a certain tribe. Consequently, they play important roles and occupy critical positions in the government and in the decision-making mechanisms concerning the Region.

¹There are many proverbs among tribes on this matter such as "*Bahti tahta degismem*" (I do not give up baht even if I am enthroned), "*Baht yigidin kalesidir*" (Baht is the castle of a brave man), "*bahtsiz insan köprü de olsa üzerinden geçme*" (even if a person who does not have baht is a bridge, do not cross over it).

The leaders of tribes have always received great compliments, since for politicians to obtain the votes of majority of people in the area is much easier by just negotiating with the leaders of the tribes who hold an important influence on members. Therefore, for the leader, keeping members together using "the tribal tie" is important for the sake of being more powerful in the above-mentioned aspects. In this regard, the leaders use their economic and political powers to keep members tied to the group. Members of the tribe work at their leader's lands as tenants or shareholders, they are provided with job facilities, obtain financial aid and every kind of support they need. Consequently, the members who are well aware of these advantages and opportunities regard this "tie" as very important.

On the other hand, apart from economic and political factors, there are social and cultural factors which support tribal ties; within the socio-cultural context, loyalty to tribe is regarded as a norm, carrying primary importance.

It is certain that *ashirat* organizations in the region differ in terms of both forms and activities. Based on geographical conditions, coexistence of social groups and the levels of modernization, the existence and activities of *ashirats* vary.

On the other hand, the tribal tie has been very important in every aspect of people's lives in this region for centuries. Loyalty to the tribe not only means nobility in the area, but also is a symbol of "priority" over people or groups who do not have such a tie. Tribal structures include religious, political and social values, which depict their members' "ideal" behavioural patterns. People who obey the rules of their tribes are regarded as self-governing and noble heroes in the region and are rewarded with the title of *asir*, which, according to Gökalp (1992: p. 18), means "knight".

Asirs who behave in consistency with the rules of the tribe should carry certain characteristics. These reflect his and his tribe's honour and prestige: such as bravery, generosity, honour, chastity and good fortune.

Granting good fortune (*baht*, *aman*) means to protect a person who is in difficulty and to take him under protection. An *asir* who gives *baht* to a man has to protect this man even he is the murderer of his father. If he does not so, he loses his honor and pride¹. *Namus* (honor) is another concept, which is strongly emphasized among the tribal values; According to tribal traditions, "*Kara Çadır namussuzlugu asla affetmez*" (*The Black Pavilion—in which the leader of the tribe lives—does never forgive dishonesty*).

Aim of the Study

As it was in the past, the tribal formation still preserves its function in providing most of the needs of the local people in the region. Many "facilities" from finance to protection, from providing justice to receiving help from each other have been provided by or through this formation. In this sense, industrialization, urbanization, or social changes alone cannot wipe away these social formations. On the contrary, they may transform and empower them. Unless modern organisations, which will perform the functions of tribes, are set up, to evaluate the transformation of tribal constitutions as downfalls will not be logical or realistic.

The aim of this study is to describe hierarchical order and social status, normative/legal order and marriage and family patterns in Bin Yousuf tribe settled in Harran valley of Sanliurfa province, Southeastern Turkey. Naimi and Bradat are the two clans loyal to Bin Yousuf tribe.

Methodology

In this study, by using techniques of in-depth interview, observation and focus group interviews, a qualitative research was carried out upon the members of the Bin Yousuf Tribe who dwell in the villages and pastures that are within the administrative regions of Akçakale and Harran districts of Sanliurfa province for four months from June 2011 to September 2011. Their population in 1970 was 5378 and it is estimated to be 10,000 today.

The tribe of Bin Yousuf is a sedentary tribe who lives around the Harran valley. Naimi and Bradat are the two clans who are under this tribe (**Table 1**). The reason why we have concentrated more upon the Bin Yousuf tribe during our interviews and observations is that because it is believed that the members of Bin Yousuf tribe are descendents of the Prophet and considered as having the most trustworthy and highly honoured families in the region.

In the region, the titles of sayyid or sheikh has been used for those persons whose ancestry is regarded as distinguished. This “honor” that belongs to the families having this “royal” ancestry differentiates the families and is owned by the same families and the members of these families. Therefore, divinity includes not only sheikh and his immediate family but also his extended family members as a result of social thinking in which the ideology of *ashirat*/kinship and its basis, namely blood relations, are very decisive (Ökten, 2010: p. 183).

At the beginning of the research, we determined the exact places where the Bin Yousuf tribe is densely populated. We used the techniques of in-depth interview and observation in the villages of Karali and Karatepe where a great number of Bin Yousuf members dwell. We asked appointments from the leaders who would be interviewed as key informants. At first, they refused our requests, so we acquired the expert assistant of locally well-known people who have a great influence over the tribe.

Table 1. Tribes and sub-clans that are settled in the Harran valley: tribes and clans who speak Arabic (Doğanay, 1997: p. 21).

CUMAYLE	SIYALE	Bin. MUHAMMAD BİNİECİR	B. YOUSUF
Isahasan	Hubait	Gajar	Nubakne Naim
Zeyneddin	Taan	Fiteet	Saramda Bredet
Nafle	Maacile	Ubade	Duveyced
Abucindi	Nuaceh	Davud	Biniset
Hileybi	Binizeyt	Bişecma	Meşhur
Haşimi	Cihem	Çuağan	Biniamir
Ciedana	Abuisi	Tammah	
Benenzin		Dannadle	
		Halava	
		Seccu	
		Marabde	
		Muğeylet	
		Çive	
		Suadi	
		Kaf-Kaf	
		Sevzat	
		Bihamait	

During the interviews, a considerable amount of data concerning the family life and structure, the normative order, the hierarchy and the status system within the tribe, was gathered.

Interviews were held as either open personal interview or in some cases as group discussions with both male and female members of the tribe. These interviews were realized in order to collect data about the critical subjects like blood feud, property rights, relations between the *agha* (the local big land-owner) and the tribe members, responsibilities and duties for the *agha*. In addition to these interviews, we held face-to-face focus group discussions with a group of six young members of the tribe on issues concerning the process of social change, which has occurred in the tribe. Furthermore, we held group discussions with twenty old members of the tribe in order to get information about issues like social relations, history and traditions of the tribe.

Results

Hierarchical Order and the Concept of Status

Status is considered as a very important concept in tribes and the “status” of a person depends on his/her family, wealth and acquired holly/spiritual powers.

The influence of status is reflected in the daily lives of the local people in various ways. For example, in tribal gatherings and house visits, the words to be spoken and the place where the leader will sit are pre-planned carefully. Another important subject to be emphasized here is the sensitivity of indicating the equality of status: people having the same status, state this clearly when they come together. Another symbol of status is having “primacy”. Taking the first order in the row and a priority is a symbol of high status according to the culture of this region.

Since there is a leader of every level in the hierarchical order, each tribe and clan have their own leaders. Dynasty, the family from which the leader comes, is the core of the tribe. All of the members have a wide range of responsibilities against their leader who is dominant in both ruling the tribe and taking decisions regarding the tribe. In the patriarchal kinship structure of the tribe, as soon as a girl gets married with a man from another tribe, she is considered to be a member of her husband’s tribe.

In the specific terminology of the area, there is an important difference in naming the leaders of different levels in tribes, clans and families: all of them are called *agha* in Kurdish and *sheikh* in Arabic, but the leaders of tribes, clans, groups (*taife*) and families (*soy*) have different names. Including close relatives, households at the basic level of the tribal hierarchy are called “soy”. Households coming from the same leader (who is named as *mezin* (great) or *maqul* (wiseman), father, grandfather or ancestors distinguish themselves from the others. People speaking Arabic or living close to the Arabs use *sheikh/rais* (Arabic word for leader) for the tribe or clan leader.

Mir and *bey* (read as bay, meaning sir) are originally feudal titles and used only for great leaders. These titles, which are attached to names such as *Bedirhan Bey*, *Sidar Bey* are no longer used today. They lost their validity in terms of their feudal roles.

Bey/Beg (sir) was used for old landowners at managerial positions. *Agha* (master) is the tribe leader living together with the members of the tribe in mountains or valleys (villages). *Bey* may live in the city and he is not necessarily the leader of a tribe. But the important thing here is that the term *agha* has a

rather different meaning from the one, which is normally used in daily, spoken Turkish. According to the standard Turkish, the *agha* is the richest person in the village and possesses lands, but not necessarily political power. However, the *agha* in this region may not possess a significant amount of wealth, but he is the absolute governor.

The most determinative factor in the hierarchical organization of the tribe is the dynasty family, which constitutes the foundation of the tribal organization. Selected members of the dynasty form the ruling and decision-making mechanism of the tribe. A leader coming from the dynasty is situated at the top of this hierarchical order. Follow respectively after the leader, the siblings, the children of the leader's and the leaders of the clans of the tribe, respectively.

Although the high number of population and possessing economic wealth has great significance in the eye of local people, being a member of the dynasty is a privilege in this area. The dynasty acquires a special inborn status. People coming from the dynasty, also naturally come into the possession of the leadership (*reis* or *agha*). The basic distinguishing factor of the dynasty is the "nobility".

The feelings of "honor" and "dignity" are dominant in ashirats. Therefore, they always need to make a connection between themselves and a noble lineage. Noble lineages such as Khalidi, Abbasi and Umayyad are frequently preferred noble ancestry for sayyids (Kılıç, 2003: p. 131). Thus, tribe leaders in the region attempted to use lineage register, linking them to leading Islamic, mostly Arabic, figures in order to legitimize their positions in the society. However, these connections are false, but it seems that such attempts reinforce their power (Bruinessen, 2003: p. 308).

As the leader often consults it, the council constituted by the elderly and noblemen of the tribe has an important function in the tribal system. The responsibility of the council is to solve disagreements and provide judicious decisions in accordance with tribal customs. Among the tasks of the council are solving the problems related to ending vendettas, struggles among the members of the tribe or with other tribes, returning stolen goods to their owners and acting as a mediator in disagreements concerning kidnapping young girls for marriage, grazing livestock and watering. The council of the older people expresses the will of the community while common people of the tribe affect the aims and decisions of tribal leaders.

Although for giving important decisions, the leader consults the older and experienced members of the tribe such as the *Talba*, *Arfa*, he still holds the the right to give the final decision. Upon the leader's call, *arfes* and *talbas* meet and discuss a matter but the leader gives the last decision.

There are two important consultant groups in the tribe concerning the implementation of the customs and solving individual and social problems. One of these groups is called *Talba* carrying the function of solving individual or social conflicts, as a judiciary and conciliating institution for the inter-tribal and intra-tribal problems even today. The later one is called *arfa*, a group of people function as a family consultancy and as an aid agent within the community that provide solidarity.

The people in these groups are selected from the older people who know the history of the tribe very well and receive respect from their own members and from other tribes. They are not selected by vote or appointed. With their manners, experience and knowledge, the older individuals who in time gain trust and respect from the other members automatically undertake this

responsibility.

People who later join into the tribe are at the lowest level of this hierarchy, simply because they are out of the family solidarity.

Normative/Legal Order

It is a well-known fact that each society has developed certain rules and norms of behaviour in accordance with their own customs and traditions in order to regulate rights and obligations among individuals. Each society's perception of law and regulations are directly connected with their socio-economical and cultural structures.

Cognitive and symbolic anthropologists such as Goodenough, Schneider and Geertz define culture as symbolically coded information rather than collective behavior. According to them, the notion which distinguishes certain information and beliefs as "cultural" is the collective use of it by community members. As collectively shared information and common belief systems propose meaning pertaining to social world, it is quiet possible to evaluate them as meaning systems. For Geertz, culture is "an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and their attitudes toward life" (Geertz, 1973: p. 89) The agents responsible for a child's socialization such as parents, relatives and teachers, play an important role in transmitting ideas, emotions, reactions and behavioral patterns. In other words, the *meaning system*, which includes culturally constructed beliefs and values of the community are transmitted to the child. (Altuntek, 2008: p. 40).

Living a communal life, tribes have also developed certain rules regulating the relations within the tribe. These norms, being altered from the previous generation to the next, have formed the customs and traditions.

One of the most important mechanisms of a tribe is the unwritten social rules or conventions, which are called *tore-örf* (mores). Each tribe has its own particular fundamental values (mores). Obeying these rules in any condition is obligatory for the tribal members and heavy punishments are applied in cases of violation. Within the tribe, the leader's authority is reinforced by intensively emphasizing the peace, the privilege of and respect to the ancestors in the tribe.

The most common conflicts break out in the region is the disputes over lands, vendettas, molestation and attacks against one's property and kidnapping girls with the intention of getting married. According to the customs and traditions of the tribe, there are certain sanctions for these crimes. According to these sanctions, to kill or exert any other criminal act against one member of the tribe is considered as the whole tribe members are assaulted, because all of the members of the tribe are believed to descend from the same ancestor and any damage or harm to one of them is taken as it is done to the common ancestor and since all members are accepted as relatives, tribe members react such cases in concord a situation which causes a dispute that breaks out between two men to spread into two tribes as *vendetta*.

The religion has been organized around common blood relation. Therefore, each person is "blood" of the others. Here the term "blood" sociologically refers to coming from the same ancestry and to kinship. It also refers to the fact that each person is one of the basic elements in maintaining the life of the

group as “blood” in biological terms is one of the basic elements in one’s life. Furthermore, blood represent the groups’ honor. Thus, attacking anyone belonging to the group is perceived as an attack to the whole group. In other words, since attack against any member of the group is regarded as an attack to the blood and honor of the group, it is considered to spatter the group as a whole. In order to socially fix it, the only solution is taking the revenge or “cleaning the blood” (Ökten, 2010: p. 4).

In the region, vendetta indicates hostility as a result of killing a member of a tribe by a member of another tribe. The basic criterion is “blood relation” as indicated above. A vendetta is pursued with the idea/principle in mind that revenge should be taken for “shading the blood of their member”.

Two basic internal dynamics of the *ashirat* organization are the very strong feeling of “we” and of “solidarity”. These dynamics developed both common attack and common defense mechanisms (Doğanay, 1995: p. 18). Basic reason for solidarity in *ashirats* is the “confrontational” patterns between individuals and groups. The most known example of this fact is vendetta. Confrontational pattern and solidarity pattern that cause and reinforce each other is a way of surviving developed against all people and groups that are considered to be “the other” (Altuntek, 2002: p. 4).

As a result of the “we” concept which is widespread in the social/cultural structure of a tribe, it causes an attack to be committed altogether and defence mechanisms are activated by all members of the tribe. That means, the tribe in a full unity takes a defensive position fencing around their member who is a murderer.

Findings of the studies on the region indicate that there is a causal relationship between vendetta and events leading to it and that there are common problems reinforcing all disagreements as well as vendetta. These findings also reveal that the reasons for vendetta are related to similar topics. These topics are as follows: landowning, irrigation, grazing areas, distribution of family inheritance, rape, honor killings, status contradiction among families and political confrontations (see Ünsal, 1995: p. 102; Tezcan, 1991: p. 57).

Basically, economical, political and social causes lie beneath vendettas. Major economical reasons involve conflicts over landowning, grazing areas and watering, political reasons are related to the local administration (muhtarlık) of a village, bitter rivalling to gain the “power” especially in local and general elections, while problems associated with “women” are the basic social reasons that break out vendettas. A “woman” is one of the most important reasons for committing murder because of the importance the society give to chastity and honour.

However, there is no necessary causal relationship between problems contributing to the disputes and vendetta. Because it is observed that in addition to disputes stemming from the socio-economical conditions of the region, very simple disagreements may lead to vendetta. The significant point here is not the reason for the beginning event of vendetta, but tradition that recommends taking the revenge. Therefore, the significant point here is not the complexity or simplicity of the event leading to vendetta, but the social environment that provides the grounds to make any dispute the cause of vendetta.

Although the principle of collective responsibility assumes that all members of the groups to which perpetrator and aggrieved belong may attack or be the subject of this attack, there are various criteria about who will be responsible for the event. The first criterion is the kinship rank. The actualization of this

criterion appears to differ in different societies. For instance, in the Arabic tribes, responsible individuals are all male relatives from first to fifth rank of the aggrieved, in Kurdish tribes relatives from seventh rank are also considered to be responsible. Additionally, age and gender factors are also taken into consideration to determine responsible individuals in the revenge attempts (Ökten, 2010: p. 6).

Tradition of carrying guns, lack of proper governmental authority, extreme devotion to honour, display of bravado, swaggering show of courage, fights that erupt due to the excitable nature of people, the strong urge to take revenge and high level of ignorance because of lack of education are among the other social causes, which support vendettas. Although today, it is not as widespread as it was in the past, to consider gun-carrying merely as a tradition and as a phenomenon that has roots in the earlier times of the history, is necessary for us to understand the subject in terms of “sociological imagination” in Mills’ terminology.

According to traditional norms, if a girl falls in love with a boy from another tribe and runs away with him, both the girl and the boy are sentenced to death. Even if they may get married, this punishment is applied to the boy who takes away the girl, because he or his family did not pay the “bride price” (*baslik*) to the girl’s family and disgraced their honour.

If a married woman escapes with another man, both of them are also sentenced to death. Either the husband or the relatives of the woman may kill them as soon as they find them.

However, vendettas are effective factors in reinforcing the solidarity in the tribe, because it provides a sort of peace within the tribe and consolidates the authority in terms of concepts like “us” and “them”. Tribes that commit vendettas strengthen inner solidarity in their own tribe by clamping together, as they are always vigilant and equipped with arms.

In a vendetta, target people at the first rank to be killed or the people who are responsible for paying the blood indemnity are determined. These people are selected according to their level of kinship with the murdered person. By this way, family groups coming from a common ancestor are also categorized. So, it is claimed that those who are at the target or those who are primarily responsible for paying the blood indemnity form a true family group. This situation reveals a differentiation in the region between the Kurdish tribes and Arabic: Arabs regard people going back until the fifth father in the family tree who is the common ancestor, as responsible for paying the blood indemnity; whereas the Kurdish tribes consider people until the seventh father responsible for the indemnity.

Another significant factor that causes vendettas to occur is the very common and unbreakable traditional practice of kinship marriages; a phenomenon, which can be seen at all levels of the tribe. By reinforcing the segmental structure of families, the insistent practice this tradition caused a total separation among families.

In an event of vendetta, united altogether within their own community, tribes come face to face filled with rigorous feeling of “taking revenge”. This revenge feeling is not exerted only towards the murderer, but the whole tribe including the leader and the family of the murderer and consequently in return, members of the opposing tribes murder a member of the original tribe and this feud goes on by mutual murdering.

In the nomadic or semi-nomadic periods, carrying weapon was necessary due to the factors such as unsafe roads, ambushes, difficult natural conditions, exports and imports con-

ducted over borders between different regions or countries, potential conflicts among tribes, etc. Moreover, at the time of the Ottoman Empire when relations with the government was limited to paying taxes and providing the Empire with armed forces when necessary, the more a tribe had members and armed forces, the more it was favored by the government. Under the superior identity of Ottomans, Muslims and non-Muslims were living peacefully together where non-Muslims working on non-prestigious jobs were not taken into the army service, (they did not wish to join the army any way). In those days when the concept of bravery was strongly emphasized, carrying weapon was a symbol of being prestigious in the society. Walking around without a gun was regarded as something “disgraceful”. There used to be many cases reflecting this situation one of which was explained by Erdost (1987) who performed his army service in Şemdinli (Hakkari) in 1965, as this:

“Osman Kaya who had ambushed six soldiers at the beginning of summer in 1960 was in Iraq at the time. Towards the end of the summer of 1964, he went to the farmers who cultivated the lands that Osman was used to cultivate before, and seized all the harvest by claiming that it is his share. Upon that, Molla Mustafa called Osman, took all his guns and expelled him. Those people telling the story commented about the case as follows: Osman was walking around without a gun. This was such a shame of him that it would be better if he would die”.

A man who does not take his revenge for his “shaded blood” is not considered as an adult, real man in the region. He loses his entire honour and status in the society and he is treated as an alien.

In the social settings where vendetta is perceived or regarded as a social task or value, taking revenge is not a personal choice, but a compulsory social task given to the individuals by society. Revenge of the person killed can only be taken through killing the responsible individuals. Otherwise, it is thought that the spirit of the person killed cannot be pleased and that the honor of his relatives will be “spattered”. Taking revenge is a basic and dominant behaviour in *ashirats* that are in continuous power struggle with one another. It means nobility and having honor, while those who did not take their revenge lose their material and spiritual power and are regarded as inferior by their rivals. An elderly interviewed in the study summarizes this fact as follows: “Here those who have power win” (Ökten, 2010: p. 6).

Upon the explanations on vendettas and some events that are evaluated based on the tribal traditions that can be regarded as causes of vendettas, give us an idea about solutions. Some information about the applications of tribal traditions was obtained through interviews as follows:

When a murder is committed as a result of struggle between two members of a tribe, relatives of the murderer have to persuade the relatives of the murdered by paying them the blood indemnity. If they don't do it, the relatives of the murdered (may) kill the relatives of the murderer whenever and wherever they see him.

In a case of a murder, the tribe or the relatives of the murdered may plunder the goods of the murderer. This is called *kan tozu* (blood dust) in the region. Plunderers are not accepted as criminals, since this plundering is a right according to tribal traditions. Besides, if peace is generated, the plundered goods are accepted as blood indemnity.

Traditionally, when a fight breaks out between two tribes and their members start to beat each other, tribes that are nothing to do with the fight try to stop the fight and prevent them to injure

each other.

To achieve a peaceful solution to the conflict, a mediator who is accepted by both of the sides should be chosen. If the mediator is a member of one of the fighting tribes or if the mediator has an organic tie with one of them, his mediation is not accepted.

In some cases, the leader of the neighbour tribe tries to be a mediator between the conflicted tribes in a vendetta. But some powerful members of conflicting tribes may not permit the leader to mediate. Because this situation provides more prestige to the mediator in his own tribe which turns the situation against them.

For this reason, generally mediators are accepted from those who belong to the upper positions such as a *sheikh* or an unbiased person from the government. A proverb is widely used in the area summarizing the situation; “leaders are found very easily, but a leader to whom other leaders listen is found very rarely”.

Generally, *sheikhs* are outside of the tribal structure, they do not belong to any tribe. They are religious figures, who receive loyal devotedness from a group of believers. Their positions are deemed to be very respectful. Consequently, they are regarded as the most appropriate individuals to be applied for being a mediator. Nearly in all conflicts *sheikhs* are chosen as mediators. This, in turn, reinforces their positions within the society.

According to traditional rules, if a fight between two families in a village ends with a murder, the murderer and his family should migrate from the village. They cannot come back to the village until the peace is settled. The same rule also applies to other situations such as “kidnapping a girl”, etc. If there is any plundering during the attacks of two tribes, the plundered goods should be returned to provide the peace. Otherwise, the tribe whose goods are plundered will continue the hostility and they will try to find out an opportunity to re-attack the enemy.

Debts taken from the members of the tribe or other tribes must be paid back. The leader should solve problems that have risen among the members of the tribe because of these debts. He can transfer the goods of the debtor to the creditor to compensate the loss. If one of the members of two different tribes does not pay his debt on due, under the protection of his own tribe, the creditor can confiscate the goods of one members of the debtor's tribe as a pledge. These goods are given back when the debt is paid. This is not accepted as robbery in the area. It is called *vesge* in the terminology of the area. Members of a tribe can renounce their credits. But the creditor has the right to take the debtor's goods such as his livestock as compensation for the debt.

For a robbery case that has been committed in the village, the tradition applied by the tribe is as follows; somebody who is protected follows the tracks of the thief. If these tracks end in a village and the thief cannot be found there, the people of the suspected village have the right to follow the tracks on their own by the help of other followers. If the people of the village cannot prove the tracks going out of their village, for instance if the follower brought by the suspected villagers is agreed on the tracks' ending in the village, the owner of the goods has the right to require from these villagers to compensate his loss or to search for his goods at each house in the village. If he chooses to search for his goods in the village and cannot find them, then his right for compensation is no more valid.

“Feuds” of a tribe is tried to be solved by their own efforts in accordance with traditions. These cases are not brought before a

judicial court or any other authority of the state. If a tribe cannot find the solution themselves, it will cast a shame upon them because their shedded blood and murdered member would be left without any retaliation.

The murderer may be arrested by the security forces of the state and sentenced to certain punishments or released, the hostility still will not be erased, until the indemnity is paid or the peace is provided. The tribe does not give up their allegation until the case is solved in accordance with their conventional law. According to the tribe, tribal law and the law of the state are different and the former is more important than the latter.

The basic and the most important factor recognized in every event is the fact that the tribe members are accepted as part of one family in terms of their inter-relations among themselves. In tribes, paternal kinship is valid and all members are close or distant relatives to each other. Nobility, blood ties, being a whole family or coming from the same race are important attributes of this kinship to be protected. According to traditions, members of a tribe in which the concept of 'us' is dominant act together in every event. The same thing happens also in other events as well as vendettas or facing any attack. Members of a tribe help each other in funerals, weddings, in cases of illnesses, etc. Other members or the relatives of a person, who is ill, murdered or in jail are jointly responsible to take care of his wife and children.

Honesty, chastity, keeping one's words all of which is summarized as controlling of one's hand-waist-tongue, bravery, friendship, good reputation and dignity are sacred values in tribes. Hospitality, generosity, thanking God for the things He gives and being modest are the basic characteristics of a tribe.

Patterns of Family and Marriage

In the following section, the results of our interviews and observations, our findings related to marriage, family and positions of man and woman in the family are discussed.

Although extended families are still seen, nuclear family structure is dominant in the tribe. Especially among families who do not have lands, nuclear families are prevalent due to economic hardship.

Although nuclear family structure is dominant in the area, the tribe and kinship ties are still effective in the constitution of these families. These ties also influence their behavioural patterns in the frame of traditional values and norms.

At the end of our interviews, we have found out that, as an institution, the tribe is an important impediment for the nuclear families to put forward their individual enterprises and independent participation. The most outstanding example of this effect can be seen during the elections when the political party for which individuals will vote is pre-determined by the tribe.

In our interviews, the majority of people state that lands should be inherited only to men. Another study that is carried out in the region¹⁶ revealed that the ratio of people who claimed that lands should be inherited to only males was 55.7%. The rate of people asserting that all children should equally share the heritage was 49%. On the other hand, due to the socialization, opinions of girls upon the heritage sharing developed in favour of their brothers. Since owning vast lands is considered as the real source of gaining wealth in the area, it is clear that sharing and controlling of heritage are done on behalf of men. Another factor, which supports this control, is the intermarriages. A certain level of flexibility can be seen when

goods, rather than lands, are under concern

A typical family of the region is a core family including mother, father and children. On the contrary to what is generally believed, families based on monogamous marriages and are not patriarchal. Marriage is a must; there cannot be seen old bachelors or maidens in the area. Neither bachelor oath due to religious reasons nor free love can be found in the region. The age of marriage is low; men at the age of 20, girls at the age of 16 - 17 get married by the demand of their families (Baran vd., 1998: p. 25).

Our informants indicated that although intermarriages are common, some brides from other tribes are also taken in marriage in order to develop a kinship with them and to provide a peace among tribes, which are in conflict. Marriages among cousins are also quite common.

The ties of *ashirats* have continued to affect the behaviour of individuals. Kinship has two functions: a holding system encompassing the individuals and a basic context for social solidarity. Therefore, the groups in the region are based on kinship depending on real or imagined "blood relations". *Ashirat* order is organized around the principle of patriarchal solidarity. In this order, solidarity is determined based on kinship degree. Marriages are also shaped depending on the preference over patriarchal kinship degree. Thus, such a preference entails the marriages between children of two brothers.

The marriages between children of two brothers are common in the region. Such a marriage, in fact, is not only a preference, but also a right for males. Therefore, males may not accept to marry to their uncles' daughter. When a foreigner wants to marry a girl from the *ashirat*, her father consult his relatives, particularly his cousins. If the cousins want to marry her, they have priority over the other people. Otherwise, male cousin may refuse the marriage and "prohibit" the girl since he has this right. Another person cannot propose this girl since it is unaccepted traditionally and may lead to serious disputes. There are several examples of such cases in the region. On the other hand, this case is regarded as a result of male cousins (Ökten, 2009: pp. 88-89).

Marriages among the children of real or categorical uncles are preferred. It is also preferred to marry a person who is not a relative but a member of the tribe, a situation that still conserves the endogamous character of marriages. Virginity of the newly wedded girl is absolutely obligatory and she has to prove this at her nuptial chamber.

The number of polygamy marriages is not so high and moreover, there is almost no marriage with more than two women. In a study carried out in the region it is found that 92% of the males interviewed have one spouse, whereas 6% of them have two spouses. No participant is found to have more than two spouses. Polygamy is more widespread among the leaders/ aghas, or the elite people in tribes. This type of marriage is a symbol of wealth and power, and a means of providing manpower as well as "soldiers" to the "army" of the tribe; in other words, the armed forces of the tribe. Beside these features, household members participated in this study, consider conditions like wife bearing, no child, old age, or having a sickness as important causes for polygamy (Ökten, 2004: p. 132).

Although this finding allows us to say that the tribal ties are getting loose in cities, the woman whose husband has brought a second wife, continues to stay at her husband's house, as a widowed woman stays at her father-in-law's or brother-in-law's house. Although there is no such tradition that the wife whose

husband died should get married with his brother or one of his close relatives, this type of marriages (called *levirat*) still can be seen. This occasional situation can be explained in terms of the worries of keeping the widowed woman (who is considered to be the honour of the family), children and goods inside the family.

Even though the notion about couples must come from the same family, creed or village is valid even today; we can say that the biggest determining factor of marriage is coming from the same tribe.

It is fundamental to live in accordance with the traditions and customs of the tribe and marriages and ceremonies are arranged due to these traditional principles. The bride price is paid to the bride's family and *berdel*, which is a mutual exchange of girls from two families (it is preferred not to pay any bride price), is a widespread method of marriage.

The bridegroom or his family pays the bride price or the goods to the bride's family. The amount is determined on the basis of common practice and socio-economical situations of both families. It can be paid either in cash or in goods such as giving a certain amount of livestock, mill, land, etc.

This money or goods carry economical importance for the bride's family and at the same time, it is considered as a necessary social insurance. Thanks to this practice, men consider women more valuable, or at least it acts as a dissuasive factor for divorces.

Another type of marriage is called *berdel*, a mutual exchange of girls between two families. In this type of marriages, mutual attitudes of spouses are fundamental rules directing the marriage. Each spouse should develop appropriate reactions to each other's behaviours. This dual marriage tradition is practiced in many aspects; from the beginning of the marriage to the type of furniture and jewelry that are bought for the brides, to the houses for them to live should be the same and as long as the marriage is valid the same mutuality continues. The man's family chooses the girl to their son's wife. The wedding ceremony is performed under the permission of both parents of the girl and the boy.

Traditionally, a girl is strictly forbidden from declaring the man whom she loves. The families arrange most of the marriages. Even after getting married, a woman is always responsible to her father and brother(s). It is just due to the fact that her father and brother(s) continue to undertake her responsibility in certain aspects. Her husband, even her father—may be more than her husband—is responsible of her actions; for example if a crime is committed by a woman, her father is responsible as much as her husband, or even more than him, for her misdemeanour. It is not traditionally proper for a woman to demand her share from the inheritance. However, there are cases in which a father can voluntarily leave his heritage to his daughter.

Getting divorced is not welcomed at all by the tribal traditions. For this reason, divorce is very rare in the area. Instead, the tradition of bringing a second wife (called *hewi*) to the house and keeping her together with the first wife in the same house is widely spread.

A man may get divorced, but if his ex-wife marries another man or stays at her father's house, this is considered as a shame for him. Moreover, in order to keep his sons under his paternity, the husband keeps his both wives at the same house.

Polygamy is applied when a man cannot have a son or a child. On the other hand, if the wife is very old or if the man has an irresistible desire of showing off power, polygamy becomes a

factual in the area. As mentioned earlier, polygamy marriages that are practiced in the region generally consist of only two wives.

Tribe members perceive the above-mentioned negative state of women very differently. They think that, even though women do not hold an equal position with men in the family especially in taking decisions, it is a result of division of labour that exists between men and women. Moreover, they believe that women are respected in tribes. The main authority in the family is the man; but the woman has also the right to express her ideas. When the relation between husband and wife is considered, woman has got a sort of priority; she has an equal status with the men in the village aristocracy and among educated people living in cities.

The tribe members accept this position of a woman as a natural phenomenon. It is definitely thought that this situation arises just because of the fact that woman is in need of protection because of her fragile, delicate nature.

Women receive great respect among the tribe members and this is protected under the tribal traditions. The results of our research reveal that women are untouchable in cases of feuds or other type of conflicts. Her chastity and honour is strictly forbidden to be gossiped about and this wrongdoing is seen as a great shame and considered as a big crime. According to tribal traditions, when an attack against a woman occurs, the unbiased tribes may also interfere.

Another example of respect shown towards women is seen when they are used as mediators in severe conflicts that cannot be easily solved. The problems, which cannot be solved by male mediators, are solved by the support of female mediators. When a woman comes to solve the problem as a mediator, it is a very big shame to refuse her, no matter how big the problem is.

Another important tradition about the need of a woman's help for resolution appears during an unfair situation. A woman in trouble expresses her anger by knotting a respected man's *puşi*, or *chafya* (headgear) in her tribe. In such a case, whatever the problem is, and whatever it may cost, all members of the tribe do their best to help her. If they do not, this will cast a shame upon their honour and respect.

The position of a woman in the tribe changes depending on her age and status. This state changing can be observed from her status at home and in public and from her way of garmenting. Within a period that a woman marries and gives birth to a son and brings him up until a certain age, her status changes in the tribe and receives an increasing respect. Old women are said to have the absolute right to express their ideas in the tribe.

The way of dressing for married and single women is different. As a girl is dressed up differently from a married woman, a married woman's garments are different that of a widowed woman. By this way, it is easily recognized that whether a female is a virgin girl, a woman or a widow. The most outstanding difference is the caps used by women. For example, young girls tie their headscarves called *yazma*, in a way that their necks are visible. Married women tie their embraced or plane headscarves called *dolbent* to cover their necks and hair. A widow who lost her husband uses a black or dark coloured headscarf.

Conclusion

In this study we focused on hierarchical order, status, normative order and family/kinship structure in Bin Yousuf Tribe and observed that the dominant traditional organization determines

the main aspects of social structure in the region. The basic feature of this social structure is the loyalty to the introverted institutions such as the tribe and *aghaism*, which are interlaced with each other through the very long history. The most characteristic element appears to be the possession of a strong cultural and emotional commitment to tribal community and a strong feeling of identity being manifested in ethnocentrism, like most tribes worldwide. Belonging to the tribe means to be of distinguished and noble ancestry and is linked to pride. The people in the tribal community share the notion of being distinct from others. The “us” feeling creates strong ties among members which underlines solidarity.

Here we have to emphasize the critical role of the tribal leader. He acts both as a political and social authority in the tribe and held responsible for the acts of community members. The power of the leader come from his noble ancestry.

Majority of the individuals still living in the area consider themselves, firstly, as members of a clan, then members of a tribe to which their clan belongs to. Patriarchal loyalty is the basic factor affecting the inter-relations. In this context, a tribe/clan is believed to be constituted by families having “blood ties”. Therefore there’s a strong emphasis on inheriting “blood” from patrilineal ancestors and accordingly patrilineal inheritance of group membership. As kinship is considered to be given at birth, it is fixed, ascribed and performative in every respect. In fact, tribal kinship is seen to be about sharing all aspects of life including both emotions and substance. On each level of social life, effects of these ties including various tribal responsibilities can be observed.

Due to the rapid social change and the transition period that the region is going through lately, communities living in this area are suffering from great difficulties and adaptation problems. An important conclusion we derived from our study is that although the traditional social structure of the region is in the dissolution process and reveals transformations, the tribal values, norms, laws and relations resist against modern life and tribe members preferentially try to reconstruct the traditional in modern life. Even though the physical outcomes of this structure no longer exist today, this structure still retains its influence at political, economical and social levels, in other words the more informal local power structures, which are traditionally oriented are effective in the form of a segmentary tribal system.

We observed that all matters of order are mostly settled within the traditional tribal norms. In fact, the tribal tie has a determinative effect on every social stage of social life such as the political attitudes of individuals, normative order, and the structure of marriages and families. The tribe mostly decides upon the party for which the members vote. It still is a considerable means of providing economical support and solidarity. The tribal ties are especially taken into account when children, especially daughters, are given in marriages by their families. Accordingly we have to stress that there is a strong, culturally based social control system which is reinforced by custom, mostly unquestioned, which effect and regulate behavior and decisions. It is observed that these are longstanding practices that have been operative in the community. As the tribe is particularist in its normative system and has its own moral order, an attack against a member means an attack to the whole members. Here we have to stress the unilateral form of social control in the form of self-help which may lead to restroing to extralegal methods such as vengeance and vigilantism. Here crime

may be a form of social control (Horwitz, 1990). As tribal societies need to work around emotive, tight social bonding, they may fall prey to destructive feuding. This also may be considered as a form of negative reciprocity.

The most outstanding demographic feature of the population in the area is the increase rate, which is a result of intention and desire of having many children. The traditions and values of the tribal society originate this intention. As far as the maintenance of the tribal values are concerned marriage seems to be one of the most important institutions. Endogamous, arranged marriages and bridewealth appears to be quiet common. Tre tribal community as a whole provides a rather effective control on women. Girls are expected to get married at early ages.

The tribe as an institution in the area where there is no strong governmental organization or security over any matter, maintains its function in overcoming difficulties and solving the problems such as the need of getting and using bank loans, establishing security and solidarity. Here we observed the tribe as a unit of subsistence and this situation considerably maintains the loyalty of the members to the tribe.

In summary, it is seen that the tribal ties continue affecting the people in the region intensively and extensively. It can be stated that this structure can undergo some different forms and dimensions by the time elapses and the tribal structure under concern may sometimes exert more influence or may recede depending upon the conjuncture, but it will never lose its function and effectiveness. On the other hand, the tribe as a structural concept or as a principal of social order is just a component within a more complex social and political web. The only way to remove the absolute loyalty to the tribe, which keeps functioning in many matters, is to establish firm and modern institutions and organizations that will take over all the functions that have previously been performed by the tribe.

REFERENCES

- Aksoy S. (1992). The issue of land ownership. The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, *Journal of Science and Technology*, 292, 52-53.
- Altuntek, N. S. (2001). An evaluation of the research on marriage and kinship in Turkey. *Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 18, 17-28.
- Altuntek, N. S. (2008). A symbolic-cognitive approach to the concept of honor. *Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 25, 37-58.
- Baran, A., & N. Çabuk, (1998.) *Şanlıurfa harran valleys in land and village development project*. Ankara: GAP Administration.
- Crone Patricia (1986). The tribe and the state. In J. A. Hall (Ed.), *States in history*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Doğanay, F. (1997). *Harran valley in social and cultural transformation process and the southeastern Anatolia project experience*. Ankara: DPT.
- Erdost, M. İ. (1987). *Şemdinli interview*. İstanbul: Onur.
- Gökalp Z. (1992). *Sociological analysis on Kurdish Tribes*. İstanbul: Sosyal.
- Horwitz, A. V. (1990). *The logic of social control*. New York: Springer.
- Kılıç, R. (2005). *Sayyids and Sharifs in the Ottoman Empire*. İstanbul: Kitap.
- Ökten, Ş. (2004). *A sociological analysis of development Attempts in Turkey: The Southeastern Anatolia Project*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara: University of Hacettepe.
- Ökten, Ş. (2010). Blood feud: Vengeance of blood or the collective fight for honour. *Journal of Anthropology*, 24, 165-187.
- Ökten, Ş. (2010). Sociological identity of power: The form and sources of power in tribes. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 13, 183-215.
- Reading, H. F. (1978). *A dictionary of the social sciences*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Sencer, M. (1993). *Research on development trends in the region of southeastern Anatolia project*. Ankara: TMMOB.
- Tapper, R. (2004). *Frontier nomads of Iran*. Ankara: İmge.
- Türkdoğan, O. (1998). *Southeastern identity: Tribe, culture and people*. İstanbul: Alfa.
- Van Bruinessen, M. (2003). *Agha, shaikh and state*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Yalçın-Heckmann, L. (2002). *Tribe and kinship among the kurds*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- bul: İletişim.
- Yalkın, A. R. (1997). *Turkmenian clans in the South*. Ankara: Ministry of Culture.
- Yinanç, R. (1995). *The composition of population and ethnic structure in Anatolia according to the ottoman tax registers*. Ankara: Türk Yurdu.