

**EFFECTS OF NEW REGIONAL POLICIES ON TURKISH REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF SOUTHERN EASTERN ANATOLIA PROJECT**

**A THESIS SUMMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLEEAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

BY

SEZİN DEMŞEK

**IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF URBAN POLICY PLANNING
AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

DECEMBER 2003

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Tarık Şengül

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Çağatay Keskinok

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Melih Pınarcıoğlu

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Tarık Şengül

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çağatay Keskinok

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

05.01.2003

Sezin Demşek

ABSTRACT

EFFECTS OF NEW REGIONAL POLICIES ON TURKISH REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF SOUTHERN EASTERN ANATOLIA PROJECT

Demşek, Sezin

M.S., Department of Urban Policy Planning and Local Governments

Supervisor: Assoc.Prof.Dr. H. Çağatay Keskinok

December, 2003, 116 pages

In this thesis, changing regional development policies and effects of these in Turkey is discussed. Regional inequalities have been one of the important concerns of the Republic of Turkey. However, the restructuring of state and capitalism during 1980's led to a change in regional policies and Turkish regional policies have surely begun to be affected from new policies. Yet, these new policies do not seem to offer much about promoting development in underdeveloped regions. This study aims to analyze the effects of new regional policies with their successes and failures in order to find out whether they can offer a suitable policy framework for promoting development in underdeveloped regions of Turkey. With this aim, changing policies in Southern Eastern Anatolia Project (GAP) will be discussed.

Transformation of GAP, from a project of irrigation and energy based on previous allocative regional policies to a sustainable human development project will be examined. According to findings of the study, some remarks will be made about policy framework that should be taken as a basis in GAP.

Keywords: Regional Development Policies, New Regionalism, Sustainable Development, Southern Eastern Anatolia Project (GAP)

ÖZ

YENİ BÖLGESEL POLİTİKALARIN TÜRK BÖLGE KALKINMASINA ETKİLERİ: GÜNEYDOĞU ANADOLU PROJESİ ÖRNEĞİ

Demşek, Sezin

Yüksek Lisans, Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç.Dr. H. Çağatay Keskinok

Aralık, 2003, 116 sayfa

Bu tezde, değişen bölge kalkınma politikaları ve bunların Türkiye üzerindeki etkileri tartışılmaktadır. Bölgesel eşitsizlikler Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin önemli konuları arasında olmuştur. Ancak, 1980'lerde devletin ve kapitalizmin yeniden yapılandırılması bölgesel politikalarda değişikliğe yol açmış ve Türkiye'deki bölgesel politikalar da bu yeni politikalardan etkilenmeye başlamıştır. Fakat, bu yeni politikalar azgelişmiş bölgelerde kalkınmayı teşvik etmek için fazla bir şey önermiyor görünmektedir. Bu çalışma yeni politikaların etkisini başarıları ve başarısızlıkları ile analiz ederek, bunların Türkiye'nin

azgeliřmiř blgelerde kalkınmanın teřvik edilmesi iin bir politika erevesi oluřturup oluřturamayacađını bulmayı amalamaktadır. Bu amala, Gneydođu Anadolu Projesi (GAP)’ndeki deđiřen politikalar tartıřılacaktır. GAP’ın nceki kaynak dađılımcı blgesel kalkınma politikalarına bađlı bir sulama ve enerji projesinden srdrlebilir insani kalkınma projesine dnřm incelenecektir. alıřmanın bulgularına gre GAP’ta temel alınması gereken politika erevesine iliřkin bazı neriler yapılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Blgesel Kalkınma Politikaları, Yeni Blgecilik, Srdrlebilir Kalkınma, Gneydođu Anadolu Projesi (GAP)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Assoc.Prof.Dr. Çağatay Keskinok for his guidance during the preparation of this study. I would also like to thank my jury members Assoc.Prof.Dr. Melih Pınarcıoğlu and Assoc.Prof.Dr. Tarık Şengül, not only for being my jury member, but also for teaching me a lot throughout my education in METU.

I offer special thanks to Prof.Dr. Melih Ersoy from whom I learned much in my graduate education. I would also like to thank Ms. Aygöl Fazlıoğlu from GAP Administration and Ms. Filiz Doğanay for their comments and suggestions about my thesis.

I express my sincere thanks to my friends Gülçin Tunç, Derya Yıldırım, Seçil Üretmen and Meriç Kalaycıoğlu for their support. I am also very debtful to my friends and colleagues Osman Balaban and Cenap Yoloğlu who shared my work at the department and gave me extra time for the preparation of this thesis. Thank you for your support and patience.

I offer my sincere thanks to Aren Kurtgözü for his support and encouragement in the preparation of the thesis. Most of all, I thank him for being with me. I love you.

Finally I would like to thank my parents and sister who encouraged me throughout my education. Without the encouragement of my parents I would never be where I am now. Thank you for support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGING REGIONAL POLICIES.....	6
2.1.Regional Development Policies From Early 1950's to mid 1970's	6
2.1.1.Regional Development and the Welfare State	7
2.1.2. Common Stand Points	8
2.1.3. Weaknesses of The Policies.....	11
2.2. Crisis, Restructuring and Changing Regional Policies.....	14

2.3. New Regionalism and Regional Development	17
2.3.1 Foundations of New Regionalism.....	18
2.3.2. Main Arguments of New Regionalism	20
2.3.3. The Role of State in New Regionalism	23
2.3.4. New Regionalism and Underdeveloped Regions	25
2.3.5. Weaknesses of New Regionalist Debates	26
2.4.Changing Development Priorities: Emergence of Sustainable Development Approach.....	28
2.4.1. Introduction of Environmental Concerns to the Field of Development.....	28
2.4.2. Emergence of Sustainable Development	29
2.4.3. Participatory Processes in Sustainable -Human – Development	32
2.4.4. Evaluation of Development Proposals of Sustainable Development Approach	35
2.5. A Brief Evaluation of Changing Regional Policies	36
 3. REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN TURKEY	 38
3.1. Regional Policies in National Development Plans.....	39
3.1.1. 1 st Five-Year Development Plan (1963-1967)	40
3.1.2. 2 nd Five-Year Development Plan (1968-1972)	41
3.1.3. 3 rd Five-Year Development Plan (1973-1977)	43
3.1.4. 4 th Five-Year Development Plan (1979-1983).....	45
3.1.5. 5 th Five-Year Development Plan (1985-1989).....	46
3.1.6. 6 th Five-Year Development Plan (1990-1994).....	48
3.1.7. 7 th Five-Year Development Plan (1996-2000).....	48
3.1.8. 8 th Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005).....	49
3.2. Regional Planning Practices in Turkey.....	51
3.3. Evaluation of Regional Policies and Planning Practices in Turkey	53

4. EFFECTS OF NEW DEVELOPMENT POLICIES ON SOUTHERN EASTERN	
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (GAP).....	60
4.1. Evolution of the Project.....	60
4.1.1. 1989 GAP Master Plan	63
4.1.2. Establishment of GAP Regional Development Administration	65
4.1.3. Introduction of “Sustainable Human Development” to GAP’s	
Planning Approach	69
4.2. Examination of Projects Undertaken in the Context of Sustainable	
Human Development	73
4.2.1. The Umbrella Program	74
4.2.2. 2002 GAP Regional Development Plan	76
4.2.3. Establishment of an Economic Development Agency- GAP GİDEM’s	79
4.2.4. Promotion of Employment and Business Potential in the	
Urban Informal Sector	82
4.2.5. Multi-Purpose Community Centers – ÇATOMs	83
4.2.6. Rehabilitation of Children Working in Streets	85
4.2.7. Social Progress for Youth.....	85
4.2.8. Assistance for Urban-Rural Integration and Community	
Development Programs in Halfeti, Şanlıurfa.....	86
4.2.9. Capacity Development for Local Development	88
4.2.10. Environmental Projects in GAP.....	89
4.3. Realization Level of GAP	90
4.4. Problems of the Projects Undertaken with Sustainable	
Development Approach	92
5. CONCLUSION	95

5.1. Positive and Negative Aspects of Changing Policies in GAP	95
5.2. A New Policy Framework for GAP	97
APPENDIX A List of Provinces Defined as PRD by the Periods of Five-Year	
Development Plans	100
REFERENCES.....	110
ONLINE REFERENCES	116

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE:

3.1. Distribution of Public Expenditures by Regions (1983-1997) (At 1997 Prices).....	56
3.2. Developed and Less Developed Provinces According to Socio-Economic Development Indexes.....	58
3.3. Number of Households and Distribution of Income by Regions.....	58
4.1. Cash Realization of GAP.....	91

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ÇATOM:	Multi-Purpose Community Centers
FAO:	Food and Agriculture Organization
FYDP:	Five-Year Development Plan
GAP:	Southern Eastern Anatolia Project
GİDEM:	Entrepreneur Support and Guidance Centers
IMF:	International Monetary Fund
KOSGEB:	Small and Medium Industry Development Organization
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organization
PRD:	Priority Region in Development
SME:	Small and Medium Size Industries
SPO:	State Planning Organization

TESK: Confederation of Artisans and Craftsmen

TOBB: The Union of Chambers of Commerce, Industry, Maritime Trade and
Commodity Exchanges of Turkey

UN: United Nations

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

WB: World Bank

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Regional development inequalities have been one of the important problems of Turkey. Especially eastern and southern eastern regions have been underdeveloped both economically and socially, compared to the rest of the country. Although policies and projects have been designed to overcome the problem this situation still continues.

Overcoming regional development inequalities has been one of the major concerns of the Republic of Turkey. In the early years of the Republic, development of Anatolia was given a great emphasis. Ankara was introduced as the new capital, public industries were located in many other Anatolian cities, and these were supported by railway systems as given in the industrial plans. By this way reforms of the Republic to modernize society were expanded to Anatolia. As Tekeli points out, “Anatolian provincial centers were used as contact points in introducing social change, and they became a means to destroy the conservative centers in the former period” (Tekeli, 1975).

Regional inequalities have also been one of the most important concerns in the planned period that is from 1963 to now on. Starting from the first national development plan (five-year development plan), policies about regional development have been given in every plan. Although statements in these plans sometimes differed, the main aim has always been reducing regional disparities.

Apart from policies, regional development projects have also been prepared. During 1960's regional plans were prepared by the Ministry of Public Works and Settlement for Antalya, Marmara, Zonguldak and Çukurova regions. Yet, those regions were not underdeveloped ones. It can be said that preparation of these plans for developed regions was done with the purpose of creating growth poles in consistency with the regional policies of that time. Plans were not prepared at that time for the underdeveloped regions. Comprehensive regional development planning for these regions starts with Southern Eastern Anatolia Project (GAP) in the late 1980's.

Important changes took place at the end of 1970's and at the beginning of 1980's, which in turn affected regional development policies and practices. The socio-economic changes in global and national levels found their reflection at regional level as well. From 1950's to the middle of 1970's, which can be called as post-war period, regional development was state-driven, incentive-based and standardized, aiming at redistribution of income and welfare by allocative state policies. The restructuring of nation-states also changed their policies about regional development.

The economic crisis at the second half of 1970's led to restructuring of nation-states in early 1980's. Keynesian welfare politics were given away and neo-liberal policies began to be applied by nation-states in both developed and underdeveloped countries. State intervention to market economy or direct state investments were no longer accepted in these neo-liberal policies. Shortly, the role of state in economy was lessened. In this period, regional scale lost its importance with the rise of localities, mostly as a result of increasing mobility of capital and with the diminishing role of state in economy as a result of restructuring process.

Under these circumstances, regional development policies lost their importance. However, this situation did not last too long. Regional scale began to get much attention during 1990's with a renewed interest in economically successful regions. This interest in regions led to the emergence of "new regionalist" arguments. In these new arguments, the role given to regions was different than it used to be. In this "new regionalism" regions are considered as a scale for economic development and political governance (MacLeod, 2001). In the new regionalist arguments many and sometimes overlapping concepts like "intelligent regions", "learning regions" were developed.

Apart from these, new concerns were integrated to the field of development. Introduction of social and environmental concerns led to the emergence of sustainable-human-development approach, to which great emphasis has been given at international scale.

These new policies are different from the previous ones in a number of ways as will be seen. Yet a few points are given here to determine the aim of the study more clearly. First of all, new policies favor designing bottom-up policies in a participatory way. This emphasis on participation radically changed the role of public sector, designing policies and projects by itself in a top-down way, in the previous policies. However, considering underdeveloped regions, like the one examined in this thesis, it is hard to say that these new policies proposed alternatives to replace supportive role of state in previous policies to promote development in such regions. The emphasis on participation has also made developing capacities of people and institutionalization important targets for development. Secondly, especially with sustainable human development approach, social issues like gender-balanced development or empowerment of disadvantaged groups were integrated to development efforts, which were hardly mentioned in previous policies.

However, as will be seen in the following chapter, these new policies are ambiguous and context-specific, implementation of which changes from place to place. Although context-specific approach may help a lot to take into account socio-economic conditions of regions, ambiguities in theory may create big problems in implementation of policies derived from these ambiguous theories.

Nevertheless, these policies have been affecting GAP from mid 1990's. Started as a project of irrigation and energy, GAP was transformed into a multi-sectoral regional development project with 1989 Master Plan. This plan was prepared in consistency with previous allocative policies to guide the activities of public institutions in the region. However, the increasing interest in new development policies also affected GAP and it has adapted sustainable human development approach since mid 1990's.

This thesis aims to examine these changing regional policies in GAP to find out whether they offer a suitable policy framework for GAP or not. In examining the changing policies in GAP, both previous and new policies will be discussed to determine their successes and weaknesses and to offer a new policy framework for the project, in which positive aspects of these policies can be integrated in a way to leave out the weaknesses.

For this purpose, in the second chapter of the thesis, theoretical framework about previous and new development policies will be given to understand their successes and weaknesses. By this way, a framework will be supplied for analyzing policies in GAP.

As stated before, regional development has been one of the major concerns of the Republic of Turkey. To understand how the problem of regional inequalities has been approached and what has been done to overcome it, statements about regional development in national

development plans and regional planning practices in Turkey will be given in the third chapter. After examining these, some remarks will be made why regional inequalities continue to be a major problem of Turkey despite these efforts.

In the fourth chapter of the thesis, changing policies in GAP will be examined. Allocative policies at the earlier stages of the project and reasons for policy change in way to adapt sustainable human development approach will be examined. Later, projects designed according to the sustainable human development approach will be discussed. By examining these it will be possible to determine negative and positive aspects of both policies.

After analyzing policy changes, the reasons for it and looking at some projects designed in GAP, concluding remarks will be made in the last chapter. As stated before, new regional policies take away supportive state policies of the previous period yet, they do not offer much about promoting development in underdeveloped regions. However, allocative policies are very crucial for GAP, which depends on realization of big-scale energy and irrigation projects for development. On the other hand, social development is also very essential for the region, which is emphasized by new policies. In this respect, it will be argued that neither allocative, top-down policies nor new development, bottom-up policies can alone realize socio-economic development of GAP region. For this reason it will be concluded that realizing socio-economic development in the region requires an integrated policy framework of these two; top-down allocative policies for realizing big-scale projects for economic development and sustainable human development policies for social development.

CHAPTER 2

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGING REGIONAL POLICIES

In this chapter, theoretical debates about regional development and changing regional policies will be examined to provide a background for succeeding chapters. With the help of this framework it will be possible to evaluate not only regional development policies and practices in Turkey but also changing policies of GAP.

With this purpose firstly, previous regional policies that dominated the field of regional development until mid 1970's will be discussed. Secondly, the reasons behind the changing regional policies will be given. Later, new regional policies will be given to find out its differences from previous ones. After that, sustainable development approach introduced to the field of development at early 1990's will be evaluated to understand the changing policies in GAP more clearly. Finally some remarks will be made about the theoretical debates, which will be used for analyzing policies in the succeeding parts.

2.1.Regional Development Policies From Early 1950's to mid 1970's

The increasing interest in growth economics and regional disparities after the Second World War led to the emergence of regional development/planning as a field of study during 1950's. In the period between 1950's to early 1970's, many theories were developed about

regional development and regional planning with the influence of growth economics and geography.

In this section, these theories will be examined briefly focusing on their similarities and weaknesses to get a background for understanding the changes in the field of regional development and in regional policies.

2.1.1.Regional Development and the Welfare State

First of all, it must be stated that regional development or eliminating regional development inequalities was a duty of state in the previous policies. In consistency with states' role as distribution mechanism, regional inequalities were the problems that states had to tackle with. As distributor of welfare among the citizens, it was states' responsibility to realize regional development to have integrated national economic development and to make the conditions of citizens living in underdeveloped regions better off. For these reasons, in this period policies were designed at national scale and implemented to eliminate regional inequalities.

These policies or plans were supposed to be suitable with overall national development objectives, since in this period states were also responsible for managing national economic development. In this respect, preparation of national development plans by state to guide national economic development for achieving defined targets was seen as a necessity, especially for underdeveloped countries.

These plans were prepared in a comprehensive way to cover all economic sectors and their relations. Besides the economic sectors, national plans were also defining social

development targets and policies like education, health and regional development. In fact, reducing regional inequalities was supposed to be one of the major aims of these plans. As put by Myrdal; “A main purpose of state policies blue printed in the plan, therefore, must be to increase strength of the spread effects of the development impulses among the regions and among occupations” (Myrdal, 1957).

As can be seen, for increasing economic development of a country, which was the main aim of national development plans, reducing regional inequalities was considered as an important target. State, being responsible for economic development, was also given duty of designing and implementing regional development policies in consistency with the policies given in national plans. In this framework, regional plans were suitable tools to realize policies of national plans. The economic and mostly sectoral policies given in development plans, lacked spatial aspects. They did not determine where to make investments, in which sectors those investments should be made and did not consider the relations among sectors. With regional plans, these problems were supposed to be overcome, since they should combine sectoral policies of national plans with such spatial aspects (Friedmann, 1965).

2.1.2. Common Stand Points

The basic common characteristic of policies or theories of this period was to favor unbalanced national growth that was favoring development in certain sectors in selected regional centers. It was argued that especially in developing countries that had scarce fiscal resources, it was impossible to start development process everywhere (Hansen, 1981). Thus some centers should be selected and supported where investments and in turn development could concentrate. Developments in these centers were supposed to spread to other areas in time.

One of the earliest approaches of such unbalanced regional development was developed by Hirschman (Hirschmann, cited in Hansen, 1981). According to him, development should be concentrated in specific centers and by this way using scarce resources should be optimized. Success in selected growth points would spread to other areas –hinterlands- and development would be achieved in hinterlands with these spreads or “trickle down effects” in Hirschman’s terms. The need for public investments in growth points would decrease in time as development targets were realized in these areas. For this reason, released public funds could be transferred to other underdeveloped areas. With this cycle of trickle down effects and public funds, the problem of regional underdevelopment was supposed to eradicate in time (Hansen, 1981).

Similar arguments can be seen in Myrdal. Like Hirschman’s polarization and trickle down effects, Myrdal used the terms “backwash and spread effects” to explain the process of unbalanced regional development. Spread effects refer to the expansion of development from selected centers to other areas, whereas backwash effects refer to negative effects of unbalanced development. According to Myrdal, if spread effects were stronger than backwash effects, regional economic development could be sustained (Myrdal, 1957).

Likewise, Perroux emphasized the role of “growth poles” in regional development. For him, dominant industries could influence other sectors to develop and by this way general development of economy could be achieved. Interconnection of industries with different sectors would in turn cause all these sectors to develop in selected centers. By this way, growth poles would emerge from which development was supposed to expand to other areas (Friedmann, 1988).

In all of these approaches given above, centers or growth poles were taken as isolated units; relations between these growth poles in a national system of regions were not considered adequately. It was John Friedmann that first considered these not as isolated units but in a spatial system where they had relations with each other. In consistency with unbalanced regional development approach, Friedmann (1964) stated that development process should start in “core” areas as later affecting their “peripheries”. Yet, these core areas were determined by their place in hierarchy of settlements. Their size and the size of their peripheries would change according to their place in hierarchy.

As stated before, in all of these approaches unbalanced growth for achieving development in underdeveloped regions was offered. In all of them, the process of development was supposed to spread from cores/growth points to peripheries/ hinterlands.

Another similarity of these approaches was that, they were investment-based. This was mostly caused by the influence of growth economics on the field of regional development. As given before, increasing interest in growth economics was one of the causes of the emergence of the field of regional development. With this influence, many models were developed in this period about allocation of resources or investments. With the emergence of these models, regional development was considered as a thing that was totally calculatable. Although different models were designed for regional development, general logic behind these was same, in which regional development was explained and calculated by purely mathematical models (Eraydın, 2002).

These models were thought as applicable to any region or in any country regardless of regions’ or countries’ conditions. Such an approach reduced the problem of regional development to investment decisions, mainly for public sector. At this point, it was decision

of states' to make direct investments or to support private sector investments, either in relatively developed centers with efficiency concern or in underdeveloped regions with equity concern.

2.1.3. Weaknesses of The Policies

The previous regional development policies had their own weaknesses. As stated above, consideration of regional development models applicable to any region failed to take into account regional differences; in terms of their different socio-economic conditions, resources, potentials or problems. Social problems of underdeveloped regions were supposed to be solved as level of economic development increased by making adequate level of investments.

In addition, the unbalanced regional development policies of the period between early 1950's and mid 1970's failed to consider the problems of countryside or peripheries adequately. Such problems were supposed to be solved in time as development process expanded to these areas. Shortly, policies of that period were mostly dealing with the development processes in selected centers; other areas were left aside. As argued by Friedmann; "planners now in a good conscience ignore all but a few strategically chosen places; the leftover areas could be taken care of the spread effects that were presumed to follow" (Friedmann, 1975).

This ignorance was mostly caused by the consideration of underdevelopment as a temporary situation. Consideration of underdevelopment as a temporary problem is among the one of the important failures of previous approaches. Almost in all of the previous regional development theories, the problem of regional inequalities or regional underdevelopment was considered as a temporary problem that would be overcome as national economic

development level increased. As argued by Friedmann and Alonso (1975), spatial patterns were supposed to change with the changes in the level of economic development since they were thought to be directly affected by economy. Following this logic, there was a special kind of spatial organization created by specific level of economic development. In earlier stages of development, as in case of many third world countries, regional inequalities might be sharper since development would/should concentrate in few centers. However, as level of economic development increased and spread to peripheries, such inequalities would be lessened. Shortly, the problem of regional inequalities or underdevelopment was a temporary problem that would be eradicated in time as level of national economic development increased.

In this respect, development was equated to industrialization and regional inequalities were seen as unavoidable and compulsory outcome of this industrialization/development process. Especially in developing countries that were in the earlier stages of economic development, concentration of industrial activities in a few centers was considered as a normal and desirable thing. In these stages, since these centers would develop faster than other areas, regional inequalities would be sharper. Yet, like argued in regional development theories examined here, as development process proceeded and as national economy grew development would spread to other areas and regional inequalities would decrease. As put by Alonso; “in earlier stages of development there will be increasing disparity between developed and underdeveloped regions, but there will be a tendency toward equalization as the economy matures” (Alonso, 1975).

If the problem of regional inequalities was a temporary situation that would be solved by increasing level of national economic development, why there was a need for designing and implementing regional policies to overcome this problem. Why the efforts was not only

aimed at increasing overall national economic development. As stated before, in that period state was seen as distributor of welfare among its citizens. Considering the conditions of citizens living in underdeveloped regions compared to the ones in relatively developed areas, doing nothing for the former might cause serious political and social problems, which would affect not only underdeveloped regions but also whole country. As put by Friedmann;

Social and political unrest resulting from increasing impoverishment on the periphery may ultimately undermine developments at the center itself. Countervailing measures to maintain minimum inter-regional balances in the major indices of welfare therefore have to be undertaken (Friedmann, 1964).

Thus, some policies should be designed for these areas to avoid such crises and to achieve more equitable situation, which was one of the major responsibilities of states during that period.

This assumption of development as a process that would follow the same path everywhere regardless of countries' or regions' conditions faced serious criticism, especially from Marxists (Hansen, 1981). Bringing international relations and dependencies to the field of development, Latin American Dependency School made serious criticism to this understanding of development.

These criticisms argued that the problem of underdevelopment was not limited to regions. The problem was belonging to a broader context at international scale, in which there were causal links between developed and underdeveloped countries. It was argued that, underdevelopment of some countries were caused by being others' developed. To put it in another way, developed countries had been increasing their development levels by using resources of underdeveloped ones, which in turn made the latter underdeveloped in turn. In such a system of interconnections, it was impossible for underdeveloped countries to act

independently for increasing their development levels. Development and underdevelopment was strongly related to each other in an international system. Equity, whether at national or regional scale, could not be achieved without breaking these interdependencies, or in other words, without a general social change in the system.

Despite these weaknesses, the unbalanced regional development theories and policies dominated the theory and practice of regional development for over 20 years, until mid 1970's.

2.2. Crisis, Restructuring and Changing Regional Policies

The economic crisis occurred in the late 1970's led to restructuring of capitalism as well as state. These restructuring processes had great effects on spatial organizations. These restructuring processes also caused changes in regional policies. As put by Keating, "One of the driving forces behind the new regionalism is provided by economic restructuring and rapid changes in modes of production" (Keating, 1998).

Like stated the quotation given above, the restructuring process caused changes in regional policies. In order to understand the effects of restructuring on regional policies, this restructuring process will be examined briefly.

Considering the restructuring of capitalism, maybe the most important change occurred in production systems. The fordist type of production that was dominant in the previous period was replaced by post-fordist, flexible production systems. Fordism was characterized by mass production in which there was a strict division of labor. Thus the products in fordism were highly standardized. The scale of production and the standards of products were clearly

defined in fordist production system, which were hard to change since production was taking place among a production line in huge amounts.

That kind of production needed huge amounts of demand. States used to play an important role for sustaining this demand both by its regulative macro-economic policies and by its role of distributor of welfare which in turn increased income and demand levels (Eraydin, 1992). However, the economic crisis of 1970's created problems for implementing regulative state policies that protected fordist type of production.

Flexible/post-fordist type of production emerged as a response to the problems fordist type of production faced due to the economic crisis. This new type of production was flexible in production unlike highly standardized production process of fordism. In post-fordist type of production, not only production process but also division of labor was highly flexible. Production process was disaggregated; it was more sensitive to changing demand and technologies.

Apart from changing production systems, developments in technology also affected restructuring of capitalism. New technological innovations, especially in communication and transportation, together with flexible production systems increased the mobility of capital. This increasing mobility meant that choices of location for investors were so much more than it used to be; investment decisions were no longer limited to national boundaries, location decisions were taken at international scales. This situation had great effects on restructuring of nation-states and spatial organizations.

Nation-states also responded to the crisis with restructuring. Due to fiscal constraints they faced and restructuring of capitalism, the welfare policies of previous period were given

away. States' role as controlling economy and distributing welfare was left. Market intervention with such concerns was abundant. As response to fiscal crisis, deregulative state policies, that are privatization policies, were launched and public spending was reduced. Apart from fiscal constraints, increasing mobility of capital also weakened states' power to control economy. Such restructuring policies that were firstly implemented in developed countries like England and USA was imposed to underdeveloped countries by international organization like IMF or World Bank. As a result, similar processes related to restructuring of state took place in many countries.

The restructuring process had great effects on spatial organizations. As argued by Castells and Henderson (1987), what differentiated the restructuring of 1980's from previous ones was that restructuring has changed existing spatial organizations. The increasing mobility of capital not only weakened powers of nation-states but also led to creation of a competitive environment in which places were competing with each other to attract mobile/international capital. In this competition, especially regional scale gained importance not only to attract capital but also for governance and economic development.

However, in such a competitive environment regional policies of nation states were losing importance as a result the same restructuring process. As mentioned before, states' role as distributor of welfare in previous period was providing a basis for regional development policies. Since this role was given away with restructuring, regional policies were severely affected. In addition to this, weakened fiscal capacities and policies to reduce public spending due to the crisis also affected regional policies negatively. Shortly, because of fiscal capacities lessened of nation states and unwillingness of them to intervene market after restructuring, regional development policies to lessen regional inequalities was no longer a major concern for most of the nation-states.

Despite this situation, some regions succeed to adapt to this changing environment better than others. Such successful regions like Third Italy, Silicon Valley led to emergence of a renewed interest in regions both among academicians and practitioners. The reasons behind these regions' success were explained by different causes than before, like learning, innovation, and existence of a civic tradition. Such different explanations led to changes in regional policies since previous regional development approaches were unable to give a full explanation for these success stories. Thus new regional policies – which will be called as 'new regionalism' hereafter- emerged mostly stemming from the experiences of successful regions.

2.3. New Regionalism and Regional Development

Region as a scale of economic development and governance was highlighted at the beginning of 1990's. As stated before, the emergence of successful regions led to a renewed interest in regions. The success of these regions was attributed to different causes than before. Mainly, non-economic factors were considered to be the source of success in these regions like existence of various institutions, networks among them and collective learning environment. This renewed interest in regions as scales of economic development and governance gave way to the emergence of the debates, which are called as "new regionalism". Basing its arguments on mostly institutional economics, new regionalism considered region as the most appropriate scale for learning, innovation, and information exchange, institutional networks, shortly for economic development.

2.3.1 Foundations of New Regionalism

As stated before, new regionalism is different from the previous approaches to regional development. This difference mainly arises from its economic foundations. Unlike previous ones, which put classical economy in their framework, new regionalism's main arguments stem from "institutional economics".

Institutional economics rejects the idea of individual making purely rational decisions for his own benefit. It considers "economy as an instituted process" embedded in social relations. This embedness refers to the effects made by the society in which individual lives and to the effects on individuals' economic decisions (Amin and Thrift, 1994). Economic actions or decisions are also social actions. Thus, economic relations are context specific, not wholly rational. Individuals having relations with each other make decisions in these networks of relations, not acting rationally by themselves. Different networks leads to different decisions in same circumstances, shortly, there is no rational individual acting independently from the society he inhabits as classical economy claims.

The effects of institutional economics are clearly seen in the arguments of new regionalism. Based on this economic approach, new regionalism tries to increase and to mobilize plurality of institutions since the level of institutionalization and the networks among them are supposed to effect economic decisions in a positive way. For this reason, the success of some regions in recent times began to be explained not by economic factors like product specialization, agglomeration but by social and cultural factors like level of institutionalization, social consensus and so on.

In understanding the foundations of new regionalism, apart from institutional economics, the concept of “social capital” is very important. Most of the concepts developed in new regionalist debates, like relational assets, institutional thickness, are closely related to social capital as will be seen.

The concept of social capital was used by Robert D. Putnam in his work *“Making Democracy Work”* to explain the development differences between North and South Italy. In his study, Putnam concludes that high development level of North Italy compared to the South was closely related to the civic tradition in the North. To put it in other words, North Italy with its long civic tradition had high level of social capital; trust relations among individuals were developed which in turn enabled reciprocity and cooperation in the North. On the other hand, South Italy was lacking social capital that led to its underdevelopment.

In most simplistic form social capital can be defined as a set of moral assets like trust, reciprocity, mutual confidence and collaboration. In small societies where individuals know each other it is easier to have such assets and to build social capital. Yet, in more complex modern societies this task is much harder. Putnam offers two ways to develop social capital in such societies. One way is to develop norms of reciprocity and the other is to develop networks of civic engagement.

Similar to new regionalist debates, institutionalization plays an important role in developing social capital. Civic engagement and thus institutionalization is very essential in Putnam’s arguments. As he puts it; “Networks of civic engagement are an essential form of social capital: The denser such networks in a community, the more likely that its citizens will be able to cooperate for mutual benefit” (Putnam, 1993).

The vertical networks, which bring equivalents together, are usually found in civic institutions. For this reason, the more involvement in these institutions, the more mutual trust, collaboration, reciprocity would develop among its members and in turn the more social capital would develop in the society.

Developing social capital in regions that lack civic tradition is not mentioned in Putnam's arguments adequately. He clearly rejects "third party enforcement", like involvement of state for developing social capital; he considers this as inadequate solution. He admits that building social capital takes time and it is not an easy process. Yet, how it can be built remains unanswered in Putnam's arguments.

Putnam's arguments on social capital in explaining development differences have been affecting new regionalist debates clearly. The emphasis on institutionalization, collaboration, and cooperation for development is almost the same in Putnam's social capital arguments and in new regionalist debates. However, the problem of Putnam's arguments about building social capital given below has not been overcome by new regionalist debates.

2.3.2. Main Arguments of New Regionalism

New regionalism brought a different approach than the previous ones. Unlike post-war period, in which top-down policies were implemented, new regionalism offers designing bottom-up policies for development. New regionalism's development approach can be summarized as favoring bottom-up, region specific policies by taking into account the endogenous resources of region and with the participation of various actors and institutions both public and private. Here it is important to stress that; bottom-up policies are not

supposed to be designed only by devolution of power from state. It rather points to a participatory process apart from decentralization.

The effects of institutional economics on new regionalism are very clear. Putting emphasis on existence of institutions and the networks among them, new regionalism uses not economic factors but social and cultural ones, like level of institutionalization in a society to explain the causes of economic development. The concepts like “learning regions”, Amin and Thrift’s “institutional thickness”; Storper’s “untraded interdependencies” or “relational assets” were used to explain the success of some regions in consistency with institutional economics approach. Networks of learning, reciprocity, and coordination are considered to be the driving force beyond this success. For this reason, such assets are utmost important to achieve development in new regionalist debates.

Many and mostly overlapping concepts emerged in new regionalism to explain the importance of such assets. In order to understand the debates, some of the commonly used ones will be given. First one is the concept of “*institutional thickness*” defined by Amin and Thrift (1994). Institutional thickness can be defined as the networks and coalitions among various institutions. The concept requires existence of various institutions like regional development agencies, local authorities, chambers of commerce and industry, unions, government agencies and so on. However, the existence of these is not sufficient for sustaining institutional thickness. In addition to these networks among institutions, defined rules or patterns of coordination and coalition among them and lastly awareness among institutions that they all involve in common process should exist (Amin and Thrift, 1994). Institutional thickness refers not to existence of institutions but to networks among them. The more regions’ institutional thickness is denser, the more it has chance to succeed since the level of institutional thickness determines conditions of learning and innovation and in

turn determines regions' competitive advantage and chances for development (MacKinnon, Cumbers and Chapman, 2002).

Learning and innovation are also important aspects of new regionalism, since not only achieving development but also sustaining it is supposed to depend on learning and innovation. With these concerns concepts like "intelligent regions" and "learning regions" have emerged within new regionalist debates. The learning process in new regionalism is collective thus level of institutionalization is very important to achieve this collective learning. Apart from institutionalization, mutual trust is also important to have collective learning. Yet, building mutual trust is not easy considering the private interests of firms involved in learning processes. As put by MacKinnon and others;

... the literature on learning regions would seem to underplay the problems of building and sustaining trust in the face of competitive pressures which might lead firms to seek to appropriate network assets for their own private benefit (MacKinnon et al., 2002).

Creating such an environment, in which institutional thickness enables collective learning processes, is a necessity for achieving development. According to Amin (2000), in order to have such assets like networks of institutions, learning and cooperation, regions should find a way to replace existing hierarchical and state-dependent policies with link of mutuality between various actors and institutions.

Although shift in policy level is recommended for development, how this can be done remains unanswered. Creation of such an institutionalized environment and more importantly the creation of networks depending on mutual trust are big problems new regionalist debates have not answered adequately. Amin (2000) offers development of civic programs to enforce the identity of citizenship and thus to build trust relations and

cooperation. By doing so, social capital in region can be built, level of institutionalization can be raised and suitable environment for development can be achieved. Such programs can be realized with public resources yet, state should not interfere the context of projects. Similar to Putnam, Amin also states that it may take time to build such moral assets and rejects the involvement of state in building social capital. However, as in Putnam's case, the proposals to build such an environment remain inadequate.

Apart from institutionalization with networks of learning and collaboration, another important emphasis of new regionalism is using endogenous resources for development. This emphasis makes new regionalism sensitive to spatial differences. Thus development of regions is context specific in new regionalism changing according to regions' potentials.

2.3.3. The Role of State in New Regionalism

One of the distinct features of new regionalism from the older development policies is the role given to state. Since new regionalism brought involvement of many actors to development processes, it changed the traditional role of state in regional development as the direct provider of regional development policies and practices.

In new regionalist debates, state is only one of the actors that involve in regional development processes. Redistribute state policies of previous periods are considered as inadequate since they can no longer sustain development alone by themselves in a competitive world. Thus, state is not the only provider of development anymore, many institutions, as well as state, should involve development process. In this framework, states role is supporting development by its skills and by providing necessary infrastructure.

Although it is limited than before, state still plays an important role for regional development. It can be said that the role of state is not diminished in new regionalist debates it has rather changed. As put by Amin and Thrift, “Nation states still hold considerable power and they cannot be neglected in any solution to a region ill” (Amin and Thrift, 1994).

State with its experience in regional development, is still one of the most important actors despite the changing economic conditions and regional policies. For example, it plays an important role in the regulation of macro- economic framework. Surely, such regulation goes beyond the powers of regions, yet it is important to achieve and sustain regional development. As put by Amin;

... the new regionalism will amount to very little in the absence of sustained macro-economic support for the regions notably a secure financial and income transfer base and expansionary programmes to boost overall growth at national and international level (Amin, 2000).

Shortly, new regionalist policies have certainly changed the traditional role of state in regional development, however its role is by no way eradicated. This changing role can cause serious problems for underdeveloped regions, of especially underdeveloped countries. Considering underdeveloped regions, it is not adequate to offer only using their existing capacities efficiently for development since such capacities hardly exist in these regions. It is clear that development of these regions, like the one examined in this thesis, should be supported. Previously this support was given by state with allocative policies. However, change in regional policies left such regions without this type of support.

Whereas state support was taken away with new policies, there is nothing defined for underdeveloped regions to replace it. This situation causes a big problem for new regionalist policies. Changing traditional policies and supportive role of state for promoting regional

development, new regionalism fails to define new supportive mechanisms to replace previous ones. To sum up, these changing policies about the role of state do not offer much about promoting regional development in underdeveloped regions (Eraydin, 2002).

2.3.4. New Regionalism and Underdeveloped Regions

The general policies of new regionalism stem from successful regions, thus they may not be suitable for all regions, especially underdeveloped ones. As Amin argues, “Region building, in short, may not be an option for all regions, owing to the restrictions of context and time” (Amin, 2000).

Despite this statement, new regionalism does not offer a solution to the problem it defines clearly. The low level of development in some regions is attributed to the lack of a certain level of institutionalization and in turn lack of learning, innovation, coordination and collaboration. Yet, not much is said about building these in such regions. The question of development in regions that do not possess skills for development, like learning capacity, small and medium size entrepreneurship, networks of mutual trust among institutions, remains unsolved. As state before, only shift in policy level, from state dependent policies to the creation of learning environment with high level of institutionalization, is proposed for achieving development.

In this situation it can be argued that new regionalism do not offer appropriate policies for promoting development in underdeveloped regions. Shortly, although it is stated that experiences of successful regions cannot be imitated and cannot guarantee success for all regions, nothing more than the policies derived from successful regions is recommended for

development. In addition supportive policies of state is taken away with these new policies as mentioned previously.

2.3.5. Weaknesses of New Regionalist Debates

With reference to the arguments given above new regionalism's main weakness can be defined as not offering policies for underdeveloped regions. The experiences of successful regions in mostly developed countries are taken as a starting point for designing policies. However, it is very doubtful that, policies based on the experiments of these regions would succeed in underdeveloped, "unsuccessful" regions of underdeveloped countries. New regionalism with its emphasis on endogenous resources, on different development potentials of regions seems to fail to consider the conditions of underdeveloped regions. It rather tries to suit the processes in successful regions to underdeveloped ones. As Lovering points out, "The New Regionalism is self-consciously a perspective informed by (interpretations of) experience in some prosperous regions. It might become more substantial and coherent if it also took in the experience of less fortunate regions" (Lovering, 2000).

This weakness of new regionalism can also be observed in its emphasis on competition. As stated in most of the new regionalist debates in globalized world regions are competing with each other. Yet in this competition everyone cannot be a 'winner', there is and should be 'losers', unsuccessful regions. Not much is said about the regions which have less changes for success or which are unsuccessful in the competition. The problem of not offering suitable policies for underdeveloped regions repeats itself in the emphasis on competition.

Apart from these, the policy proposals of new regionalism are mostly about development of a specific sector, these proposals do not capture the development of the whole economy or

the link between various sectors adequately. Lovering (2000) clearly criticizes this incremental approach of new regionalism. He argues that new regionalism tries to analyze development only by considering export-manufacturing sector since this sector is assumed to be 'foundation of prosperity'. For this reason, the role of other sectors, like service or public sectors, are not taken into account adequately. As he states; "The New Regionalism is a set of stories about how parts of a regional economy might work, placed next to a set of policy ideas which might just be useful in some cases" (Lovering, 2000).

The relations with macro-economic framework are another problem in new regionalism. The relations with other scales such as relation with other regions at national scale are not given enough consideration. Such relations should be examined more detailed. For example, as argued by Amin, the relations with macro-economic framework regulated usually by state should be taken into account in regional analysis.

Another point needs attention is the participatory process in new regionalism. As stated before, participation is utmost important in new regionalism for designing and implementing bottom-up policies. In every argument of new regionalist debates the importance of participation can be clearly seen. Participation of private sector to regional development process is given a greater role as will be seen in discussing regional development agencies. Yet, mechanisms for participation and representation are rarely mentioned especially for disadvantaged groups like women, elderly, ethnic minorities and so on (MacLeod, 2001). At this point it can be said that the participation offered by new regionalism cannot capture the power relations in society. Except from private sector, participation of other and less advantaged groups is hardly mentioned.

2.4.Changing Development Priorities: Emergence of Sustainable Development Approach

Sustainable development is one of the new development approaches that gained much attention among both academicians and practitioners especially after 1990's. This approach has also been possessed by GAP since 1993.

For this reason, in this section a brief evaluation of sustainable development approach will be given to provide a basis for analyzing changing policies and practices in GAP.

2.4.1. Introduction of Environmental Concerns to the Field of Development

Environmental concerns began to get much attention during 1960's. In this period, people began to be more interested in pollution caused by industrialization/development processes. Such an increasing interest gave rise to "environmentalism" which was different from nature protection by being activist and political and by being interested in environmental issues at global scale (Elliot, 2000).

In these early years of environmentalism, relations between environmental problems and development processes were understood more clearly. Yet, in these early years, development and environmentalism were usually seen as incompatible.

It was in 1970's that the attempts to integrate these two was started. Relationship between development and environmental problems were more clearly understood and many international meetings were organized to integrate environmental concerns with development

objectives. With such meetings, governments' attention to environmental issues was drawn and environmental concerns began to find place in national development policies.

2.4.2. Emergence of Sustainable Development

It was with these international efforts to integrate environmental aspects to development policies/practices that the concept of “sustainable development” emerged. Although the attempts have been made, there is no single definition of sustainable development that everybody agrees upon. In shortest terms, *sustainable development is “maintaining development over time”*(Elliot, 2000). One of the most commonly used definitions of sustainable development was given by World Commission on Environment and Development as follows. *“Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”*

As can be seen, development without risking next generations' living conditions is the main aim of sustainable development approach. Yet, as stated before, sustainable development is a very ambiguous concept that has no single definition. This ambiguity mainly arises from the fact that it is being dependent on political decisions for implementation. Sustainable development with its emphasis on environmental and social issues involves decision-making in economic, social and environmental areas. However, such decisions may not be easy to make since it may require prioritization among one of these areas. The conflicting requirements for development among these areas necessitate political decisions to be made. Thus, there is no prescription for sustainable development and no single definition of it to cover all different implementations. As put by Sharp; “Sustainable development cannot be a fixed destination; rather it is a process, as a part of which our institutions and human resources can be moulded to meet the perceived priorities of the time”(Sharp, 1992).

Similar to the new regional development policies, policies and practices of sustainable development also differ according to in which context and to where they are implemented. Actions towards sustainable development are defined according to society's social, ecological and economic conditions.

Though its definition is still not very clear, many attempts have been made at international arena to define guiding principles of sustainable development. As stated before, such international efforts helped much to integrate environmental issues to development practices and to the emergence of sustainable development. For example, the term "sustainable development" became popular with Brundtland Commission Report in 1987. Yet, it gained much more attention in the "United Nations Conference on Environment and Development- the Earth Summit" held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

The Earth Summit, as the largest conference at international level, focused on identifying the principles of sustainable development. In defining these principles, human beings were put at the center of sustainable development efforts. For this reason, the declaration of the Summit not only defined principles about environmental issues but also defined social and economic principles like empowerment of disadvantaged groups, participatory processes and eradication of poverty. Actions related to these issues were given prominent role as much as environmental protection. For example, considering eradication of poverty, in the 5th principle of the Rio Declaration, it was stated that;

All States and all people shall cooperate in the essential task of eradicating poverty as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development, in order to decrease the disparities in standards of living and better meet the need of the majority of the people of the world (UN, 1992).

Although principles about sustainable development was defined in this conference, it is important to note that the Rio Declaration was an action plan rather than a binding legal agreement that governments were obligated to follow. The principles given in the declaration are just a set of recommendations.

In 2002, ten years after the Earth Summit, the World Summit on Sustainable Development was held in Johannesburg, South Africa. The Summit was held to offer solutions to the problems that aroused in the implementation of the sustainable development principles. This summit too, has drawn much attention by not only the representatives of governments but also many NGOs and business groups participated it. In this summit, special attention was given to alleviation of poverty in the context of sustainable development.

This attention was a result of a growing interest in economic and social problems in the field of development. During 1990's, other concerns, apart from environmental ones were integrated to development policies like meeting basic needs for all, poverty alleviation as can be understood from the principles given in the Rio Declaration. It can be said that, increasing poverty of world's population as well as increasing marginality of the poor affected development policies during 1990's.

People-centered sustainable human development approach mainly tries to enlarge the capacities of people to meet their own needs (UNDP, 1990, 1997). The main characteristics of sustainable human development can be defined as follows.

Sustainable Human Development is a new development paradigm which not only generates economic growth, but distributes it equitably; that regenerates the environment rather than destroying it; and that gives priority to empowering people rather than marginalizing them (Speth, 1994; cited in Nicholls, 1999).

As can be seen, sustainable human development gives priority to developing the capacities of human capital, to empowerment of marginal/disadvantaged groups like women, uneducated, poor and to equal distribution of benefits of development processes.

Another definition of sustainable human development made by UNDP also underlines this people-centric characteristic. According to this definition sustainable human development is a *development of people* (developing people's capacities) *by people* (development in a participatory way) *for people* (well-being of all as well as securing next generations' opportunities).

Following this definition, UNDP proposes two main strategies for sustainable human development. These are,

1. Empowerment of people,
2. Creating an enabling environment in which people can achieve their goals and aspirations.

In this respect, four areas of action are prioritized for achieving sustainable human development. These include elimination of poverty, creating employment opportunities and sustainable livelihoods for all, advancement of women and other disadvantaged groups and lastly protection and regeneration of environment.

2.4.3. Participatory Processes in Sustainable -Human – Development

As it is understood from the general principles of sustainable -human- development, participation of people in decision-making processes in development practices is utmost

important. As argued by Holmberg and Sandbrook; “ development to be sustainable requires the active involvement of people, the beneficiaries themselves, in the design and implementation of activities to improve their welfare” (Holmberg and Sandbrook, 1992).

Participation in sustainable development process usually takes place at project level. To enable participation more easily, participatory projects offered in the context of sustainable development are generally small scale ones. Realizing participation in small-scale projects is supposed to be easier since people can be more interested in issues that directly affect them. However, it is important to note that those small-scale participations do not necessarily mean there is a broader democratic environment. They can take place in non-democratic environments/countries as long as they do not question power relations at larger scales.

Although participation is an indispensable part of sustainable development, it is emphasized in most of the related writings that participatory processes cannot follow the same path everywhere. Different social, economic and political conditions of the countries should be taken into account when designing participatory policies, especially the ones aiming at empowerment of the disadvantaged people. Policies designed to empower these groups regardless of such conditions can have adverse effects. As Sharp points out;

... while sustainable development requires a participatory political process, the imposition of unfamiliar democratic forms without the necessary checks and balances in place is liable to prove socially divisive and counter-productive (Sharp, 1992).

Putting emphasis on participation, sustainable development requires not only the existence of institutions but also networks among them. As in new regional development policies examined previously, sustainable development is also related to institutionalization with

similar concerns. For realization of sustainable development principles like empowerment and participation; institutional development is utmost important.

As stated before, empowerment is one the strategies of sustainable human development. In this respect, developing people's capacities to supply empowerment, and participation in turn is very essential.

With these concerns many studies focused on capacity development and the ways to realize it, especially by international organizations like UNDP and WB, as the institutions emphasizing the sustainable development.

Shortly, the *capacity development* may be defined as follows. "Capacity development is the process by which individuals, groups, organizations and institutions and countries develop their abilities, individually or collectively, to perform functions, solve problems and achieve objectives" (UNDP).

This definition of capacity development is very similar to ways offered to build social capital. They both emphasize the importance of participation, development of civil society, and networks of institutions to achieve development.

Although what importance of capacity development is clearly defined, as in the case of building social capital, the ways and the mechanisms to realize it remains unclear. As given in its definition, it is a process in which people 'learn by doing'. Thus realizing capacity development is a hard task that does not follow a pre-determined way. The ways to develop the capacities of people changes according to the social, economic and political conditions of the society in which it takes place.

2.4.4. Evaluation of Development Proposals of Sustainable Development Approach

Apart from principles, problems of sustainable development approach should also be discussed in order to understand both negative and positive effects of it on Turkish regional development. The most important difficulty that the sustainable –human- development approach faces is it is still an ambiguous concept. Definition of sustainable development that everybody agrees upon has not been made yet. Because of this ambiguity of definition, its principles are also ambiguous depending on abstract principles too much.

Although such ambiguity may not create many problems in theory, it can do so in practice when realizing principles of sustainable development. For example, sustainable development is an approach that can offer protection of private property rights and land reform for landless farmers at the same time. In theory, these two proposals may not cause huge problems. Yet in practice, making land reform without intervening into private property rights is almost impossible. It can be said that, ambiguities in theory of sustainable development may create many problems when realizing its principles. It is for this contradiction between theories and practices that sustainable development offer usually small-scale projects for implementation, which have easier problems to be solved as compared to the big-scale ones. These small-scale projects may act as experiments whose successes and failures can teach a lot for the other projects. Yet it is clear that, depending on realization of small-scale projects mainly for its ambiguities in theory, sustainable –human- development approach has a long way to go for realizing its principles like equity and basic needs for all.

Despite such weaknesses, sustainable development approach brought new issues to the field of development like environmental and social ones, which should be taken into account in

any development attempt. It is worth mentioning to remember that realizing principles of sustainable development differs from place to place. Although some general principles such as participatory processes, empowerment are offered, the need for context-specific approach should be kept in mind when designing policies to realize these principles. Policies of sustainable development must take into account specific conditions of places that they are designed for. Such a context sensitive approach could help much to achieve sustainable development.

Being context-specific is characteristic of both new regional development policies and sustainable development approach. Also both of these approaches put too much emphasis on capacity development and participation. At policy level, it may be easier to act in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. Yet, in practice this may not be so easy. Policies designed regardless of local conditions would surely face difficulties in implementation. Policies designed without taking into consideration of socio-economic conditions of places they would be implemented. This characteristic should be kept in mind when designing sustainable development policies in Turkey, which has no participatory planning tradition although it is emphasized by new development approaches.

2.5. A Brief Evaluation of Changing Regional Policies

Up to now, changing policies and priorities in the field of regional development have been given. It is clear that regional policies have changed much as a result of restructuring of capitalism and nation-states. After examining all these policies and approaches, a few things can be said for succeeding chapters in which effects of the policy changes on GAP will be discussed.

It should be noted that new regional development policies with their ambiguities do not offer much about promoting development in underdeveloped regions, like GAP. Supportive state policies are rejected by these policies yet, there is nothing defined that can replace such policies. Shortly, the proposals of these policies do not offer much about underdeveloped regions.

This does not mean that, these new policies are totally useless. They made important contributions to the field of development with their emphasis on social and environmental aspects of development. Empowerment of disadvantaged groups, gender-balanced development, designing bottom-up policies in a participatory way should be taken into account in any development attempt. Previous regional development policies dealt with the economic aspects of development and mostly ignored social, cultural and environmental issues. New policies can overcome this deficiency of previous ones with their emphasis on such issues.

On the other hand, supportive state policies based on allocation of resources are still needed for underdeveloped regions since they cannot achieve development by themselves as argued in new regionalist policies. What is needed then, is a policy framework in which these allocative policies can be combined with the new issues of development brought by new policies. This need for an integrated policy framework will be tested in the GAP case in the succeeding chapters.

CHAPTER 3

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN TURKEY

As stated before, although reducing regional inequalities has been an important concern for Turkey, the problem of regional inequalities still continues. In order to understand the reasons for this situation, regional development policies and practices will be examined briefly in this section.

Regional development problem has been one of the major problems that the Republic tackled with since the early years of the republic. Especially in the planned period that is from 1963 to now on regional development was one of the major issues in national development plans. Before the planned period, state's approach to regional development can be analyzed in two periods; 1923 to 1950's, which were the early years of the republic and 1950's to 1960.

The underdevelopment of country in the early years of the republic necessitated a rapid industrialization process. Since capital accumulation in the country was low and national investors were unable to make necessary amount of investments to realize a rapid industrialization process, state made direct investments in industrial sector. To guide the development of national industry, two industrial plans were prepared and implemented in this period.

In these plans, locations of industries were dispersed to whole country to distribute development process and its benefits more evenly. These industries were supported with transportation networks especially the railroad system as stated in industrial plans (İnan, 1973). As given in industrial plans, most of the public sector investments were made outside İstanbul, in especially western and central Anatolian regions. This was done considering the social benefits of an even regional development. As put by Okyar, “This approach means nothing else than taking into consideration partly the social factors in economic development and partly the unseen economic advantages and the concept of regional expansion” (Okyar, 1966).

However in the second period that is from 1950’s to 1960 private sector investments began to concentrate in Marmara Region, especially in İstanbul. Eastern regions of the country could not get such amount of investment to develop as fast as the western regions of the country (DPT, 2000). As a result development gap among regions became wider.

3.1. Regional Policies in National Development Plans

As given before, in previous regional development approaches preparation of national development plans was a very important thing both to manage overall economic development of country and to eliminate regional disparities. In this respect, such guiding plans were much more important for developing countries.

With similar concerns, national development plans have been prepared in Turkey to guide the economic development of the country. Starting from 1963 State Planning Organization has prepared five-year national development plans. These plans have been very comprehensive, in sense that they not only cover economic aspects of development but also

social ones like education, health etc. Regional development has been one of the headings in national development plans. In the following, these policies in the plans will be given to understand the national policies about regional development in the planned period.

3.1.1. 1st Five-Year Development Plan (1963-1967)

In the planned period, starting from the 1st plan, the role of planning for regional development was stressed almost in every national plan. The 1st plan considered regional planning as an inseperatable part of the national plan. Regional planning was seen as a necessity for the following reasons:

1. To distribute income more evenly
2. To increase productivity by allocating resources priory to regions that had high development potentials
3. To eliminate regional disparities and to fasten development processes in backward regions.

Thus, regional planning was considered a necessity for both relatively developed and underdeveloped regions; for increasing productivity in developed ones and to fasten development processes in the underdeveloped ones.

In this first plan, regional plans were considered as an inseperatable part of the national plans. Regional planning was thought as mechanisms for spatilization of the national plans.

As put in the plan;

The national plan was based essentially on sector studies and surveys of various branches of activity. These studies, however, had to be implemented by careful

regional analysis. Regional planning serves to ensure development based on inter-regional balance, the distribution of public services on lines designed to promote a more equitable income distribution, rational development of regions according to their potential resources and to find solutions to excessive urbanization and population problems (DPT, 1963).

3.1.2. 2nd Five-Year Development Plan (1968-1972)

The emphasis on regional planning made by the 1st plan was repeated in the 2nd plan. However, priority was given to backward regions in regional planning studies by the 2nd plan whereas 1st plan considered regional planning as a necessity for the whole country. Regional plans were considered as a tool to understand development potentials and to lessen regional disparities.

In a similar way, regional development policies were mostly about backward regions. It was stated that, these regions should be given priority in public investments to lessen regional disparities. As well as providing infrastructure, the amount of public investments in industrial sector in these regions should be increased to promote this sector. Urban centers in these regions with higher development potentials would get more public investment in order to create growth centers. Apart from public sector investments, private sector would be encouraged for the development of industrial sector. To do this, tax exemptions, credits would be given to private sector as well as guiding services and provision of land with infrastructure.

Regional planning studies were said to be carried out mostly by State Planning Organization. The potentials of backward regions would be determined by public-private partnerships and State Planning Organization would coordinate these partnerships as well as developing regional planning methods. After determining potentials and methods for regional planning,

State Planning Organization would prepare regional plans with related institutions. The budgets of these institutions would be organized according to the proposals of the plans.

In the 2nd plan, although statements were made about the importance of regional planning in regional development not much was said about the implementation of these plans, which is still one of the major problems of regional planning in Turkey.

In 1968, during the period of 2nd FYDP the practice of Priority Regions in Development (PRD) was started. 22 provinces from Eastern and Southern Eastern regions of the country were defined as PRD. In 1972, “Department of Priority Regions in Development” was established under the State Planning Organization. The main aim of the practice was defined as promoting development in underdeveloped regions to sustain a balanced development in the country. In this regard, provinces defined as PRDs were supposed to enjoy some privileges like special incentives given by public sector to accelerate development processes in these areas. Having this main aim, the duties of the Department was defined as follows.

1. To carry out to determine the underdeveloped regions of the country according to the studies about socio-economic development levels of provinces.
2. To make organizational proposals between central administrative bodies and their field units that would work in these regions.
3. To work for eliminating the development differences of underdeveloped regions with other ones in economic, social and cultural aspects.
4. To carry out other necessary work that would be given. (DPT, 1972)

The Department has been carrying out these duties since then. For determination of PRDs, the Department carried out studies to find out socio-economic development levels of the

provinces in 1973, 1979, 1981, 1985, 1996 and 2003. Policies and tools have been designed to eliminate development differences among regions.

Yet, the authority of the Department or State Planning Organization is limited to these. It has been the Council of Ministers that decides for PRDs. This situation has made the practice vulnerable to political pressures as can be understood from the rapid increase in the number of provinces defined as PRD. In 1968, out of 67 provinces 22 were defined as PRD. Today this number rose to 50 out of 81 provinces.

In 1969, province of Elazığ was added to Priority Regions in Development. Later in 1972, provinces of Afyon, Burdur, Çankırı, Çorum, Giresun, Kastamonu, Niğde, Ordu, Sinop and Yozgat were defined as Priority Regions in Development and the total number rose to 33 from 22 in four years. This situation shows that the practice of PRD has been open to political pressures from the beginning since the Council of Ministers, that is elected members of the parliament, decides for the determination of them.

3.1.3. 3rd Five-Year Development Plan (1973-1977)

With the 3rd plan, the emphasis on regional planning made by the previous plans was given away. Rather than regional planning to eradicate regional disparities economic criterion like efficiency was emphasized. It was stated that, policies trying to lessen regional disparities in the short-run might cause inefficient distribution of resources, which in turn would slow down capital accumulation and economic development in the long run. For this reason, priority should be given to economic criteria in deciding where to make investments. Shortly, in order to fasten national economic development, the problems of relatively underdeveloped regions were ignored.

In the plan, regional development policies were associated with Priority Regions in Development. It was stated that it was not possible to define regions as completely developed or underdeveloped since some underdeveloped regions had developed areas whereas some developed regions had underdeveloped ones. Thus development or underdevelopment was considered in provincial scale and the emphasis on regional development and planning was abandoned.

Firstly in the 3rd plan, policies about the Priority Regions in Development were given in the National Plans. In the 3rd plan, as it was previously offered in the 1st plan, determination of socio-economic development levels of provinces was proposed in order to find out the existing development potentials of regions. Policies would be developed sensitive to existing development potentials like natural and human resources, and infrastructure.

Another statement about Priority Regions in Development in 3rd Five Year Development Plan is about the “Provincial Plans”. These plans were proposed to overcome the problems of small-scale municipalities like providing infrastructure and other municipal services. The preparation of these plans would include all of the municipalities and villages within a province, provincial administration and governor. State Planning Organization would give technical support during the preparation and implementation of the plan. These “provincial plans” would provide a basis for development policies that would be implemented in Priority Regions in Development.

The number of Priority Regions in Development continued to increase in the period of third plan. In 1973, provinces of Bilecik, Bolu, Çanakkale, Denizli, Kırşehir, Tokat and Uşak were added to Priority Regions in Development and total number rose to 40. With these provinces, spatial distribution of Priority Regions in Development was no longer limited to relatively

less developed Eastern and Southern Eastern Regions of the country. Again, this situation clearly shows political effects on practice. Although designed originally as tool to promote development of underdeveloped eastern and southern eastern regions at policy level, in practice in order to enjoy the privileges given to PRDs many provinces have been defined as PRD.

3.1.4. 4th Five-Year Development Plan (1979-1983)

Like the 1st and 2nd plan, the 4th plan also put emphasis on regional planning. It was stated that, uneven development among regions, the different potentials and problems of regions made regional planning a necessity. In this context, especially for the development of Eastern and Southern Eastern Regions preparation of regional development projects was offered. In these projects, especially the connections between regional centers would be strengthened.

The role of administrative structure for regional planning was underlined in the 4th plan. Developing institutions that could prepare and implement regional plans were considered as essential and non-existence of such arrangements was seen as an important problem for regional planning.

In addition to regional plans, policies about private sector were designed in this plan. It was stated that public sector would act in cooperation with private sector. In order to reduce regional disparities local investors would be promoted, state incentives would be organized in a way to promote investments in underdeveloped regions.

In the Fourth Five Year Development Plan, considering the Priority Regions in Development it was stated that relatively less public investments was made to Priority Regions in Development during the last three five year plans and inadequate subsidies given to these areas also widened the existing gap. In order to balance the development gap among regions regional plans should be made. Especially, the development of Eastern and Southern Eastern Anatolia should be considered in framework of comprehensive regional plans that should propose development projects for given regions. These projects or plans should mobilize the regional potentials, like natural or human resources, for development, subsidies should be arranged for this purpose, that is, and they should be differentiated according to regions' or provinces' needs and potentials.

Differentiation between Priority Regions in Development was made in the period of 4th plan. In 1981, PRDs were defined as 1st Degree and 2nd Degree. However, the number of PRDs was also decreased sharply. In 1981 total number of provinces defined as PRD fell to 27. Ten of these 27 provinces, mostly from the eastern region of the country were defined as 1st degree and 17 provinces were defined as 2nd degree.

3.1.5. 5th Five-Year Development Plan (1985-1989)

In the Fifth Five Year Development Plan special emphasis was given to the regional planning and development of industrial sector. In order to fasten development and more efficient use of regional resources, preparation and implementation of regional plans were offered for the whole country. As put in the plan, "Regional plans would be drawn up in order to accelerate the development and ensure efficacious use of resources in economically developing regions that have certain sectoral potentials"(DPT, 1985).

State Planning Organization defined 16 regions according to results of the study, “Gradation of Settlement Centers in Turkey”. These regions were defined on the basis of “functional” relations, not administrative boundaries as it was given in the study. It was stated that, regional planning studies would be carried out according to the defined regions.

To eliminate regional disparities, settlement centers in especially underdeveloped regions would be given priority in any kind of state support. Those centers would be supported with public services and productive public investments. In addition, assistance to private sector for investments would be given by public sector as well as supporting them with credits, tax, and fee and duty exemptions.

For the development of industry, which was an important concern of 5th plan in regional development, it was stated that the existing potentials and resources should be considered together with the foreign and domestic demands. To meet such demands, production that was orienting towards export to Middle East from the Eastern and Southern Eastern Anatolia Regions would be promoted. Also, industry and infrastructure investments should be planned simultaneously. For the development of industry, the importance of local entrepreneurs was stressed.

The main aim of the practice Priority Regions in Development in the 5th plan was defined as eliminating regional disparities. As put in the plan, “The basic target is to develop the Priority Development Areas, starting first with the Eastern and South-Eastern Anatolia Regions, and reduce and, in time, eradicate, the difference of development existing between these and other regions”(DPT, 1985).

For the achievement of this target, an important role was given to industrial sector in consistency with general regional development policies of the plan. It was stated that, industries sensitive to existing resources of provinces should be supported. In accordance with this statement, small scale and labor-intensive industries would be prioritized.

3.1.6. 6th Five-Year Development Plan (1990-1994)

The need for regional planning for reducing regional disparities was emphasized again in this plan. In this plan the emphasis was on creating and subsidizing “regional centers”. For the creation of regional centers, development of new supportive policies together with the existing ones was proposed. Priority was again given to Eastern and Southern Eastern Regions in regional development. Instead of the 16 regions defined in the previous plan it was stated that preparation of such regional plans would start from Priority Regions in Development.

In this period, Southern Eastern Anatolia Project (GAP) was transformed from a project of irrigation and energy into a multi-sectoral regional development project. Thus many statements made in the 6th plan were about GAP, which will be discussed in the following sections.

3.1.7. 7th Five-Year Development Plan (1996-2000)

In the Seventh Five Year Development Plan (1996-2000) the emphasis was given to regional planning again. It was stated that different potentials and problems of regions make regional planning, that combines sectoral economic decisions with spatial aspect, a necessity. With this purpose, regional plans should be prepared from “sustainable development” perspective

for Eastern and Southern Eastern Regions considering the resources and potentials for development of the said regions.

The regional plans should especially offer solutions to unemployment problem. To do this, rural development projects that were based on animal husbandry and irrigated agriculture should be prepared as well provision of construction sector that could create employment opportunities. These projects would in turn mobilize industry, especially the industries based on agricultural products. As a result unemployment was supposed to decrease.

3.1.8. 8th Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005)

As a result of Turkey's integration process to European Union (EU), regional development principles in the 8th plan are very similar to those of EU. In the plan, before national ones EU's regional policies were given. Looking at both of these policies, it is seen that they both emphasize social, economic and spatial integration, protection of natural resources, strengthening of local governments and establishment of a common geographical information system.

In the plan, it is stated that, although much has been done to eliminate regional disparities, the difference between development levels of the regions is still a major problem in Turkey. Considering regional development, the main aim is stated in the plan as development of natural resources to sustain maximum economic and social interest and to decrease regional disparities to a minimum degree.

The emphasis on regional planning is repeated with this plan. It is stated that regional planning studies that try to determine differences, development levels, problems and

potentials of the regions will continue. Regional planning is assumed to sustain a link between socio-economic national plans and physical plans prepared at the local level. With regional plans, decisions taken at national plans would spatially be organized, regional and local potentials would be defined better. Those regional plans are supposed to be prepared and implemented in a comprehensive and participatory way, keeping in mind that regions have different opportunities, needs and problems.

In addition to those general statements made almost in every plan, in the 8th plan institutional arrangements for regional planning are also taken into account. Under the heading of “Institutional and Legal Arrangements”, it is stated that to prepare, to implement, to coordinate and to monitor progress in regional plans, State Planning Organization would make arrangements and organize field units in necessary centers.

Another important policy given in the 8th plan is the introduction of “provincial development plans”. Provincial plans were offered in the 3rd plan to overcome the problems of small-scale municipalities. Yet, in the 8th plan these plans are offered to minimize inequalities in income distribution, to fasten regional development and to rationalize distribution of resources. Provincial plans would be consistent with regional plans and be prepared by Planning and Coordination Unit under Provincial Governance in a participatory way. As in the case of regional plans, implementation of provincial plans is also problematic. Nothing is said for the implementation of these plans, which involves many institutions both public and private, organized at regional, provincial and sub-provincial scales.

3.2. Regional Planning Practices in Turkey

Regional development plans were prepared in Turkey, especially during 1960's. Here some of them will be given briefly to show regional development practices and problems of these practices.

Eastern Marmara Project was the first regional plan prepared in Turkey. The project area was covering İstanbul, Kocaeli, Sakarya, Bursa, Balıkesir, Tekirdağ, Edirne, Kırklareli and Çanakkale provinces. Like it is today, İstanbul was growing at a higher rate than the rest of the country during 1960's. In consistency with unbalanced growth approach mentioned in previous section, this growth was considered as inevitable and desirable outcome of developing process. In order to manage this growth, regional plan for İstanbul and its periphery was prepared. In this respect, the plan was favoring development of İstanbul in a way to increase regional inequalities in the country. Development of this region was supposed to expand to other areas by "spread effects". The problems that could arise as a result of concentration of growth in İstanbul was tried to be overcome by favoring decentralization within the region. With this aim, development of Asian side of İstanbul and development of industry in Adapazarı-İzmit corridor were offered.

In order to carry out necessary studies for the plan, a regional planning unit in İstanbul was established. The preparation of the plan was completed in 1964. However, since legal arrangements to realize the plan was not made its proposals did not have much effect in practice. Although development of Adapazarı-İzmit corridor happened, the spread effects that were supposed to expand development process to other regions have not happened. Instead, concentration of growth in İstanbul and its hinterland has continued until today.

Zonguldak Project was prepared to guide development process in Zonguldak, which was the main production center of coal, iron and steel in Turkey. The main aim of the plan was to fasten development process of Zonguldak by providing infrastructure, decreasing income differences, promoting urbanization and supporting development of non-agricultural economic sectors. Preparation of the plan was finished in 1963. Yet the plan was not implemented.

Çukurova Region Project was covering provinces of Adana, İçel and Hatay. A regional plan was prepared for the region that had high development potentials. The aim of the plan was to determine suitable investment sectors for the region and to realize a more even distribution of income within the region. Although detailed land use plans and detailed studies about resources of the region were made in preparation of the plan, it was not implemented.

Keban Project consisted of four provinces, namely Elazığ, Malatya, Bingöl and Tunceli. The electric energy supplied by the construction of Keban Dam was seen as an opportunity to prepare a regional plan for Keban region. Apart from that, resettlement projects for the villages affected by the construction of Keban Dam were prepared within this project. The main aim was to decrease development differences of the region with the rest of the country. Yet, the plan was not implemented except from the resettlement plans.

Antalya Project was covering Antalya, Burdur and Isparta provinces. The aim of the plan was to find out suitable investment areas of the region and to serve as a training practice about regional planning techniques for related public personnel. Preparation of the project finished in 1965 but it was not implemented.

As can be seen, the regional plans in this period were prepared for the regions that had certain potentials for development like Çukurova region, Antalya and Zonguldak. Yet, regional plans for the underdeveloped eastern and southern eastern regions had not been prepared although it was stated in most of the national development plans.

Regional planning for these regions was started with Southern Eastern Anatolia Project (GAP). In 1989, GAP was transformed to a comprehensive regional development project from a project of irrigation and hydraulic energy, which will be examined in detail in following chapter.

Apart from GAP, two other regional plans for relatively underdeveloped regions were prepared in 2000, namely Regional Development Plan for the Eastern Black Sea Region (DOKAP) and Eastern Anatolia Project (DAP). Like GAP, these two are comprehensive regional development plans aiming at reducing development gap of these regions with the rest of the country. However, these two plans have not been implemented yet.

3.3. Evaluation of Regional Policies and Planning Practices in Turkey

Regional development policies designed at national scale have not changed much in time as can be seen in the statements in FYDPs. With little changes, almost in every plan the main aim has been reducing regional disparities. The policies designed for this purpose have not changed either. Almost in all of the plans the importance of regional planning and encouragement of private sector to invest in underdeveloped regions with state incentives were emphasized and it was assumed that these would fasten development processes.

Except the third one, the necessity of regional planning was stressed in every plan. In most of the plans, eastern and southern eastern regions have been prioritized for development and regional planning studies was supposed to be started from these regions.

Considering regional planning, it is seen that state was given a dominant role in both preparation and implementation of regional plans. In the first plan, it was stated that SPO would carry out studies about preparation of the plans and establishment of necessary organizations to implement them with related public institutions. Similar policies can be seen also in the eighth plan. SPO was given duty of not only preparing regional plans in a participatory way but also of making necessary institutional arrangements to implement them, by even establishing field units where necessary. These statements can be seen in most of the plans, indicating that the role of state in regional development planning has not changed much in time at least at policy level.

Apart from regional planning, state incentives of many kinds have been designed and offered as tools for promoting development in most of the plans. Yet, the role state determines for itself in promoting economic development has not been limited to them. Direct state investments in industrial sector were proposed in some of the plans. For example, in the second plan it was stated that direct state investments in industrial sector in backward regions should be increased. Likewise, in statements of the seventh plan it was given that if required, direct state investments in underdeveloped regions could be done in regional centers. By taking into account social benefits as well as economic ones, such policy was designed, although it seems in contradiction with general economic policy of state towards abandoning direct investments in productive sectors. Considering state investments to fasten development process in underdeveloped regions, it is seen that policies developed for this reason have not changed much despite the changing economic policies at national scale.

Recent debates about regionalism and regional development given in previous chapter did not seem to find place at Turkey's national policies until 8th plan. In the 8th plan, strengthening of local governments, that is giving more active role to them in regional development was emphasized similar to new regionalist arguments. Yet, these statements did not reflect a major change in national regional development policies.

Looking at the policies given in FYDP, it is seen that, policies about PRDs have been very similar to ones about regional development. They both emphasize the importance of regional planning, supporting industrial sector, and starting development in regional centers. This shows that, although in practice PRD has been a tool of state incentives, it is supposed to be a more comprehensive policy to promote regional development both economically and socially.

As stated before, the PRD practice has been a tool of state incentives to encourage investments in underdeveloped regions. However, it is hard to say that these incentives are designed well enough to achieve this aim. For example, in some cases there is almost no difference in investing in a province taking part in PRD or investing in an organized industrial estate. It is rational for investors to choose industrial districts that have adequate infrastructure as location of their investment. If the aim of subsidies and provisions given to PRDs is attracting investors to underdeveloped regions and by this way increasing the development level of such regions, these subsidies and provisions should be revised in a way favoring PRDs (TOBB, 1989).

Apart from economic dimension, until now the practice of Priority Regions in Development has not been concerned with social aspects of development like education, health etc. Although these sectors were considered in the studies carried out by State Planning

Organization for the determination of the Priority Regions in Development, in practice it seems that little has been done in these sectors.

Reducing regional inequalities has been one of the major national concerns, yet in practice not much was done until the Southern Eastern Anatolia Project. Regional plans prepared in the planned period during 1960's were mainly for the regions that had a certain degree of potential for development and these plans were not implemented.

As a result, regional inequalities in Turkey have not been reduced in time. Here it should be noted that, continuing regional inequalities is not a total failure of the policies but as a result of not realizing them. It is hard to say that adequate public resources have been given to underdeveloped regions or they have get a fair share from public investments. Between 1990-1997, 51 provinces defined as PRD only got %12.1 of total public investments (At 1998 prices) (www.dpt.gov.tr). Distribution of public expenditures also supports this argument. Distribution of public expenditures by regions in the period between 1983-1997 is as follows.

Table 3.1. Distribution of Public Expenditures by Regions (1983-1997) (At 1997 prices)

Regions	Share of Public Expenditure (%)
Mediterranean	11.8
Eastern Anatolia	6.9
Aegean	20.2
Southern Eastern	10.1
Central Anatolia	19.5
Black Sea	9.3
Marmara	22.2
TURKEY Total	100.0

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

As can be seen in this 14-year period, the most developed region of the country, Marmara Region got the highest share from public expenditures, followed by another developed

region, the Aegean. On the contrary, Eastern Region got the lowest share. Marmara Region's share was higher than the total share of Eastern and Southern Eastern Regions, the less developed regions of the country.

It can be argued that, not allocating adequate amount of resources to underdeveloped regions is one of the major factors behind the continuing regional inequalities. The reasons behind this situation are mostly related to fiscal capacities of state. As Pickvance (1981) points out, the limited fiscal resources of state and its strong relations with capitalist classes forces state to cut public/social expenditures, like regional policies, to aid development of industry. The public expenditure cut from regional policies and projects can be transferred to development of industry. In such a situation, like observed in Turkey, although industrial development level of the whole nation would increase, the regional inequalities would surely continue to exist.

In such a situation, regional inequalities in Turkey still continue. Socio-economic development index of provinces clearly show that, not much has changed much in time with respect to development level of regions. 22 provinces determined as PRD firstly in 1968 are still at the lower parts of the socio-economic development index of provinces according to the study carried out in 2003. Similarly, provinces at the top of the index have not changed much either. Table given below shows the developed and the less developed five provinces according to socio-economic development indexes of 1963,1970, 1996 and 2003.

Table 3.2. Developed and Less Developed Provinces According to Socio-Economic Development Indexes

Years	1963	Developed Provinces	İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana, İçel
		Less Developed Provinces	Mardin, Van, Muş, Adıyaman, Bingöl
	1970	Developed Provinces	İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana, Kocaeli
		Less Developed Provinces	Adıyaman, Ağrı, Mardin, Muş, Bingöl
	1996	Developed Provinces	İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Kocaeli, Bursa
		Less Developed Provinces	Bitlis, Ardahan, Bingöl, Ağrı, Şırnak
	2003	Developed Provinces	İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Kocaeli, Bursa
		Less Developed Provinces	Muş, Ağrı, Bitlis, Şırnak, Hakkari

Source: Elmas, G., 2001, www.dpt.gov.tr

As can be seen the less developed provinces have always been the ones in eastern and southern eastern regions whereas, the developed ones have been from the western parts of the country.

Continuing regional inequalities can also be observed in distribution of income with respect to number of households by regions.

Table 3.3. Number of Households and Distribution of Income by Regions (%)

Regions	Years					
	1973		1987		1994	
	Number of Households	Share of National Income	Number of Households	Share of National Income	Number of Households	Share of National Income
Marmara-Aegean	33.37	37.73	36.96	44.99	42.26	52.48
Mediterranean	15.18	13.15	13.44	10.66	12.47	11.06
Central Anatolia	21.88	23.47	24.27	21.52	17.91	15.42
Black Sea	14.50	15.76	10.69	8.92	12.81	10.86
Eastern-Southern Eastern	14.66	9.89	14.72	13.91	14.55	10.18
TURKEY	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası, 2002

As seen in the table, the number of households and share of income in Marmara and Aegean Regions increases, however such an increase is not observed in any other region. Share of

income has always been higher than the percentage of households in these regions. On the contrary, share of income has been smaller than percentage of households in Eastern and Southern Eastern Regions. The table clearly shows that imbalances about distribution of income with respect to number of households by regions has not got any better; maybe got worse considering the increasing share of national income that Marmara and Aegean regions have.

To sum up, despite the attempts to overcome it, regional inequalities are still one of the major problems of Turkey. Policies about regional development were given in every national development plan. These policies were designed in consistency with previous regional policies; they were depending on allocation of public resources to these regions, on creating regional “growth poles” with these resources. However, these policies have not been realized adequately. The shares of underdeveloped regions from public expenditures have been less than those of the developed ones. Not realizing these allocative policies is among the most important causes of continuing regional inequalities. These policies are still very essential for promoting development in underdeveloped regions, as will be discussed in GAP case.

CHAPTER 4

EFFECTS OF NEW DEVELOPMENT POLICIES ON SOUTHERN EASTERN DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (GAP)

Up to now, the changes in the regional policies have been discussed and general information have been given about regional development policies and practices in Turkey. Besides this sustainable development approach has been explicated. In this section the effects of those new policies will be analyzed by focusing on GAP to find out to what degree previous and new policies offer a suitable policy framework for the project.

With this aim, in the first section, evaluation of GAP, project of irrigation and energy to a sustainable human development project will be given. After that, some projects designed according to sustainable human development principles will be examined to understand the common characteristics of these principles and to determine success and failures of the projects for providing a basis for the discussions in the conclusion part of the thesis. Finally the project will be evaluated in terms of the attainment of initial goals and objectives.

4.1. Evolution of the Project

GAP is the biggest regional development project that the Republic of Turkey has been undertaken. Originally, GAP was planned as an irrigation and hydraulic energy project on the rivers of Euphrates and Tigris during 1970's. The project comprised the construction of

22 dams and 19 hydraulic power plants and irrigation of 1.7 million hectares of land in the region. The total cost of these projects is estimated as 32 billion US \$ (GAP, 2003). The total capacity of the planned power plants planned to be constructed is assumed to produce energy of 27 billion kWh annually (GAP, 2003).

Such amount of energy production and irrigation would surely lead to remarkable changes in the socio- economic conditions of the region. The changing production pattern in agriculture as a result of irrigation would in turn affect production pattern in industry and other related sectors. In order to estimate the changes and to coordinate them SPO prepared GAP Master Plan in 1989.

With this plan, GAP was transformed into a multi sectoral development project from a project of irrigation and energy. As a multi sectoral project, it was revised to cover areas of agriculture, forestry, mining, rural and urban development, infrastructure, education and health as well as hydraulic energy and irrigation. The project area covers %9,7 of whole country's area in 9 relatively underdeveloped provinces; namely, Adıyaman, Batman, Diyarbakır, Gaziantep, Kilis, Mardin, Siirt, Şanlıurfa and Şırnak.

In accordance with state policy, main aim of GAP can be defined as eliminating regional disparities. As it is put by GAP Administration, the aim of the project is,

... the improvement of living standards and income levels of the people so as to eliminate regional development disparities and contributing to such national goals such as social stability and economic growth by enhancing productivity and employment opportunities in the rural sector (GAP, 2003).

Objectives of GAP can be grouped under three headings.

1. Agricultural development objectives: Considering the agricultural sector and rural areas, the main aim is to increase employment opportunities and income levels of people living in rural areas by diversifying agricultural products and increasing agricultural productivity with irrigation. By this way, rural migration is supposed to decrease. Another objective in agricultural sector is to provide inputs for agriculture-based industries, and thus fastening the industrialization process in the region.
2. Industrial development objectives: Industry is seen as the driving force of the economy in the region since it can attribute the attainment of the main aim, reducing regional disparities, by increasing employment opportunities and income levels and by creating demand for technological change and education. Thus development of industrial sector is utmost important for the project which is mostly depended on the developments in agricultural sector for input.
3. Social development/transformation objectives: It is well known that the Southern Eastern Region is characterized not only by its economically backwardness but also its existence of strong traditional social relations. Being a multi-sectoral regional development project, GAP aims to change this situation by creating modern type of institutions and organizations to replace traditional ones. Special emphasis is given to women and younger generations to democratize inter-family relations and to improve the status of women in the region by opening new channels to them to participate more in economic and social life. (GAP, 2003)

4.1.1. 1989 GAP Master Plan

1989 GAP Master Plan was prepared as a part of a national policy that aims to reduce regional disparities to sustain a balanced growth in Turkey. To put all investments to be done in GAP region in a long-term comprehensive regional plan was supposed to increase efficiency and to sustain coordination among related public agencies. GAP Master Plan was prepared for these reasons. The main aim for the preparation of the plan was defined as follows, "... prime objective is to promote the GAP implementation by providing a guideline and tool to facilitate the coordination and integration of development efforts by various public agencies" (DPT, 1989). Thus aim of the 1989 Master Plan was to guide activities of public agencies involved in the project. However, the role of private sector was hardly mentioned in that plan.

Before examining the objectives and strategies of the plan, it is important to consider the conditions of the GAP Region. Economic structure of the region was very weak at the time when master plan was prepared. In 1987 gross domestic product per capita in GAP Region was only %38 of the Turkey average (UPL, 2003). Agriculture was based on dry agriculture and animal husbandry. Low level of mechanization in agriculture led to low levels of production in turn. In addition, land ownership patterns were based on large ownership and there were many landless farmers. The manufacturing industry in the region was not developed adequately either. In 1987, the ratio of industrial production of the region in the total production of the country was only %2 (UPL, 2003). Combination of these factors led to low levels of capital accumulation in the region, less employment opportunities and low levels of income.

This weak economic structure led to another important problem of the GAP region. The region has been facing rural migration to regional urban centers and to outside the region. The underdevelopment of the region was not only in terms of economic aspects but of social ones as well. The birth rate, infant mortality rate of the GAP region has been above the country average. In 1990, the birth rate in Turkey and in GAP Region was 2,65 and 4,37 respectively (UPL, 2003). Besides, the literacy level has been below the country average, especially among women. In 1990, literacy rate among women was %71,95 whereas the ratio was % 44,77 in the region (UPL, 2003).

Having these problems, 1989 Master Plan developed four objectives in accordance with national policy. These are,

1. To strengthen economic structure of the region to raise income levels and to reduce development gap with other regions.
2. To increase employment opportunities and productivity in rural areas.
3. To increase capacities of larger regional urban centers.
4. To contribute to the realization of national policies by developing region in terms of both economically and socially (DPT, 1989).

Strategies were given in the plan on sectoral basis in accordance with these general objectives of the plan. Apart from sectoral ones, four main strategies were given to achieve the objectives of the plan as follows.

1. Development and management of water resources for irrigated agriculture, industrial development and urban use.
2. Better use of land resources by diversifying agricultural products, especially after the

realization of irrigation projects.

3. Supporting industries based on agricultural products and on other resources of the region.
5. Keeping qualified public personnel in the region, to meet the demands of inhabitants by improving urban infrastructure and social services. (DPT, 1989)

Shortly, the main development scenario of the master plan was to diversify agricultural products with irrigation projects in a way to supply input for manufacturing industry for its development.

In consistency with this general scenario, 1989 Plan especially proposed development of water and land resources. Changes that would occur as a result of these developments in employment structure, population distribution in urban and rural areas were estimated. Additional need for infrastructure, housing, education and health services based on these estimations was also given in the plan.

4.1.2. Establishment of GAP Regional Development Administration

The Development Law 3194 determines the regulations about the preparation and implementation procedures of the development plans in Turkey. According to the law the authority to prepare regional plans is SPO. However, the implementation process of these plans is vague. In addition to this, in Turkish administrative system, there are no regional administrative bodies that are responsible from the implementation of the regional plans. As Polatoğlu argues Turkish administrative system is not suitable for implementing regional plans (Polatoğlu, 1995).

As a regional development plan GAP has faced the same problems. Started as a project of irrigation and hydraulic energy, the project was implemented by relevant public agencies until 1986. In 1986 SPO was given authority to facilitate GAP activities. In the same year, a research group responsible for GAP was established under SPO.

In 1989, GAP was transformed into a multi-sectoral development plan with GAP Master Plan. With this plan, GAP became comprehensive project covering social sectors as well as economic ones. Therefore, many other public institutions were involved in GAP and need for a new administrative body to implement the plan emerged. Thus, in 1989 Southern Eastern Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration was established under the Prime Ministry. Since there is no place for regional institutions in Turkish administrative structure, Southern Eastern Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration was established for a temporarily time of 15 years by a decree-law (KHK) (GAP, 2003).

The Southern Eastern Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration has two parts: Southern Eastern Anatolia Project Supreme Committee and Presidency of Southern Eastern Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration. The Supreme Committee consists of Ministry of State that is in charge of State Planning Organization, Ministry of State that is in charge of Southern Eastern Anatolia Project, Ministry of Public Works and Housing and Prime Minister or a Minister of State appointed by the Prime Minister (GAP, 2003).

Presidency of Southern Eastern Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration (GAP Administration) is formed of a chairman, two deputy chairmen and other personnel. The Prime Minister appoints chairman and deputy chairmen. GAP Administration has central unit in Ankara and a regional directorate in Şanlıurfa.

Established to realize a multi-sectoral development plan, the duties of GAP Administration are defined as follows.

- To prepare or made it prepared, necessary research and projects for the GAP region.
- To guide, monitor and evaluate the projects undertaken in the region.
- To guide and coordinate the investments which are done by relevant agencies to realize the targets of the project.
- To carry out regional planning, in a way to realize multi-sectoral development objectives.
- To carry out necessary work in economic sector, like foreign economic relations, financial balance, credit, banking, prices and capital markets.
- To prepare or made it prepared the physical plans of all scales, that is from regional plans to the plans of block and parcel.
- To organize and coordinate activities and investments, to be done in infrastructure, housing and industry.
- To coordinate construction of all types of public buildings.
- In coordination with the Ministry of National Education and other relevant public institutions, to increase the educational level of the people in the region.
- To carry out other duties which are given by the Prime Minister (GAP, 2003)

Until 1997, the budget of GAP Administration was taken from the Public Participation Fund and the Mass Housing Fund. The amount to be taken from these funds were decided by the Council of Ministers and approved by the Prime Minister or by any minister appointed by the Prime Minister for that purpose. In 1997, this was changed and the budget of the administration was decided to be formed by the following funds; allowances made from the budget of Prime Ministry; aids, loans, grants and donations; interests, rents and other kinds

of revenues. The authority to prepare budget was taken from the Council of Ministers and it was decided that, the budget should be prepared by the GAP Administration in coordination with the Ministry of Finance, SPO and Undersecretariat of Treasury. The Prime Minister should approve the budget.

Considering the objectives of the project and the duties of the GAP Administration, it is clear that many public institutions are involved like Ministry of Public Works and Settlement, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Agriculture and Village Affairs, Directorate of State Hydraulic Works, Directorate of State Highways and many more. In Turkish Administrative System each of these public bodies organizes their regional units by themselves. Thus, there is no uniformity among the regional organization of public bodies.

This general problem of the administrative system finds its reflections in the administration and implementation of the GAP. First of all, none of the regional directorates of the involved public institutions have the control of the whole GAP area. They are not organized according to the boundaries of the GAP region; thus, these institutions have two or more regional directorates servicing in this specific region. Secondly, GAP Administration does not have authority over these regional directorates; it rather acts as an institution of coordination. Without doubt, coordination is an important in a multi-sectoral development plan since there are many institutions, both public and private, involved. However, the problem of GAP is that, there is no common authority over these parties. GAP Administration is directly attached to the Prime Ministry; it does not have control on the field units of the involved public agencies. Shortly, the involved agencies can act independently from each other (Polatoğlu, 1995).

Another important problem the GAP Administration faces is that, the administration is open to political pressures. Being a regional development project, GAP has long-term strategies and targets, which need stable and strong administrative structure. However, appointment of the administration's chairman and deputy chairmen directly by the Prime Minister makes it very vulnerable to political pressures. Because of strong relations with central government, GAP Administration is very sensitive to the political changes at the center. Under these circumstances, it is hard to say that GAP Administration is an example of a regional administration aiming to realize the long-term targets. This is because it is open to political pressures both financially and organizationally. Furthermore, GAP Administration is not a permanent regional administration. It was established with a decree-law for fifteen years. According to the law, the administration is going to be abolished in 2004. However, the economic and social targets of the project have not been completely achieved until now, so the administration's abolishment may be postponed, but again for a defined period of time.

Success of GAP is surely related to the level of participation made by local actors like local governments in the region, field units of public institutions and related NGOs. However, highly centralized structure of the GAP Administration has no legal room for participation. In order to enable participation, which is one of the most important principles of sustainable development approach adapted by GAP as will be seen; structure of GAP Administration ought to be redesigned.

4.1.3. Introduction of “Sustainable Human Development” to GAP’s Planning Approach

As stated in previous chapters, sustainable development approach took much attention during 1990's, throughout the world. Many meetings were organized, some of which are

already mentioned, to determine principles of sustainable development; and to convince and to force governments to act according to these determined principles.

Having participated in these meetings, Republic of Turkey began to change its regional development policies in a way that is suitable with sustainable development approach, as can be seen in the statements of 7th and 8th five-year development plans.

Sustainable development approach, adapted at national scale, also affected planning approach of GAP. 1989 GAP Master Plan was prepared in consistency with previous regional development approaches. It was a guiding document for public sector. Yet, new concerns were brought by new regional development policies like institutionalization, learning, and development of a civil society. Apart from these, other concerns brought by sustainable development approach like environmental protection, civil participation, empowerment of disadvantaged groups, which were gaining much importance at both international and national scales, began to draw much attention in GAP. Especially the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 affected the policies of GAP.

With this increasing interest, it was understood that realizing GAP was not only about building dams or hydraulic power plants but was also about changing socio-economic backward conditions of the region. This situation is also mentioned by the interviewees. 1989 Master Plan was an investment-based plan; a general framework for the region was given with this plan. Although investments to be realized in the sectors of energy, irrigation and agriculture were given in detail, no specific perspective was developed for social sectors. Yet, as soon as projects in the context of GAP were realized in the early 1990's, it was seen that, local people were unable to understand and to use benefits brought by the big-scale

irrigation and energy projects. It was understood that, social development level of the region was very low to make use of such benefits. As stated by one of the interviewees;

After the implementations carried out in the GAP region – and we must add that they were, to a large extent, economic investments – it was observed that people were unable to understand and make use of such large-scale investments (Interview made with Filiz Doğanay on 03.12.2003).

Changing national policies that favor sustainable development or understanding importance of social development were not the only reasons behind the changing policies in GAP. Financial considerations also played an important role for this shift in policies. According to 1989 Plan, GAP was a project depending on construction of big-scale dams and hydroelectric power plants. The negative effects of dams on environment and social structure led to unwillingness of international organizations to help the project financially since during 1990's these organizations became more concerned with sustainable development and refused to help the projects that are in contradiction with this approach. To get financial help seems to be one of the reasons for the changing policies in GAP. In fact the GAP Administration also accepts this situation. As put by the Administration;

... the international platform displaying neutral attitude towards the GAP project has begun to display their deep interest and willingness to cooperate in the different aspects of this Project not only in providing technical assistance but also financial assistance through grants and loans (GAP, 2003).

In current prices GAP has taken \$2.1 billion loans from international organizations for the construction of dams and hydroelectric power plants. Apart from that approximately \$12 million has been given to GAP by many international organizations as grants (GAP, 2003). These numbers show that with adaptation of sustainable development approach, GAP has been able to get financial aid.

For the reasons given above, GAP has adapted sustainable human development approach during mid 1990's. With such a policy change, people have been put at the center of all development efforts. Projects have been designed to realize principles of sustainable development. Like stated by one of the interviewees;

Though GAP started with the aim of cultivating land and water resources, eventually it adapted a human-centered approach. Consequently this led to an increased emphasis on the projects related to people. GAP Administration started to place special emphasis on the projects for those population groups that we consider as disadvantaged (Interview made with Aygöl Fazlıoğlu on 04.05.2003).

As given in previous chapters, ways to realize sustainable development change according to different socio-economic conditions of the localities. To determine the criteria and principles of sustainable development for GAP Region, a meeting was organized by UNDP and the GAP Administration in 1995. Sustainable human development principles defined for GAP region in the meeting were;

1. Participation: All parties affected by projects should involve in project design, implementation and monitoring-evaluation processes.
2. Equality and Fairness: Disadvantaged groups in GAP region, like women, landless peasants, children should be fully integrated to development processes.
3. Development of Human Resources

Criterion for sustainable human development was also determined. The criteria defined for GAP Region at the end of the conference were as follows.

1. Participation in project design and decision-making processes; providing equity and fairness among population groups; developing human resources especially in education and health services

2. Providing adequate shelter for all; integrated provision of drinking water, solid waste disposal and sanitation; promoting sustainable land use planning and human settlements
3. Controlling human activities towards development to avoid their negative impacts on environment
4. Considering use of land and water resources by taking into account environmental protection as well as social and economic factors.
5. Introducing of new legal arrangements to reduce negative impacts of development on natural resources.
6. Realizing necessary tools and institutional arrangements for supporting industry and small-scale investments (GAP, 1996).

As can be seen, principles and criterion of sustainable human development for GAP Region are very similar to the general principles of the approach examined in the second chapter. They both emphasize participation, environmental protection, and empowerment of disadvantaged groups. Since then these principles have been taken as a basis for projects undertaken in the context of GAP. Difficulties that the projects have been facing and successes of implemented ones are given in the following.

4.2. Examination of Projects Undertaken in the Context of Sustainable Human Development

Many projects have been designed and realized by GAP Administration with financial or technical help of international organizations. Since these projects are many in number and are usually small scale ones, some of them will be examined here with respect to the arguments of the new policies. After the examination of these projects it would be possible

to get a better understanding of sustainable development practice in GAP, to determine general characteristics of the practice and to realize the successes and problems of it.

Another point that needs to be underlined is that, the projects based on the sustainable human development approach examined here are usually social projects aiming to empower the disadvantaged, to enable participation and so on. Although GAP depends on big-scale projects like construction of dams, the projects realized in the context of sustainable human development are usually social and environmental ones. The problems created by overemphasizing these projects in this second period of GAP will be discussed in the conclusion part for designing a new policy framework for the project.

4.2.1. The Umbrella Program

Most of the projects examined are from the “Umbrella Program”; a program prepared in 1995 with UNDP and has been carried out together since then. The program, aiming to increase the socio-economic development level of the region,

... emphasize the human dimension of development through pilot projects concerned with basic social services (education, health, housing), gender equity, urban management, environmental sustainability, institutional and community capacity building (GAP&UNDP, 1997).

The Umbrella Program consists of 28 small-scale projects, grouped under five main headings.

1. Promoting social sustainability and enhancing social services
2. Promoting agricultural sustainability
3. Promoting local enterprise and industry development for economic viability

4. Promoting sustainable human settlements
5. Ensuring optimal sustainable use of natural resources.

The program, emphasizing human dimension in development, mainly proposes projects to empower disadvantaged groups. Considering the conditions of GAP region, these groups are farmers in unirrigated areas, women, unemployed children, and poor households. Some of the projects designed to empower these groups will be given in the following sections.

The total cost of the project offered by the program is nearly \$4.2 million. \$1.5 million of this total amount will be given by public resources. \$700.000 will be given by UNDP. The remaining part is supposed to be funded by a third party.

As being one of the important principles of sustainable human development, participation is very essential for the Umbrella Program. In all of the projects offered, participation, especially participation of disadvantaged groups, is given a great emphasis. As put in the program report;

In the proposed program, a major number of projects are therefore designed to enhance participatory development by the local people and local administrators with particular emphasis on the poor, the disadvantaged, local community groups and women (GAP & UNDP, 1997).

Yet, as will be discussed in the following sections, participatory processes in GAP region have been facing problems. Considering the social structure and the conditions of the disadvantaged groups, realizing participation is a hard task that may take time and is obligated to take into account the local conditions.

4.2.2. 2002 GAP Regional Development Plan

1989 Master Plan was prepared with a classical planning approach by public sector to guide and coordinate activities of related public agencies. In the plan, apart from strategies, projects to be realized were given on sectoral basis. Yet, the targets of the plan could not be achieved due to fiscal constraints and unrest situation in the region. Apart from that, taking sustainable human development as a basis for actions also necessitated revision of the 1989 Plan. As a result of these, need for a new regional plan emerged. The studies for this plan were stated with the support of UNDP in the context of the Umbrella Program.

In both of the plans, the aim is to reduce development gap of the region with other regions. In order to achieve this aim, diversifying agricultural products with irrigation, development of industries based on agriculture, transformation of social structure was targeted. Thus objectives and strategies developed are similar.

The important difference between these two plans is related to their planning approaches. The master plan of 1989 was prepared essentially for the public sector as stated before. On the other hand, in 2002 GAP Regional Development Plan was prepared with “sustainable human development” approach, putting great emphasis in participation for the preparation and implementation of the plan. Therefore in the preparation phase, meetings were organized in every GAP province to discuss the plan and by this way involvement of private institutions and NGO’s were targeted in the preparation process of the plan.

Yet, it was stated by one of the interviewees who involved in these provincial meetings that, the participation level of private sector and NGOs were very low. Representatives from public sector usually participated these meetings whereas civic participation was hardly

realized. Another point that worth considering is that, civic participation in these meetings were closely related to socio-economic development level of provinces. Civic participation rate was highest in Gaziantep, most developed province of GAP region, whereas it was lowest in Şırnak. As she stated, “The level of participation of NGOs increased in direct proportion with the development level of those nine provinces” (Interview made with Filiz Doğanay on 03.12.2003).

Problem of participatory process in the preparation of the plan was not limited to these. It was stated by the same interviewee that participants were usually unable to give solutions to the problems that they determined. As the interviewee puts it;

Similar to the contributions from NGOs, information given by those from public institutions was too, in form of problems daily encountered. When we asked them to propose solutions, or to make suggestions, the responses were not capable of being used as inputs to the plan (Interview made with Filiz Doğanay on 03.12.2003).

The problems faced in the participatory processes during the preparation of the plan are closely related to developing capacities of people. As stated before, capacity development is among the most important requirements of sustainable development since it can enable people to express their needs, their problems and to offer solutions to them, shortly it enables people to better participate in decision-making processes. It is hard to say that the people in region have such capacities adequately to participate in these processes. The problems faced during the preparation of the plan clearly support this argument and underline the role of capacity development for realizing participatory processes and sustainable development. Without efforts made for capacity development, it is difficult to realize participatory processes in the region. The experience of the 2002 Plan shows the importance of capacity development for participatory processes in GAP region.

In accordance with new planning approach, the role of the public sector has also faced some changes. Considering investments in 1989 Master Plan, it is seen that the amount of public sector investments were estimated to be higher than that of private sector. According to it, public sector was supposed to realize %70 of total investments. Especially in energy sector no private investments were required. However, in the 2002 Plan, the role of private sector for realization of the plan gained much importance. The ratio of investments to be realized by public sector fell to %51, 3. In addition, in the second plan even for the realization of some projects that should be carried out by public sector like irrigation and energy, partnerships with private sector was proposed.

To sum up, although the target of both plans is similar, their planning approach is quite different from each other. First master plan was prepared to guide public sector, thus it was giving a great role to this sector for the realization of the plan. On the other hand, second plan with its emphasis on participation of private sector changed the classical role of public sector given in the first plan, although the latter still plays a major role for realization of the project.

It is important to remember the problems faced in the participatory process during the preparation of the plan. Having no tradition for participatory planning, civic participation in meetings was low. In addition people were usually unable to determine solutions for their own problems. It can be argued that realizing participatory planning in the region is not an easy task, and it may take very long time. Nevertheless, attempts should not be given up. Problems faced in the preparation of regional development plan should be treated as useful clues, reasons of which should be examined clearly for future attempts in the region.

4.2.3. Establishment of an Economic Development Agency- GAP GİDEM's

Participation of the private sector to development processes is an important concern for both new regionalism and sustainable development approach as given in the second chapter. To enable this participation, to consult private sector in development efforts and to make it more powerful, regional development agencies became important institutional mechanisms. Affected from such approaches, establishment of a development agency in GAP region was offered in the Umbrella Program with similar concerns.

In 1990, the studies about GAP Development Agency were started. In the report of the study not only GAP Development Agency is considered but also, the future of development agencies in Turkey is discussed briefly.

GAP Development Agency is supposed to service whole GAP Region supporting development of industrial and service sectors and to enable private participation to development processes in the related sectors. Among the duties of the agency there would be consultancy and training services, monitoring of firms, promoting the region's image to attract investors, providing information to investors about credit opportunities, providing industrial lands and buildings to firms. As can be seen, like most of the regional development agencies, GAP Development Agency is supposed to support development of especially industrial sector with services of various kinds.

Having such duties, whether the agency would be a public or private type of institution comes into question. It is stated that, being a public institution has certain advantages for the agency like access to public funds. Apart from that since there is a regional administration in the region it would be easier to establish the agency under the GAP Administration.

Although being a private institution has certain advantages too like acting more independently, considering the advantages of being a public institution, GAP Development agency is proposed to be a public body established under GAP Administration.

The model developed for GAP Development Agency has strong links with public authorities as can be seen. This may seem in conflict with the establishment purpose of the agency, that is enabling private sector participation. To eliminate this conflict, GAP Development Agency should be open to participatory processes; patterns and mechanisms for participation should be clearly defined in order not to be a field unit of central government but to be a local type of institution.

The agency model developed for GAP region considers development agencies, as a part of general regional institutional framework. Taking into account such type of an agency is a new type of institution for Turkey; the relations with public sector are much stronger than the ones in most of the foreign countries. Shortly, this new institution, being a part of general framework is not supposed to solve all the development problems in a region. Given its duties, it would rather act in related sectors. This development agency approach seems clearly realistic and not limiting the potential of the agency. Instead it can be argued that it is truly defining the potentials of it.

According to these proposals, economic development agencies-GAP GİDEMs (Entrepreneur Support and Guidance Centers) to support development of private sector has been established under the GAP Administration. In 1997 first GİDEMs were established in five provinces; Adıyaman, Diyarbakır, Gaziantep, Mardin and Şanlıurfa. Later Gaziantep GİDEM was closed; today other four GİDEMs are still working.

Being established to promote especially the development of industrial sector; GAP GİDEMs are usually giving research, training and consultancy services. Activities of the GİDEMs are mainly executed by the GAP Administration in coordination with UNDP. Turkish Development Bank, Turkish Union of Chambers (TOBB) and Small and Medium Industry Development Organization (KOSGEB) are also in the executive committee of GAP-GİDEMs.

Servicing almost 3000 entrepreneurs in the first five years of their establishment, success of GİDEMs also took attention of European Commission. For this reason in 2001 EU decided to help the GİDEM project financially.

As stated before, development agencies to promote development of private sector is one of the most important institutional features of new regional development policies. To promote this development, participation of related actors is considered as necessary in such policies. Established with similar concerns, participation is also very essential for GAP-GİDEMs. As put in the report on GAP-GİDEMs prepared by UNDP, “Sustainability of GAP-GİDEM offices and the success of the project depend heavily on the support of local stakeholders”(EU Interim Narrative Report on GAP-GİDEM, 2002).

It can be said that GAP-GİDEMs have been working towards realization of participatory processes. For example, to formulate targets of GAP-GİDEMs with participation of related parties, meetings were organized in every province that has GİDEM with the involvement of representatives of public institutions, of Chambers of Commerce and Industry, of Chambers of Craftsmen and Tradesmen and of Halkbank.

Up to 2002 GAP-GİDEMs gave service to 2950 SMEs (GAP, 2003). Economic development agency was proposed to promote development of industrial sector, which is very weak in GAP Region. It was designed in a rather top-down manner, as a public type of institution considering the advantages of using public resources. Although this may seem in contradiction with the new development policies that give emphasis on designing policies in a bottom-up way, it can be argued that weak industrial sector in the region sector can hardly establish an economic development agency and run its duties with its own resources. Support of public sector is essential. For this reason it can be said that, GAP-GİDEMs have been taking into account the conditions of the region and trying to enable participation to a degree. It is a public type of institution using resources of public sector to promote development of weak industrial sector in the region.

4.2.4. Promotion of Employment and Business Potential in the Urban Informal Sector

With realization of the projects designed in the context of GAP, rapid migration from rural areas to urban centers will occur. However, employment opportunities in these urban centers are not adequate to absorb all of the migrants. In this situation, most of these migrants having no special skills can only find employment in informal sector.

For this reason, informal sector has an important role in urban economies of the region. Because of this role, a project is offered in the Umbrella Program to improve employment capacity and productivity in informal sector and to integrate it to formal economy.

At the first stage, city of Diyarbakır was chosen as pilot area for implementation. Yet, the project is supposed to expand to other cities. Developed by the GAP Administration together with UNDP, the project is executed by TESK (Confederation of Artisans and Craftsmen).

KOSGEB, Halkbank and other NGOs are also involved in the project. The Project was started in 2000. A Field Study was carried out in Diyarbakır and a report was prepared according to the results of the survey. At the present state, designing sub-projects with respect to the report continues.

4.2.5. Multi-Purpose Community Centers – ÇATOMs

Taking principles of sustainable human development as a basis for its actions, GAP Administration have been implementing projects to empower disadvantaged groups and to make them participate in the development process. In this respect, empowerment of women is very important to achieve sustainable development. As put in the 20th principle of the Rio Declaration, “Women have vital role in environmental management and development. Their full participation is therefore essential to achieve sustainable development” (UN, 1992).

Women, especially poor women, are one of these disadvantaged groups in GAP region. Their education level is low compared to the rest of the country. According to 1990 census, literacy rate among women was %44.77 in the region whereas it was %71.95 in Turkey (DİE, 1994). Birth rate and infant mortality rate in the region have been above the country average. In 1990 birth rate in the region and in Turkey was 4.36 and 2.65, respectively (DİE, 1994). Women also benefit less from public services and participate less in public life. Improving the status of women in the region is therefore very essential for social development of the region.

Improving status of women in the region is among the most important social targets of GAP. With this aim, first two Multi-Purpose Community Centers (ÇATOM) were established in

Şanlıurfa by GAP Administration, Şanlıurfa Governorship and UNICEF in poor neighborhoods. Today there are 28 ÇATOMs in 9 provinces of the region.

ÇATOMs aim to reach especially poor women, for this reason they are mostly established in poor neighborhoods. Target group is women over age 14. The main aim is to sustain a gender balanced development by creating awareness among women about their problems, offering solutions to them and by increasing participation of women to public life. To realize this aim ÇATOMs have been giving services in the following headings. Education and training; health; income generating activities; social support and cultural-social activities. Shortly ÇATOMs' main aim is developing capacities of poor women to integrate them to development processes.

Gender-balanced development is an important concern for sustainable developed approach. Improving status of women is also very essential for GAP Region, since there are strict discriminations by gender in the region, which should be prevented for realizing social development. Designed to realize a gender-balanced development, ÇATOMs have been working successfully with respect to their scales. Up to now, nearly 80.000 people, including women, children and younger generations, used services given by ÇATOMs. There is more need to be done for improving status of women in GAP region since their status is really backward. Nevertheless, attempts towards developing capacities of women should be made in every possible way since without improving status of women in the region social development cannot be achieved.

4.2.6. Rehabilitation of Children Working in Streets

As a result of increasing poverty and rapid migration, children working in the streets became an important problem in GAP region, especially for the city of Diyarbakır. Here it is important to note that, children working in the streets are different from “street children”; the former still has family ties whereas the latter does not.

In Diyarbakır city, which faced a rapid migration process during 1990's, over 4000 children is estimated to be working on streets (GAP, 2003). The employment opportunities in the city could not offer jobs for migrants, thus poverty in the city raised dramatically. Most of these poor households send their children to work outside. It is easier for children to find jobs in informal sector since they can accept lower wages and marginal temporary works. Some of these children even have to leave school for these works.

The project is designed to improve living standards of these children and eliminate child labor in the long run. In the project, a training center was established in which special programs have been given to children like literacy, computer, painting and music courses; organization of football teams and folklore groups. Until 1991, 765 children were registered at the center in Diyarbakır (GAP, 2003).

4.2.7. Social Progress for Youth

Young people are one of the disadvantaged groups that GAP wants to empower. They face the negative impacts of development process, like integration problems occurred as a result of migration, and transition from traditional society to a modern one more than the older generations.

This project is offered by the Umbrella Program and funded by the Swiss Government. The main aim is to develop capacities of young generations by giving them an environment for social and cultural interaction.

The project area covers whole GAP region. City of Mardin was selected as pilot area and first Youth and Culture Center was opened there. In the center computer, painting and English courses have been given. Similar centers were opened in Adıyaman, Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa and one will be opened in Siirt. Until now, nearly 3000 young people have been participated in the activities of these centers (GAP, 2003).

4.2.8. Assistance for Urban-Rural Integration and Community Development Programs in Halfeti, Şanlıurfa

This project is one of the 29 projects offered in the Umbrella Program. With increasing level of economic development, migration from rural areas to bigger urban centers of the region is supposed to fasten. Such migration should be directed to smaller urban areas as well as bigger ones to avoid the problems that may emerge in the latter as a result of rapid migration. Halfeti is one of these smaller urban centers that migration would be directed. The project cost was estimated as \$313.000 and it was implemented with the help of UNDP and FAO.

The project aimed to increase participation level and to help community development in Halfeti. As put in the project report, the objective of the project is to, “provide full participation of local people in all stages of decision-making, including problem identification, research, planning and implementation” (UNDP & FAO, 2003).

With this objective, meetings were organized with local people in which information about prepared programs was given and they were discussed. Apart from that, small-scale training activities like beekeeping, construction, canned food preparation were given. With the help of GAP-GİDEMs consultation services were given to people who acquired resettlement payments.

There was also a resettlement project in that area due to the construction of Birecik Dam, for this reason most of the activities overlapped with the resettlement project. Firstly with this project, a participatory manner was adapted in a resettlement project. In the project, resettlements were done according to preferences of the people affected by the dam.

Being the first example, the project gives important clues about the problems of participatory planning in GAP region. Like given in the project report, in most of the cases project team was considered as moderators that could inform public authorities about the problems and the needs of the participants. The participants hardly considered themselves as active actors of the project. The effects of clientalistic relations that have so long existed in Turkey can be clearly observed in Halfeti Project. People are not accustomed to expressing their needs, to involve in planning processes directly by themselves, without intermediaries in clientalistic relations. Rather, they have been informing public agencies about their needs and problems with the help of intermediaries.

Participatory planning is a new concept for Turkey and problems arise when realizing it. Realizing participatory processes even becomes harder in GAP region that has a traditional social structure. Examples like Halfeti Project and preparation of 2002 Regional Development Plan can provide important hints for the successes of future attempts. The problems faced in these two projects clearly show that participants hardly realize what

participation in the projects mean. Therefore capacity development is very essential for the region. Looking at the problems faced in these two projects, it can be argued that developing people's capacities should be given priority to realize participatory process as offered in new policies.

4.2.9. Capacity Development for Local Development

Capacity development is utmost important for participation and thus for sustainable development. In this respect capacity development is also very important for GAP. Therefore, especially developing capacities of disadvantaged groups to integrate them into development processes have been given emphasis in GAP.

Yet, the projects examined have revealed that, there is much need to be done for developing capacities of people to realize participatory planning processes. As mentioned before, projects aiming at capacity development are very important for GAP if participatory planning is to be realized.

With similar concerns "capacity development for local development" projects was proposed. The project aims to develop capacities of public institutions, local governments and NGOs by establishment of a training center. Supported by WB, the project was rewarded with second degree in "Innovation Marketplace" competition, in which projects about alleviation of poverty were participated.

The project has not been implemented until now. It is planned that the project will be realized with cooperation of private and public institutions, local governments, NGOs, universities and chambers.

Considering the importance of capacity development for realizing principles of sustainable development, the project should be given priority. Apart from this project aiming to develop capacities of both public and private institutions, projects aiming to develop capacities of people should be designed and implemented for the reasons mentioned before. Without such projects, it would be very hard to realize principles of sustainable development in GAP region.

4.2.10. Environmental Projects in GAP

Environmental issues like protection of natural resources, of biological diversity is among the utmost important principles of sustainable human development approach. Adapting this approach, many projects have been designed in the context of GAP about environment. Since there are many projects and most of them have not been completed yet, some of selected ones will be examined here.

Environmental Study of Diyarbakır Area Project aims to determine the level of pollution around the city of Diyarbakır. With this purpose, a study was carried out by the Dicle University focusing on the pollution level in the Tigris River. The study and its report were completed in 1992.

GAP Biodiversity Research Project is designed under the Umbrella Program to determine biological diversity in the GAP region, to assess negative impacts of development processes on this diversity and to make proposals about its protection. The project was started in 2001 and has not been completed yet. UNDP has given financial aid to the project. Up to now, field studies have been carried out. After these are completed, a database about the biodiversity of the region will be prepared.

Eco-City Planning Approach for Adiyaman Project is also one of the projects designed under the Umbrella Program. Taking province of Adiyaman as pilot area, the project aims to integrate environmental concerns and planning principles of Agenda 21 to the existing planning system. To realize this integration, meetings were organized with local administrators and sociological surveys were carried out in the project area. At the present stage, final report of the project is being prepares according to the findings of surveys and meetings.

4.3. Realization Level of GAP

In the context of GAP, 10 dams have been built for irrigation and energy and 8 irrigation projects have been realized. As a result, 212.000.000 ha. area can be irrigated. Yet, this amount is only %12 of the irrigation target of the project (GAP, 2003).

According to 8th development plan, the total investment required for GAP is 32 billion \$. By the year 2001, cash realization of the project, including all the sectors given below, was 48.1%. The table below gives the cash realizations of the projects by sector at the end of 2001. It must kept in mind that, investments done in the context of the project includes many public agencies like Türk Telekom, Regional Directorate of State Hydraulic Works, Provincial Directorates of Ministry of Education, Health and so on. Allocations to be done in GAP region are given in the budgets of related agencies. Thus the numbers given below represent a sum of investments done in the region by different public agencies in the context of GAP.

Table 4.1. Cash Realization of GAP by 2001

ECONOMIC SECTORS	Required Funs (Billion TL)	Investments done by the End of 2001(Billion TL)	Realization (%)
Agriculture	6.811.714	1.144.319	16.8
Mining	522.393	530.243	100.0
Manufacturing	1.005.673	408.021	40.6
Energy	7.236.872	5.696.882	78.7
Transportation-Communication	4.982.234	1.677.455	33.7
Tourism	37.823	9.495	25.1
TOTAL	20.596.708	9.446.416	46.0
SOCIAL SECTORS			
Housing	217.702	76.730	35.2
Education & Health	597.004	507.231	85.0
Other Public Services	1.094.444	781.478	71.4
TOTAL	1.909.150	1.369.288	71.7
GRAND TOTAL	22.505.859	10.831.855	48.1

Source: www.gap.gov.tr

In schema it is clearly seen that in the driving sectors of the project much needs to be done. For example, agricultural sector is supposed to increase rural welfare; to balance migration levels, an important problem of the region, and to provide input for manufacturing industry. Shortly achievements in this sector are supposed to fasten development in other sectors like industrial and social sectors. In the same way, not realizing the investments adequately slows down the development processes in related sectors. Likewise, 33.7% realization in transportation-communication/infrastructure may slow down the development of industry. Although level of investment is very high in sectors such as mining, energy and public services, much needs to be done in the essential sectors like agriculture and infrastructure, which are the driving forces of region's development.

In order to achieve development targets of GAP, first of all realization of irrigation projects should be given priority. For increasing development level of the region, irrigation projects

plays a major role since only by irrigation agricultural and industrial production patterns can change which will in turn increase employment opportunities and income levels in the region.

Landless farmers and big ownership of lands are also crucial problems of the region for increasing income levels especially in rural areas and for slowing down the migration process. In this respect, realizing a land reform in the region is as important as completing irrigation projects. Without land reform, realizing irrigation projects could worsen the existing income inequalities.

4.4. Problems of the Projects Undertaken with Sustainable Development Approach

Apart from these big-scale investment-based projects for economic development, many social projects have been designed and realized in GAP starting from mid 1990's with the principles of sustainable development. Most of the projects examined here are small-scale ones and cannot increase socio-economic development level of the region by themselves. This does not mean that they are totally useless. Of course, social development is a major objective of GAP and these projects can help a lot to achieve this target. With these pilot projects GAP Administration has been trying to create models for social development and they have mostly been successful with respect to their scales. As argued by one of the interviewees, they have been designed to develop capacities of people, of targeted disadvantaged groups. Compared to others, participants of these projects are able to better express their needs, problems and they become more aware of the problems around them.

Despite the achievements of these small-scale projects, the projects are not without problems as stated before. Problems arise especially in realizing participation. Existence of problems

does not mean that such processes should be given up. Rather reasons of these problems should be clearly defined and future processes should be designed by taking into account these problems.

One of the main reasons behind the problems faced in the participatory processes in GAP is related to capacity development. As stated before the region has no tradition of participation. Therefore, people do not know much about what participation is, how participatory process work and how they can contribute to these processes. For this reason, capacity development is utmost important for realizing participation in GAP region. With capacity development project people may better express their opinions, define their problems and offer solutions to these problems. Shortly they may involve in participatory processes better. The solutions offered for the problems faced in the participatory processes in GAP region cannot ignore the fact that developing capacities of people is crucial for region both for realizing participation and for social development of the region.

Developing capacities of people can also help to break down the clientalistic relations in the region. Like mentioned while discussing the Halfeti Project, people are not accustomed to involve in planning processes directly, to express their problems and solutions for these. As capacities of people are developed, as people become more involved in participatory processes and make contributions to these, people can have a sense of citizenship, they can be more interested in issues around them and thus, it would be easier to replace these clientalistic relations with participatory ones.

It seems clear that capacity development is very essential for GAP region. Then, the question is how developing capacities of people, how building social capital in the region can be done. This is not an easy task and a full recipe for it cannot be given here. Yet some clues

can be given for capacity development in GAP region. By taking into account the social underdevelopment of the region, it can be argued that, public sector should play an active role for capacity development. Although this may seem in contradiction with the main arguments of new policies, putting much emphasis on bottom-up policies, it is obvious that civic society in the region cannot realize such development without external support. Such support can be provided by public sector. Public sector with its human and fiscal resources can design and implement capacity development projects. In this respect GAP Administration can play a vital role with other public institutions for achievement of this aim.

Although sustainable development approach has brought social and environmental considerations, in developing a policy framework for the project, it is important to remember that GAP is a project depending on use of land and water resources for development. Without realizing projects about land and water resources both economic and social development levels of the region cannot be increased. The social projects in the context of sustainable human development should be implemented simultaneously with other big-scale projects such as irrigation to achieve socio-economic development in GAP region. To sum up, it must be remembered that neither construction of dams and irrigation projects nor small-scale social projects can realize sustainable human development in GAP region alone by themselves. In order to achieve development targets of the project both should be designed and implemented.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

So far, changing regional policies have been discussed. After that Turkish regional development policies and practices are examined briefly and it is seen that regional inequalities in Turkey have not reduced in time. Despite the policies designed to overcome problem of regional inequalities, because of not allocating adequate amount of resources to underdeveloped regions, the problem still continues. Later, effects of the changing policies on Turkish regional development are given by examining the case of GAP.

By looking at GAP, it can be said that Turkish regional development has begun to be affected by new regional policies. In this final chapter these affects will be evaluated. Both new and previous policies will be discussed, with reference to their successes and weaknesses to give some concluding remarks about the future policies of GAP.

5.1. Positive and Negative Aspects of Changing Policies in GAP

Since GAP is the case of this thesis, successes and failures of the new policies and practices will be discussed in the context of it. In order to analyze change in policies more clearly, the project will be discussed in two periods. First period is up to mid 1990's, in which policies of GAP were designed according to previous allocative approaches. Second period is from the

mid 1990's to now on, in which sustainable human development approach has been at the center of all development efforts in GAP.

As mentioned in the second chapter, previous regional development policies were mostly favoring development based on creating growth poles by allocation of resources. Those resources were mostly public resources in consistency with the role of state in that period as provider of regional equity. Thus regional policies were designed in a top-down way.

In the earlier years of the project, policies of GAP were designed according to these previous approaches. Project was started in the sectors of irrigation and energy and these two sectors were given a prominent role in the 1989 Plan. Realizations of the projects in these sectors require allocation of great amount of public resources. Although with 1989 Plan GAP was transformed into a multi-sectoral development project covering social sectors as well as economic ones, in the first period, not much attention was given to social development objectives like improving status of women, increasing literacy rate and so on.

Regional policies have begun to change during 1980's as a result of restructuring of nation-states and capitalism. Previous policies depending on allocation of resources were given away as a result of restructuring of the state in a way to decrease public spending and to abound welfare policies. In new regional policies emphasis was given to development by using regions' own resources, to innovation, to learning, to institutionalization for designing bottom-up policies. According to new policies, allocative policies were no longer applicable since they depended too much on public resources and considered state as the only actor in development processes. In the present policies, private sector and civil participation were seen crucial to launch bottom-up policies. State was no longer the only actor in development.

Apart from these, environmental and social problems, like increasing pollution, poverty and marginalization, began to get attention in the field of development. Many attempts were made to integrate these issues to development efforts. As a result sustainable-human-development approach emerged, which not only deals with economic development but also protection of natural resources and social development.

This new approach has been adapted by many international organizations and states. As seen in development plans, Turkey has also seemed to adopt sustainable development approach. As a result of changing policies at national scale and partly to get financial help from international organizations that favor sustainable development, the approach was also adopted by GAP.

Effects of changing policies can clearly be observed in the period, starting from mid 1990's to now on. In this period sustainable human development approach has been taken as a basis for the policies of GAP as stated almost in every document about the project. Importance of social development objectives and participation in development processes has been emphasized very strongly since then.

Many projects have been implemented in this second period with social objectives. Although many of them have been successful, they are pilot projects, with which increasing social development level of the whole region may take really long time.

5.2. A New Policy Framework for GAP

Although in the second period, attempts have been made to overcome deficiency of the previous period, that is not considering social development adequately, it seems that the

importance of small-scale social projects have been overemphasized. In addition, irrigation and energy project seemed to have lost their place in the second period. It must be remembered that GAP depends on use of water and land resources for region's development. This fact has been overlooked in the second period.

What needs to be done in the context of GAP is to adapt a combination of these two approaches. It must be remembered that GAP is a comprehensive regional development project, aiming at developing the region both economically and socially. This does not mean that social projects realized in the second period are totally useless. As stated before, many of them have been successful and implementation of such project shall continue in the future. However, realizing irrigation and energy projects is no less important than social projects and without them it is impossible to develop region according to GAP's development scenario.

A few things need to be considered for this integrated approach. First of all, it must be kept in mind that social and economic development is of equal importance. Economic development cannot guarantee social development; it would be wrong to assume that after economic development is realized, social development would follow it. That is why an integrated approach is needed in GAP. With allocative policies economic development can be achieved whereas sustainable human development approach can realize social development objectives.

It has been discussed that allocative policies have been usually given away in the field of development. New regionalist policies offer development by using regions' own resources. Yet, the region still needs allocative policies for irrigation and energy projects. Underdeveloped regions, like GAP, cannot realize development with their own fiscal and

human resources. Support, guidance and resources of public sector are crucial for region's development. Under these circumstances, where it is almost impossible for the region to develop by itself, "*state-driven new regionalism*", as argued by Eraydin (Eraydin, 2002), can be solution for GAP region. In this framework, public sector can continue to play its supportive role and implement allocative policies for realizing this role.

Role of public sector is not limited to this revision of economic development policies. Public sector is ought to have a vital role for also realizing social development. The region has a traditional social structure and clientalistic relations have long been existed in the region. Apart from clientalism there is little-if any- tradition of participation in the region. Under these conditions, it is almost impossible fro region's civil society to built social capital without outside support. Supportive mechanisms are needed to build social capital and public sector with its resources can help a lot for this purpose.

To sum up, GAP needs an integrated policy framework of allocative policies and sustainable human development for overall development of the region. In this integrated approach public sector plays an essential role both for economic and social development. The GAP experience with its successes and failures tells us a lot about the problems of regional planning in Turkey and provides useful insights for future attempts.

APPENDIX A

List of Provinces Defined as PRD by the Periods of Five-Year Development Plans

PRDs in the Period of 2nd Plan

1968	1969	1972
Adıyaman	Adıyaman	Adıyaman
Ağrı	Ağrı	Afyon
Artvin	Artvin	Ağrı
Bingöl	Bingöl	Artvin
Bitlis	Bitlis	Bingöl
Diyarbakır	Diyarbakır	Bitlis
Elazığ	Edirne	Burdur
Erzincan	Elazığ	Çankırı
Erzurum	Erzincan	Çorum
Gaziantep	Erzurum	Diyarbakır
Gümüşhane	Gaziantep	Edirne
Hakkari	Gümüşhane	Elazığ
Kars	Hakkari	Erzincan
Malatya	Kars	Erzurum
K.Maraş	Malatya	Gaziantep
Mardin	K.Maraş	Giresun
Muş	Mardin	Gümüşhane
Siirt	Muş	Hakkari
Sivas	Siirt	Kars

1968	1969	1972
Tunceli	Sivas	Malatya
Ş.Urfa	Tunceli	K.Maraş
Van	Ş.Urfa	Kastamonu
	Van	Mardin
		Muş
		Niğde
		Ordu
		Siirt
		Sinop
		Sivas
		Tunceli
		Ş.Urfa
		Van
		Yozgat

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

PRDs in the Period of 3rd Plan

1973	1973	1977
Adıyaman	Adıyaman	Adıyaman
Afyon	Afyon	Afyon
Ağrı	Ağrı	Ağrı
Artvin	Artvin	Artvin
Bilecik	Bilecik	Bilecik
Bingöl	Bingöl	Bingöl
Bitlis	Bitlis	Bitlis
Bolu	Bolu	Bolu
Burdur	Burdur	Burdur

1973	1973	1977
Çanakkale	Çanakkale	Çanakkale
Çankırı	Çankırı	Çankırı
Çorum	Çorum	Çorum
Denizli	Denizli	Denizli
Diyarbakır	Diyarbakır	Diyarbakır
Edirne	Erzincan	Erzincan
Elazığ	Erzurum	Erzurum
Erzincan	Giresun	Giresun
Erzurum	Gümüşhane	Gümüşhane
Gaziantep	Hakkari	Hakkari
Giresun	Kars	Kars
Gümüşhane	Kırşehir	Kırklareli
Hakkari	K.Maraş	Kırşehir
Kars	Kastamonu	K.Maraş
Kırşehir	Mardin	Kastamonu
Malatya	Muş	Mardin
K.Maraş	Niğde	Muş
Kastamonu	Ordu	Niğde
Mardin	Siirt	Ordu
Muş	Sinop	Siirt
Niğde	Sivas	Sinop
Ordu	Tokat	Sivas
Siirt	Tunceli	Tokat
Sinop	Ş.Urfa	Tunceli
Sivas	Uşak	Ş.Urfa
Tokat	Van	Uşak
Tunceli	Yozgat	Van

1973	1973	1977
Ş.Urfa		Yozgat
Uşak		
Van		
Yozgat		

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

PRDs in the Period of 4th Plan

1978	1979	1980
Adıyaman	Adıyaman	Adıyaman
Afyon	Afyon	Afyon
Ağrı	Ağrı	Ağrı
Artvin	Artvin	Artvin
Bilecik	Bilecik	Bilecik
Bingöl	Bingöl	Bingöl
Bitlis	Bitlis	Bitlis
Bolu	Bolu	Bolu
Burdur	Burdur	Burdur
Çanakkale	Çanakkale	Çanakkale
Çankırı	Çankırı	Çankırı
Çorum	Çorum	Çorum
Denizli	Denizli	Diyarbakır
Diyarbakır	Diyarbakır	Elazığ
Elazığ	Elazığ	Erzincan
Erzincan	Erzincan	Erzurum
Erzurum	Erzurum	Gaziantep
Gaziantep	Gaziantep	Giresun
Giresun	Giresun	Gümüşhane

1978	1979	1980
Gümüşhane	Gümüşhane	Hakkari
Hakkari	Hakkari	Kars
Kars	Kars	Kırklareli
Kahramanmaraş	Kırklareli	Kırşehir
Kastamonu	Kırşehir	Kahramanmaraş
Kırklareli	Kahramanmaraş	Kastamonu
Kırşehir	Kastamonu	Malatya
Malatya	Malatya	Mardin
Mardin	Mardin	Muş
Muş	Muş	Nevşehir
Niğde	Nevşehir	Niğde
Ordu	Niğde	Ordu
Siirt	Ordu	Siirt
Sinop	Siirt	Sinop
Sivas	Sinop	Sivas
Tokat	Sivas	Tokat
Tunceli	Tokat	Tunceli
Şanlıurfa	Tunceli	Ş.Urfa
Uşak	Ş.Urfa	Uşak
Van	Uşak	
Yozgat		

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

1981		1981	
1 st Degree PDA	2 nd Degree PDA	1 st Degree PDA	2 nd Degree PDA
Ağrı	Adıyaman	Adıyaman	Çankırı
Bingöl	Artvin	Ağrı	Çorum
Bitlis	Çankırı	Bingöl	Kastamonu
Gümüşhane	Çorum	Bitlis	Sinop
Hakkari	Diyarbakır	Diyarbakır	Yozgat
Muş	Elazığ	Elazığ	
Siirt	Erzincan	Erzurum	
Tunceli	Erzurum	Erzincan	
Kars	K.Maraş	Gümüşhane	
Van	Kastamonu	Hakkari	
	Malatya	Kars	
	Mardin	K.Maraş	
	Sinop	Malatya	
	Sivas	Mardin	
	Ş.Urfa	Muş	
	Tokat	Siirt	
	Yozgat	Sivas	
		Tunceli	
		Ş.Urfa	
		Van	

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

PRDs in the Period of 5th Plan

1984	
1st Degree PDA	2nd Degree PDA
Adıyaman	Amasya
Ağrı	Artvin
Bingöl	Çankırı
Bitlis	Çorum
Diyarbakır	Elazığ
Gümüşhane	Erzurum
Hakkari	Erzincan
Kars	K.Maraş
Mardin	Kastamonu
Muş	Malatya
Tunceli	Sivas
Siirt	Sinop
Van	Ş.Urfa
	Tokat
	Yozgat

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

PRDs in the Period of 6th Plan

1990		1992		1992	
1st Degree PDA	2nd Degree PDA	1st Degree PDA	2nd Degree PDA	1st Degree PDA	2nd Degree PDA
Adıyaman	Amasya	Adıyaman	Amasya	Adıyaman	Amasya
Ağrı	Artvin	Ağrı	Artvin	Ağrı	
Batman	Çankırı	Bartın	Çankırı	Ardahan	Çankırı
Bayburt	Çorum	Batman	Çorum	Artvin	Çorum

1990		1992		1992	
1 st Degree	2 nd Degree	1 st Degree	1 st Degree	2 nd Degree	1 st Degree
PDA	PDA	PDA	PDA	PDA	PDA
Bingöl	Elazığ	Bayburt	Elazığ	Bartın	Elazığ
Bitlis	Erzurum	Bingöl	Erzincan	Batman	Erzurum
Diyarbakır	Erzincan	Bitlis	Erzurum	Bayburt	K.maraş
Gümüşhane	K.Maraş	Diyarbakır	K.maraş	Bingöl	Kastamonu
Hakkari	Kastamonu	Gümüşhane	Kastamonu	Bitlis	Malatya
Kars	Malatya	Hakkari	Malatya	Diyarbakır	Sinop
Mardin	Sinop	Kars	Sinop	Erzincan	Sivas
Muş	Sivas	Mardin	Sivas	Gümüşhane	Tokat
Siirt	Ş.Urfa	Muş	Ş.Urfa	Hakkari	Yozgat
Şırnak	Tokat	Siirt	Tokat	Iğdır	(Districts of Karabük and Ereğli)
Tunceli	Yozgat	Şırnak	Yozgat	Kars	
Van	Zonguldak	Tunceli	Zonguldak	Mardin	
	(Districts of	Van		Muş	
	Central and	Zonguldak		Siirt	
	Çaycuma)	(Districts of		Ş.Urfa	
		Karabük and		Şırnak	
		Ereğli)		Tunceli	
				Van	
				Zonguldak	
				(Ezcept from	
				Districts of	
				Karabük and	
				Ereğli)	

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

PRDs in the Period of 7th Plan

1996	1999
Adıyaman	Adıyaman
Ağrı	Ağrı
Amasya	Aksaray
Ardahan	Amasya
Artvin	Ardahan
Bartın	Artvin
Batman	Bartın
Bayburt	Batman
Bingöl	Bayburt
Bitlis	Bingöl
Çanakkale (Districts of Gökçeada and Bozcaada)	Bitlis
Çankırı	Çanakkale (Districts of Gökçeada and Bozcaada)
Çorum	Çankırı
Diyarbakır	Çorum
Elazığ	Diyarbakır
Erzincan	Elazığ
Erzurum	Erzincan
Gümüşhane	Erzurum
Hakkari	Giresun
Iğdır	Gümüşhane
K.Maraş	Hakkari
Karabük	Iğdır
Kars	K.Maraş
Kastamonu	Karabük

1996	1999
Kilis	Karaman
Malatya	Kars
Mardin	Kastamonu
Muş	Kırıkkale
Siirt	Kırşehir
Sinop	Kilis
Sivas	Malatya
Ş.Urfa	Mardin
Şırnak	Muş
Tokat	Nevşehir
Tunceli	Niğde
Van	Ordu
Yozgat	Osmaniye
Zonguldak	Rize
	Samsun
	Siirt
	Sinop
	Sivas
	Ş.Urfa
	Şırnak
	Tokat
	Trabzon
	Tunceli
	Van
	Yozgat
	Zonguldak

Source: www.dpt.gov.tr

REFERENCES

Alonso, W. (1975) “*Urban and Regional Imbalances in Economic Development*”, in ‘Regional Policy: Readings in Theory and Applications’, Friedmann, J., Alonso, W. (Eds.), MIT Press, Massachusetts, p: 622-635

Amin, A. (2000) “*An Institutional Perspective on Regional Economic Development*”, Blackwell Publishers

Amin, A., Thrift, N. (1994) “*Holding Down The Global*”, in ‘Globalization, Institutions and Regional Development in Europe’, Amin, A., Thrift, N. (Eds.), Oxford University Press, USA, p: 257-260

Amin, A., Thrift, N. (1994) “*Living in the Global*”, in ‘Globalization, Institutions and Regional Development in Europe’, Amin, A., Thrift, N. (Eds.), Oxford University Press, USA, p: 1-22

Cameron, G., Danson, M., Halkier, H. (2000) “*Institutional Change, Governance and Regional Development: Problems and Perspectives*”, in ‘Governance, Institutional Change and Regional Development’, Danson, M., Halkier, H., Cameron, G. (Eds.), Ashgate Publishing Limited, England, p: 266-275

Castells, M. (1989) “*The Informational City*”, Basil Blackwell, Oxford

Danson, M., Halkier, H., Cameron, G. (2000) “*Regional Governance, Institutional Change and Regional Development*”, in ‘Governance, Institutional Change and Regional Development’, Danson, M., Halkier, H., Cameron, G. (Eds.), Ashgate Publishing Limited, England, p: 1-7

DİE (1994) “*Ekonomik ve Sosyal Göstergeler: Şanlıurfa*”, Ankara

Elliot, J.A. (1994) “*An Introduction to Sustainable Development*”, Routledge, London

Elmas, G. (2001) “*Küreselleşme Sürecinde Bölgesel Dengesizlikler: AB ve Türkiye*”, Nobel

Yayınları, Ankara

Eraydın, A. (2002) “*Yeni Sanayi Odakları: Yerel Kalkınmanın Yeniden Kavramsallaştırılması*”, ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları, Ankara

Eraydın, A. (1982) “*Bölgesel Gelişme (Durum, Politikalar, Uygulama) Sektör Raporu*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

Eraydın, A. (1992) “*Post-Fordizm ve Değişen Mekansal Öncelikler*”, ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları, Ankara

Eraydın, A., Taraklı, D., Polatoğlu, A., Keyder, Ç. (1998) “*GAP’a Yönelik Politikalar ve Örgütlenme Önerileri*”, Türkiye Sosyal Ekonomik Araştırmalar Vakfı

Friedmann, J. (1975) “*Regional Development Planning: The Progress of a Decade*”, in ‘Regional Policy: Readings in Theory and Application’, MIT Press, Massachusetts, p: 791-808

Friedmann, J., (1964) “*Regional Planning as a Field of Study*” in ‘Regional Development and Planning’, Friedmann, J., Alonso W. (Eds.), MIT Press, Massachusetts, p: 59-72

Friedmann, J., Alonso, W. (1964) “*Introduction*”, in ‘Regional Development and Planning’, Friedmann, J., Alonso W. (Eds.), MIT Press, Massachusetts, p: 1-13

Friedmann, J., Alonso, W. (1975) “*Introduction*”, in ‘Regional Policy: Readings in Theory and Applications’, Friedmann, J., Alonso W. (Eds.), MIT Press, Massachusetts, p: xv-xxi

Hansen, N.M. (1981) “*Development From Above: The Centre-Down Development Paradigm*”, in ‘Development from Above or Below? The Dialectics of Regional Planning in Developing Countries’, Stöhr, W.B., Taylor, D.R.F (Eds.), John Wiley and Sons, New York, p: 15-38

Holmberg, J., Sandbrook, R. (1992) “*Sustainable Development: What is to Be Done?*” in ‘Making Development Sustainable: Redefining Institutions, Policy, and Economics’, Holmberg, J., Sandbrook, R. (Eds.), Island Press, Washington, p: 19-38

İnan, A. (1972) “*Devletçilik İlkesi ve Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin Birinci Sanayi Planı 1933*”, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara

İnan, A. (1973) “*Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin İkinci Sanayi Planı 1936*”, Türk Tarih Kurumu

Yayınları, Ankara

Keating, M. (1998) *"New Regionalism in Western Europe: Territorial Restructuring and Political Change"*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham

Lovering, J. (2000) *"Theory Led by Policy: The Inadequacies of the 'New Regionalism' (Illustrated From the Case of Wales)"*, Blackwell Publishers

MacKinnon, D., Cumbers, A., Chapman, K. (2002) *"Learning, Innovation and Regional Development: A Critical Appraisal of Recent Debates"* in 'Progress in Human Geography', vol: 26,3, p: 293-311

MacLeod, G. (2001) *"New Regionalism Reconsidered: Globalization and the Remaking of Political Economic Space"*, in International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, vol:25, p: 804-829

Myrdal, G. (1957) *"Economic Theory and Under-Developed Regions"*, Harper Torchbooks, New York

Nicholls, L. (1999) *"Birds of Feather? UNDP and Action Aid Implementation of Sustainable Human Development"*, in 'Development in Practice', vol: 9, issue: 4

Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Anabilim Dalı (UPL) (2003) *"Şanlıurfa İl Gelişme Planı Çalışmaları"*, Ersoy, M., Şengül H.T. (Eds.), Ankara

Okyar, O. (1966) *"Development of Eastern Turkey"*, in 'Regional Planning, Local Government and Community Development in Turkey; Papers: Eighth Seminar on Housing and Planning', Sevinç Matbası, Ankara

Pickvance, C.G. (1981) *"Policies as Chamelons: An Interpretation of Regional Policy and Office Policy in Britain"*, in 'Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society', Dear, M., Scott, A.J. (Eds.), Methuen, London

Polatoğlu, A. (1995) *"GAP and Administrative Organization"* in 'METU Studies in Development', Ankara, v.22 (2), p: 191-206

Putnam, R.D., Leonardi, R., Nanetti, Y.R., (1993) *"Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy"*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey

Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry GAP Regional Development Administration, UNDP

(1997) “*Sustainable Development Program*”, Ankara

Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry State Planning Organization, Nippon Koei Co.Ltd., Yüksel Proje A.Ş. (1989) “*The Southerneastern Anatolia Project Master Plan Study: Final Master Plan Report, Executive Summary*”, DPT, Ankara

Richardson, M. (1995) “*Güneydoğu Anadolu’nun Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Potansiyeli*”, TES-AR Yayınları, Ankara

Rodwin, L. (1964) “*Choosing Regions for Development*”, in ‘Regional Development and Planning’, Friedmann, J., Alonso, W. (Eds.), MIT Press, Massachusetts, p: 37-58

Sharp, R. (1992) “*Organizing for Change: People-Power and the Role of Institutions*”, in ‘Making Development Sustainable: Redefining Institutions, Policy, and Economics’, Holmberg, J., Sandbrook, R. (Eds.), Island Press, Washington, p: 39-64

Stöhr, B.W. (1981) “*Development from Below: The Bottom-Up and Periphery-Inward Development Paradigm*” in ‘Development from Above or Below? The Dialectics of Regional Planning in Developing Countries’, Stöhr, W.B., Taylor, D.R.F (Eds.), John Wiley and Sons, New York, p: 39-72

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1963) “*Kalkınma Planı, Birinci Beş Yıl, 1963-1967*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1968) “*Kalkınma Planı, İkinci Beş Yıl, 1968-1972*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1972) “*1972 Yılı Programı, İkinci Beş Yıl, 1968-1972*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1973) “*Kalkınma Planı, Üçüncü Beş Yıl, 1973-1977*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1982) “*Türkiye’de Yerleşme Merkezlerinin Kademelenmesi*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1983) “*Kalkınma Planı, Dördüncü Beş Yıl, 1979-1983*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1985) “*Kalkınma Planı, Beşinci Beş Yıl, 1985-*

1989”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1990) “*Kalkınma Planı, Altıncı Beş Yıl, 1990-1994*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1996) “*İllerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Gelişmişlik Sıralaması Ararştırması*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (1996) “*Kalkınma Planı, Yedinci Beş Yıl, 1996-2000*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (2000) “*Bölgesel Gelişme Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (2000) “*Bölgesel Gelişme Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (2001) “*Kalkınma Planı, Sekizinci Beş Yıl, 2001-2005*”, DPT Yayınları, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, Nippon Koei Co.Ltd., Yüksel Proje A.Ş. (1989) “*Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Master Plan Çalışması Master Plan Nihai Raporu: Master Plan*”, DPT, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Bölge Kalkınma İdaresi Başkanlığı (1993) “*GAP Bölgesi Hareket Planı 1993-1997*”, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Bölge Kalkınma İdaresi Başkanlığı (1993) “*Güney Doğu Anadolu Projesi (GAP)*”, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Bölge Kalkınma İdaresi Başkanlığı (2002) “*Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Bölge Kalkınma Planı, Yönetici Özeti*” Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Bölge Kalkınma İdaresi Başkanlığı (1996) “*Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Sürdürülebilir Entegre Bölgesel Kalkınmaya Yönelik Yenilikçi Bir Yaklaşım*”, Ankara

T.C. Başbakanlık Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Bölge Kalkınma İdaresi Başkanlığı (2001) “*2000 Yılı Faliyet Raporu*”, Ankara

Tekeli, İ. (1975) “*Evolution of Spatial Organization in the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic*”, in ‘Regional Policy: Readings in Theory and Applications’, Friedmann, J., Alanso, W. (Eds.), MIT Press, Massachusetts, p: 655-679

TOBB (1989) “*Kalkınmada Öncelikli Yöreler ve Bölgesel Gelişme İçin Bir Model*”, TOBB Yayınları, Ankara

Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası A.Ş. (2002) “*Kalkınmada Bölgesel Farklılıklar, Büyüme Kutupları ve Güney Doğu Anadolu Projesi*”, Ankara

Türkiye Sınai Bankası A.Ş., Pruva Danışmanlık Hizmetleri, A.Ş., (1991) “*GAP Ekonomik Kalkınma Ajansı Model Etüdü: Taslak Rapor*”, Ankara

United Nations (1992) “*Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*”, Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro

United Nations (2002) “*The Road from Johannesburg. World Summit on Sustainable Development: What was Achieved and the Way Forward*”

United Nations Development Programme (1994) “*Capacity Development: Lessons of Experience and Guiding Principles*”

United Nations Development Programme (1994) “*Capacity Development for Governance for Sustainable Human Development*”

United Nations Development Programme (1996) “*Capacity Development for Sustainable Human Development: Conceptual and Operational Signposts*”

United Nations Development Programme (2002) “*Interim Narrative Report: Small and Medium Enterprise Development in the GAP Region*”, Ankara

United Nations Development Programme, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2003) “*Assistance for Urban-Rural Integration and Community Development Programmes in Halfeti, Şanlıurfa, Turkey: Project Findings and Recommendations*”, Rome

ONLINE REFERENCES

<http://www.gap.gov.tr/English/Frames/fr1.html> visited on 20.09.2003

www.cevre.gov.tr/johannesburg/en%20iyi%20uygulama/catom-yoksulluk.pdf visited on 18.11.2003

www.cevre.gov.tr/johannesburg/en%20iyi%20uygulama/gap%20genclik-yonetisim.pdf visited on 18.11.2003

www.cevre.gov.tr/johannesburg/en%20iyi%20uygulama/gidem-is%20dunyasi.pdf visited on 18.11.2003

www.dpt.gov.tr/bgyu/seg/iller2003.htm visited on 02.12.2003

www.gap.gov.tr/English/Frames/fr2.html visited on 18.11.2003

www.gap.gov.tr/English/Uiliskidkp1.html visited on 20.10.2003

www.gap.gov.tr/englishosprjcatom.html visited on 05.11.2003

www.undp.org.tr/BPoverty_Reduction.htm_B1.asp visited on 20.10.2003