

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF NEOLIBERAL ECONOMIC POLICY; TURKEY CASE DURING THE 2000s

Levin ÖZGEN

Prof. Dr.

Abant İzzet Baysal University, Economy and Administration Faculty
Public Administration Department
Bolu/Turkey

ABSTRACT

NEO LIBERAL ECONOMIC POLICY BECAME DOMINANT ON THE WORLD AFTER THE 1980S. IT'S MAIN IMPLICATIONS ARE HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT, LEAVING THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TARGETS AND CENTRAL REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES, RAPID AND IRREGULAR URBANIZATION DRIVEN BY FINANCIAL CAPITAL AND SERVICE SECTOR.

KEY WORDS; *NEO LIBERALISM, UNEMPLOYMENT, PRIVATIZATION, URBAN TRANSFORMATION*

1. Introduction

In this study, implications of neo liberal economic policies and applications were taken under consideration. Because, the neo liberal structuring of the capitalist economic political system put very attractive development ways and discourse, but results are very different in practice.

Main problematic of the study is to set up and consider some results. Like rising of structural and acute unemployment, leaving the national targets, adjustment necessity of less / un developed or developing countries and their regional development policies to the recent centers of the globalized world like United States of America, and European countries, France and England. Content of the study is limited to the unemployment, regional development and urbanization, and general frames of and regional development and urbanization in Turkey as a case study, during the years of 2000s.

In the study, a selected writings from very large related scientific research belong to well known researcher and scientific person were used as main material. Also some visual material was used as supporting tools. Main method of the study is comparative consideration within the historical perspective. Main finding of the study is that neo liberal structuring of the world has not good facts and life for un / less developed or developing countries.

Within these frames, this study was achieved on five sections. The First is Introduction covering the issue and it's importance, main problematic, content material,

method, main finding and the structure of the paper. The Second considers the implications of the neo liberal economic policy, and applications basing on the globalized capitalism and the world. The Third Section relates to Turkey in general frames and her regional development policies during the 2000s. The Fourth takes in hand Turkey's urbanization characteristics and squatting. The Last Section as a concluding remark valuing the reality of Turkey and relating them to the neo liberal discourse.

I wish to explain sincerely my thanks to Andreea Vaduva and other colleagues from International Relations Faculty, Constantin Brancuși University for the opportunity to realize this study. Surely, if there may be seen some inefficiencies in the study, they belong to me.

2. Considerations On The Implications of Neo Liberal Economic Policies and Consequences During the Years of 2000s

During the years of 2000s globalized world gained a meaningful stability as a new stage of capitalism. Realization of this stage emerged after the crises of 1970s in the capitalistic system in itself. Crises were taken in hand in two groups of assumptions. One of them names the crises as petroleum crises which emerged in 1973 and 1976-77 as a result of sudden increasing of the petroleum prices applied by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). The second group of assumptions takes the crises in hand as the rigidity of the capitalist system, especially problems of the fordist labor process and production organization. However result of the crises was entering to the restructuring process of the capitalism. Meanwhile post modernist critical discourse gave multidimensional support to the restructuring and the globalization process, criticizing heavily the capitalistic system basing on the modernity. System was solved and transformed by the capitalism in itself by changing basic structural elements.

Firstly, capitalistic system changed the labor process and production organization step by step both in itself and un / less developed and developing countries by putting irregular production process and relations. Result of this step is emerging highly structural unemployment. By new labor process and production organization advantage of quality became important in the global market. Un / less developed and developing countries like Turkey, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina were forced and imposed to open their economies and restructure it as export-oriented one. Results of this stage are restructuring of industry sector, gaining importance of service sector and financial capital investment and leaving the national and regional development policies and adjusting them in according to the capitalistic centers' necessities.

As the results, structural unemployment in all types had huge increasing widespreadly all over the world. As national development target became less important fact, also regional development policies and applications directed to the small local capital accumulation dynamics, social-cultural phenomena, private sector, free market and commercial regulations gained importance.

These facts may be seen in Turkey during the years of 2000s.

3. Turkey Case

For a good understanding it would be put the general frames for Turkey.

Turkey is in the center of the world, geographically and in according to the political and religion differentiation of countries. Also she is neighbour to Romania over the Black sea.

Anatolia where Turkey takes place on, is the space of the emerging civilization. She collects in herself very rich cultural and civilization assets like the first agricultural practices in Mesopotamian geography, the first cities / cities or urban states like Sumer, Asur, Babil, Elam, Ion, Hittites, Urartu and others. Anatolia is assumed as the cradle of the civilization. She has seas surrounding all of the country in which mountainy areas covers large geography.

General characteristics of Turkey in the 2000s are mentioned as follows; Turkey is a developing country, the state and a nation ; *Who is laic, democratic and ruled by Republic according to M. K. Atatürk’s principles, * In which capitalist economic, political system is dominant, with some of the traditional economic, social structures and spaces, * Who is governed by a right and conservative party, trying to achieve articulation to the globalized world without any rule and condition, * Who is in intensive dependency relations, due to articulation, * Who gived importance to the neoliberal economic policies and export based economic structuring after 1980s, * Whose population is nearly 76 millions which integrates individuals from different ethnic, religion and language roots as a nation, * Who has geopolitical importance and role in the world and especially Middle East region, Who is not a developed country nor undeveloped, * Who takes place in the group of South countries in the globalized world’s country grouping system.

Population of Turkey shows some interesting situation. After long war years, she had less population as it may be seen in 1927 census in table 1. Then she had a modern increasing rate around 1~ 2 % and population increased regularly.

Table 1. Population of Turkey

Years	Population	Increasing per year (‰)
1927	13.648.270	---
1935	16.158.018	21.10
1940	17.820.950	19.59
1945	18.790.174	10.59
1950	20.947.188	21.73
1955	24.064.763	27.75
1960	27.754.820	28.53
1965	31.391.421	24.62
1970	35.605.176	25.19
1975	40.347.719	25.00
1980	44.736.957	20.65
1985	50.664.458	24.88
1990	56.473.035	21.71
1995	62.606.157	14.73
2008	71.517.100	12.10
2012	~76.000.000	

Male / Female Rate in Turkey’s population has a balance it may be seen in Table 2. During the establishment years female population was higher than male’s, as a result of long war years. In the years they became in a balance.

Table 2. Male / Female Rates in Turkey’s Population

Years	Male Pop. %	Female Pop. %
1927	--	--
1928	48.1	51.9
1935	49.1	50.9
1940	49.9	50.1
1945	50.3	49.7
1950	50.3	49.7
1955	50.8	49.2
1960	51.0	49.0
1965	51.0	49.0
1970	50.6	49.4
1975	51.4	48.6
1980	50.7	49.3
1985	50.7	49.3
1990	50.7	49.3
2000	50.3	49.7
2008	50.2	49.8

Population pyramid of Turkey gives large knowledge about economically active laborforce, young population and dependent groups. Young population is higher than dependent population groups which cover 0-14 and over 65 ages. Totally, dependency rates is smaller than rates in the European countries. This situation also creates lesser financial responsibility over the public administration and social security system or institution which was reformed as systemic umbrella covering laborers, staffs and independent – selfemployed workers or enterprises.

Population distribution according to age group shows the highness of the young population and less dependent population as it may be seen in Table 3. It may be said that potential economic active laborforce has high level forcing national employment capacity.

Table 3. Population Distribution According to Age Groups (%)

Years	0-14	15-64	65+	Unknown
1935	41.2	54.4	3.9	0.4
1940	42.1	54.3	3.5	0.1
1945	39.5	57.0	3.3	0.1
1950	38.3	58.3	3.3	0.1
1955	39.4	57.1	3.4	0.2
1960	41.2	55.1	3.5	0.2
1965	41.9	54.0	4.0	0.1
1970	41.8	53.8	4.4	0.0
1975	40.5	54.7	4.6	0.2
1980	39.0	55.9	4.7	0.4
1985	37.5	58.1	4.2	0.2
1990	35.0	60.7	4.3	0.1
2000	30.0	63.8	6.4	0.1
2008	26.0	67.0	7.0	-

Shares of main sectors in Turkey shows clearly the development processes of the sectors with their shares in GNDP as it may be seen in Table 4. It may obviously seen the development speed of service sector and decreasing of industry and agriculture.

Table 4. Shares of Main Sectors in GNDP in Turkey

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Agriculture	15.4	12.8	13.0	13.4	12.9	11.9	10.5	4.2
Industry	20.0	21.1	19.7	18.5	18.9	19.2	19.9	19.3
Services	64.6	66.1	67.3	68.2	68.2	69.0	69.6	76.5

Sectoral distribution of laborforce stresses the sudden increasing of service sector displacing industry as it is seen in Table 5. Along this displacement, agriculture lost importance continuously. On the other hand it may be said that industry experienced a structural change due to the transformation of the national economic policy from the state protection, import substitution one, to the export based open economy with the neoliberalism.

Table 5. Sectoral Distribution of Laborforce in Turkey

Years	Agric.	Indus.	Constr.	Services	not certain
1955	77.4	6.6	1.6	8.4	6.0
1960	74.9	7.5	2.2	10.2	5.1
1965	71.9	7.9	2.6	11.2	6.4
1970	66.1	9.6	3.1	19.2	2.0
1975	65.2	9.5	3.3	20.7	1.4
1980	57.9	11.9	4.4	24.8	1.0
1985	57.0	11.7	3.9	26.8	0.5
1990	52.1	12.9	5.3	29.0	0.6
2008	24.7	19.7	5.4	50.2	-

On the other hand, Growth Rates between 1923-2005 are high only in periods of 1924-1929, 1930-1939, 1949-1961 and 1962-1979 as Table 6. shows.

Table 6. Growth Rates, 1923-2005 in Turkey

Characters of Periods	Periods	AvarageGrowth %
* After Establishment of Republic	1924-2005	4,9
1) First 25 years	1924-1948	3,8
1a. Restructuring in the conditions of Open Econo.	1924-1929	8,6
1b. Industrialization by the Protective State	1930-1939	5,8
1c. During and After the War	1940-1948	0,0
2) Before and After Democrat Party	1949-1961	5,9
3) Mixed and Interventionist economy	1962-1979	6,5
4) Stages of Neoliberalizm	1980-2005	4,0
4a. Contr-attacks of capital	1980-1988	4,9
4b. Liberal movements of capital	1989-1997	4,3
4c. Continious IMF emposition	1998-2005	2,5

Time until the 2000s after the Republic establishment may be divided into 4 periods. The first one is mainly protective state period. Second one is generally liberalization, dependent industrialization and rapid/disorder urbanization period. The third is mixed and interventionist economy and the state. Last one is mainly defined by the neoliberalism. The highest average growth rate is in the restructuring in an open economy conditions. The second highest one is again seen in the mixed and interventionist economy. The lowest one is seen in neoliberal period.

Within the world countries Turkey took place generally in middle group like China, India, probably Western European countries and similar in according to the GNDP increasing per capita as the Table 7 shows.

Table 7. Increasing Rates of GNDP per Capita between 1913 (1950)-2001 International Findings (1990 USA \$)

	1913	1950	1973	2000
• Turkey	1,00	1,33	3,13	5,00
• Turkey	-----	1,00	2,35	3,75
• China	1,00	0,80	1,52	5,65
• India	1,00	0,91	1,27	2,59
• Korea	1,00	0,86	3,18	13,61
• Egypt	1,00	0,98	1,40	2,91
• Japan	1,00	0,98	1,40	2,91
• USA	1,00	1,80	3,15	5,16
• Western Eur	1,00	1,36	3,30	5,08
• South Eur	1,00	1,27	4,17	6,83
• South Amer	-----	1,00	1,53	1,81
• Africa	-----	1,00	1,20	1,65

Main Macroeconomic Data stresses that Turkey is a developing country with an increasing foreign debt low level of accumulation rate as it may be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Main Macroeconomic Data

	1988	1999	2005
• National income (index)	100.0	147.2	191.4
• Inflation Rate (%)	68.3	53.1	5.9
• Accumulation Rate (%)	26.1	21.9	19.6
• Export (Million \$)	11662	28842	76595
• Import (Million \$)	13475	39027	109171
• Current balance /GNDP(%)	+1.8	-0.9	-6.3
• Foreign Debt (Million \$)	40722	103126	170116
• Foreign Debt Respon. (%)	37.1	40.1	35.7

Notes: Accumulation rate: In current prices gross capital accumulation/GNDP,

Also the Table 9. shows middle levels of growth but high levels of debt.

Table 9. Relations of Growth, Current Deficit, Foreign Debt

	1990-1999	2000-2005
• Average Growth Rate %	4.1	3.2
• Current Deficit/National Income%	0.8	3.8
• Accumulated Current Deficit Billi \$	13.9	54.4
• Foreign Debt Increase Billi \$	61.2	67.0

On the other hand, unemployment is in orderly increasing and at high levels during especially 2000s as a result of neoliberalist policies and structural changes as it may be seen in Table 10.

Table 10. Unemployment

%	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
*Official Unemp.	6.5	8.4	10.3	10.5	10.3	10.3	9.9
*Unem+Hopeless7.0	8.8	10.6	10.9	11.6	12.2	12.4	
*Unem+not seek	10.9	12.3	14.0	14.0	14.6	16.1	16.9
*Unem+seasonal+ Under empl.	19.4	20.5	21.8	21.5	19.9	20.7	21.4

Findings on labor market and unemployment support this knowledges as it may be seen in Table 11.

Table 11. Labor Market and Unemployment in 2000s

2007	1988	1991	1997	2001	2003	2005	2006	
-								
15+ pop. 49.215	33.746	36.869	43.299	47.158	48.912	50.826	48.485	
Laborforce 23.523	19.391	21.010	22.755	23.491	23.640	24.565	23.250	
Participation to Laborforce %	57.5	57.0	52.6	49.8	48.3	48.3	48.0	47.8
Female	34.3	34.1	28.8	27.1	26.6	24.8	24.7	24.8
Male	81.2	80.3	76.8	72.9	70.4	72.2	47.6	47.8
Employment 21.19	17.75	19.29	21.20	21.52	21.15	22.05	20.95	
Employment %	52.6	52.3	49.0	45.6	43.2	43.4	43.2	43.1
Rural % 63.7	66.3		60.9	56.0	51.9	49.5	48.8	48.3
Urban %	42.0	40.4	40.3	38.9	37.7	39.7	39.9	40.1
Unemployed 2.333	1.638	1.723	1.552	1.967	2.493	2.520	2.295	
Unemployed %	8.4	8.2	6.8	8.4	10.5	10.3	9.9	9.9
Rural %	5.0	4.8	3.8	4.7	6.5	6.8	6.5	6.9
Urban % 13.1	12.7		10.0	11.6	13.8	12.7	12.6	12.6
Young Unempl % 17.5		15.4	14.3	16.2	20.5	19.3	18.7	19.6

Table 11. says that unemployment increased continuously as employment decreased in 2000s. Waged employment is the highest part in employment. Unregistered employment is nearly 50 %. Female workers in industry and service sectors out of agriculture showed an increasing as it is lesser in according to male workers. Female workers in social unguaranteed works are higher than male workers. Female workers in employment have generally high level education.

Meanwhile wages have been sharply decreased since the beginning of the 1980s to provide support to the private industrial sector. Then they are almost frozen with very less increases. Also right of trade unional organization was limited by various legal and institutional regulations. And than employment guarentee and capacity were decreased by application of flexible and subcontracting production practices.

Participation rates to laborforce according to sex and rural /urban distribution have also supporting values as it may be seen in Table 12.

Table 12. Participation Rates to Laborforce According to Sex and Rural /Urban Distribution

	Female/Rural	Male/Rural	Female/Urban	Male/Urban
1988	56.7	84.7	17.7	78.1
1991	56.1	82.3	14.3	77.3
1994	45.8	82.4	17.6	75.7
1997	41.0	81.3	19.6	74.2
2001	40.2	77.9	17.4	70.6
2004	36.7	74.7	18.3	70.8
2007	32.0	72.7	17.1	71.1

As it is seen in Table 12. participation rate shows continious decreasing. Female participation in urban areas is lower than participation in rural areas. Male participation in both rural and urban areas are higher than female's.

Unemployment characteristics may be clear as follows; * Open and disguised unemployments are very widespread. Structural unemployment is also extensive. Technology substitution to the place of labor disturbed highly the weak structure of employment. * Disguised unemployment is very spread in especially family firms, agricultural firms and the state institutions. * Productivity is very low in both agriculture and state bureoucracy. Service sector has similar characteristics. * Working conditions in both public and private sectors became hard and very flexible. * In the sectoral distribution of laborforce between 14-65, the highest share belongs to agriculture (52 %) with speed decreasing. Industry's share is 13 % with decreasing tendency. Share of construction is 5 % with an increasing tendency. Also service sector is in a speed increasing tendency 29 %.

These values show clearly the structure of labor class in Turkey. Working Classes have important difficulties. It may be said that laborforce is around 36 – 40 millions. However economic active laborforce or working population is in a decreasing tendency. Shortly unemployment has a high increasing tendency. Unemployment is in an order increasing since 1955 and rapid increasing in the 2000s. * Speed of new employment opportunities in the last years lower than the increasing rate of groups of 14-65 ages. * Reason of these facts may be related to the nonexistence of plan organizing healthy and rational economic structuring, economic and social development, setting rational relations

between population, education and employment. * In the historical perspective; Keynesien, neoliberal economic policies and unsuccessful applications brought these consequences. * There is a sharp passing from social welfare state and full employment to the neoliberal regulations.

Agriculture in Turkey is also in a sharp erosion. In agricultural production vegetable and livestock dealing, aquatic and forest products are very low. This situation shows permanency since 1930s. Livestock is in the permanent backwardness. Small land ownership is high. 90 % of peasants work on their own small land. Mechanization and capitalistic farming are not on high level. Rural population is in a continuous decreasing since 1923, which was 36.6 % of total in 2007.

Manufacturing industry lives both of structural change and importance lost. Surplus value share of industry in GNDP had less development between 1968-2006 decreasing from 15.13 to 21.12. It's competition power in the global market did not show an important increasing. Intermediate and consumption goods in export had high levels in spite of investment goods. This situation shows wide subcontracting production and relations with foreign main firms. In import, intermediate good is the first. The second is investment goods and the third is consumption goods. This shows the dependency to the import of investment goods in the industrial production. In the industrial production, the production of consumption goods are the first. The second is intermediate and the third is investment good production. This shows that industry in Turkey concentrates in the classical sectors like food, textile and similar. In export of industry, middle-high technology is the first. The second is the low technology. High level technology is at minimum level. The big 100 firms focus on those industrial sectors in 2000s; 1. Metal, 2. Food, drink and tobacco, 3. Chemistry, oil products, plastic and rubber. In 1970s the first was the industry of textile and clothing, shoes and leather. Industry is in a structural change.

Energy issues is also in some problematics in Turkey. The most consumed energy types are 1. Oil, 2. Gauze, 3. Coal. Their prices are orderly increasing. National energy production covers 29 % of energy demand in 2010. Dependency for energy tends to increase continuously. Privatization was also done in the public energy sector.

Relations with European Union are interesting. Turkey is a member of European Custom Union since 1990s. But she is not a member of European Union (EU). Turkey's export to the EU is lower than import from the Union.

Meanwhile foreign investment did not realize at high levels. Direct foreign investment during the 2000s showed some increasing. Direct foreign investment concentrated in service sector.

Regional Development Policies have been basic for national development in Turkey. Since the establishment of Republic, leader teams, M. K. Atatürk and his friends aimed to develop a national capital accumulation and a national bourgeoisie class. To realize these social protective welfare state was the main actor to mobilize national dynamics. They realized 3 plans for development and industrialization during the years of 1920s, 30s and 40s. At the end of the 1950s, regional development policies were based on the development plans for five years (FYDP). Plans were coordinated by The State Planning Organization (SPO). established in 1963. 9 plans are realized until 2013. Main aim in plans to eliminate and then to reduce the development differences by investments and services especially by hand of

the state and to direct the private sector to undeveloped regions by the state supports and subventions.

Development Rank of the Regions is shaped in according to the plans. These plans based on 7 regions. Their development rank is as follows; 1. Marmara R. 2. Aegian R. 3. (4) Inner Anatolian R. 4. (3) Mediterrenean Sea R. 5. Black Sea R. 6. South East Anatolian R. 7. East Anatolian R.. This rank is similar with very less changes in 1950s and 2000s. 3rd and 4th changed in theirselves in some periods.

These regions were geographic areas. They have not a juridical personality / entity, legal regulations and boundaries. Their boundaries based on the service and responsibility boundaries of regional managements of some state institutions like The State Water Affairs, Highways Institution, Village Affairs and similar. Also they depended on climate and geographical land conditions.

Regional Development Policies and Applications may be open as follows; Policies untill 1980s are basicly formed by the Keynesian economic policies, welfare economy policies and social state approach, state protection, mixed economy and import substitution. Provided supports, credits, subventions by the hand of the state aimed to direct the private sector to invest to the undeveloped regions. The state also directed the public investments and services to there. Also some plans were made on scale of definite regions like Marmara region development plan, Cukurova development plan, South East Irrigation and Energy Plan. They focus mainly on concentration of the industrialization and urbanization to the definite region and city, irrigation and development of agriculture and partly social cultural development. After all efforts development differencies and development rank of the regions could not change.

Adjustment to EU Regional Policies forced radical change in Turkey’s regional development policies and organization. Since the beginning of the 2000s, regional development approach changed sharply going away from national development understanding, macro and large level region assumption and centralized approach applied by SPO. Neoliberal understanding began to cover also regional development. Also hegemony of the globalized capitalist system, EU regional development policies affected and directed this change. In place of centralized regional development policies and FYDPs, strategic plans, small regions and regional division in according to the NUTS (Nomenclature Units for Territorial Statistics) (In Turkish Statistical Region Units Classification) became on agenda. In place of 7 regions, in according to the SRUC (NUTS), country was taken in hand in 3 level regions grouping cities, provinces and regions in different groups.

Level-2 contains 26 regions with provinces groups with similar dynamics and characteristics.

Level-3 covers 81 regions depending on provincial boundaries.

To achieve the adjustment to The EU Regional Policies those were also done. The task of plan coordination was taken from SPO and this institution became Development Ministry. In place of SPO, Regional Development Agency (RDA / DA) was established in according to public law when it’s activities were regulated in according to the private commercial law. Mixed structure of DA is very foreign and new for Turkey’s public administration structure and tradition.

After the beginning of the 2000s, various DA was established and began to be active. They are around 30 agencies. They effort generally to develop social, cultural projects

to mobilize the local dynamics and actors to realize progressive climate in cities, provinces and regions. To take EU's financial supports are another target of DA. As a result, systemic national development policies and application give place to the private and local development efforts and markets.

4. Urbanization In Turkey

Definition of the city in Turkey depends on various criterion or standards; 1. Settlements with over 10.000 population – population criterion and 2. the centers of province and districts (town) - Administrative statu. The first standart is changeable throughout administrative periods. For example 10.000 population became 5.000 and 20.000 in different periods. With these assumptions, generally it is assumed that urbanization in Turkey began after World War II as a speed tendency. Before and during the 1940s urbanization was slow and there was not a powerfull urbanization tendency.

The years of 1950 experienced a speed and irregular urbanization as a result of a dependent industrialization. This speed continued along the 1960s and 1970s. It slowed down in the years of 1980s when a military regime emerged. As a result of brief knowledge, urban population increased from 7 milli. to 44 milli. as an increasing of nearly 6 times. Urbanization Rate in 1997 was 64. 6 %, it became in 2000 65.1 % and continued to increase during the 2000s. Consequently, urbanization in Turkey is higher than less developed countries' urbanization rates when it is lesser than developed countries'. Avarage urbanization speed also increased continuously. Political approach of governments supported the speed urbanization as a develoment tool. Number of city also increased continiously. In the 2000s it passed over 470. This increasing sourced from small towns with population over 10. 000. Some of them experienced sudden industrialization.

Avarage urban size increased because of the urban population increased rapidly than the number of city.

	Avarage size
– 1935	33.000
– 2000	88.000

If it is taken Turkey's urbanization in hand in according to the city sizes, cities may be grouped in 6 clusters. Each group has different growth speed;

1.Big Cities with population over 100. 000 (middle big). A large part of increasing urban population lives in these cities.

2.Cities with population 10.000 – 20. 000

3. “ “ “ 20. 000 – 50. 000

4. “ “ “ 50. 000 – 100. 000 (stagnant). Their shares in urban population are in a continious decreasing.

5. Cities with population 500. 000. Large cities with small cities surrounding.

6. Cities with over 1 million population – Metropoles – with rapid metropolitanization and metropolitan region. Also it may be said that they achieve an urban region, regional city or conurban with flows of labor, capital, services and products. They become a large urban areas over rural space. They have very complex matters and issues of definition, boundaries, administration and public services, like İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana.

Avarage speed of urbanization in Turkey is 5.5% per year. The most speed urbanization in middle-big cities due to regional mass migration like Adıyaman, Şanlıurfa,

Malatya, Van, Bingöl, Muş, Hakkari, Şırnak. In South East Anatolian Region, main fact is intra region migration. Some of them lived 100 % increasing. Speed growth of the biggest cities creates more complex problems in economic, social political/ administrative and cultural frames than the matters in the smaller cities. Geography of urbanization in Turkey is shaped by following factors; * Development differences of regions also effect the spatial distribution of big and small cities in Turkey. * Big and developed cities take place in the western part of the country. If it is drawn a line from Adana as a Mediterranean Sea city to Samsun at the north as a Black Sea city, this line separates the developed and undeveloped regions and cities. It may be said that urbanization is very high in all regions due to destructuring of the rural areas and traditional structures.

Reasons and factors of urbanization in Turkey may be taken in hand as pushing, transmissing and pulling factors or reasons.

PUSHING FACTORS (from rural areas and agriculture) are those; * Low productivity in agricultural production and village life, * Highness of disguised unemployment, low level income in agriculture, * Unjust distribution of land and income, high fragmentation of agricultural lands, * Late and weak mechanization and capitalization (entering of truck in 1950s), * When the majority of population earns livelihood from agriculture, they take continously decreasing shares from national income, * There are some traditional actors like agha (landowner), tenant usufruct, maraba, peasant without land and agricultural and seasonal worker.

These factors create mass migration from undeveloped rural areas to the center of the regions, big cities and also abroad.

TRANSMISSING FACTORS relating rural areas to urban are follows; * Development of transportation, highways and roads after the 1950s in spite of the railways, * Development of markets and marketing opportunities, * Increasing of numbers of types of vehicles, bus, trucks.

PULLING REASONS to urban areas are put as follows; * Industrial investment in the cities by the state in all periods untill the 1980s, * Legal regulations and support for industrialization by the state from the 1920s, * Planning for national development and industrialization by the state due to the weak and stagnant national and private capital accumulation, * Investments to three whites (sugar, flour and cloth) by the state to be sample for private sector, * Policy for creating Growth Poles and to create these poles, investments in towns by the state, * Giving importance to the small enterprises, * Development of industry and employment opportunities in cities after the end of 1950s, * Increasing of workers, emerging of classes of labor and capital. Trade unions emerged. * Social security regulations and institutions were created by the state, * Opportunities of health, education, cultural activities developed, * Service and construction sectors developed.

As the result of pushing-transmissing-pulling factors characteristics of urban in Turkey may be explained as follows; *A rapid, unhealthy and over/irregular urbanization, * Existence of large marginal sector, * High open and disguised unemployment (moving of disguised unemployment from rural areas to city), * Public sector as an employment door,

* Migration of capital and labor to city, dynamic and young population lost of rural areas, * Degeneration and radical changes of cultural, social assets, * Complex problems in traffic, parking, substructure, city transportation, bus-loaded (dolmuş-arabesque music-

lahmacun), * Small- selfemployed enterprises (underleader production), * Squatter and squatting surrounded the big cities like İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana.

In the Constitutions (1960 and 1982) some regulations and explanations took place about urbanization, development and relations among them. FYDPs took in hand urbanization as a tool of development. Some institutions focused on urbanization problem like ministries, the State Planning organization, Highway institution and similar state institutions. The Constitution 1982 limited the settlement freedom (migration) to realize the social-economic development and urbanization.

Urbanization was set up in FYDPs in Turkey;

1. FYDP – 1963 -1967= as it has not an open urbanization policy, it stresses the importance of optimum city size and investment in according to regional balance, proportion among urban growth and employment opportunities.
2. FYDP – 1968-1972= it has a clear urbanization policy. It supports urbanization as a tool and result of economic – social development and industrialization. It sees urbanization as a required fact and as a development focus. (In this period Turkey lived a mass migration toward foreign countries)
3. FYDP – 1973-1977= aimed at an urbanization in a balanced development all over the country.
4. FYDP – 1978-1983= gave importance to the role of metropolitan cities in the national development and importance to the viable healthy urbanization and to the protection of natural-historical environment.
5. FYDP – 1984-1988= saw the urbanization as a positive fact, stressed the good government for urbanization, gave importance to the specialization among cities with population 50. 000 – 500. 000.
6. FYDP – 1990-1994= stressed the same targets and importance of qualified – healthy living in urban areas, tried to decrease the problems of metropolitan cities, like problems of substructure, physical plan, land, transportation, employment, housing, education and health.
7. FYDP – 1996-2000= aimed at to decrease migration to the metropolitan cities and to develop middle cities as regional centers.
8. FYDP – 2001-2005= aimed at to develop the urban culture.
9. BYDP – 2007-2013= has no aim and policy about urbanization, has one discourse; to take measures to decrease the socio-cultural adjustment matters/problems emerging from intensive migration and irregular/speed urbanization.

As a result of these facts mentioned above in Turkey cities * Became large and chaotic settlement areas, * Had very crowded and heterogeneous population (with marginal sector) and heavy housing question, * Were surrounded mushrooms or squatters, * Had very large squatting areas and matters, * Due to these facts, had triple structure with modern, traditional and squatter areas and economic, social, political and cultural structures, * Experienced speed and disorder urbanization. In this composition Mushroom / Squatter is interesting and complex fact.

It is generally assumed that squatter emerged after the WWII in the un/less developed countries like Turkey, Latin American countries, India, Pasific and African countries who are poor and undeveloped countries without industry revolution and industrialization and industry society.

Squatter is an answer of an individual in a society to the housing problem that emerges from lack of housing investment or solution by public administration and private sector. Generally it is a house type which is made in a night over the lands belong to the state or private sector or individual person or institution without any permission, without any urbanization and technique rules and regulations and with materials collected from waste areas like papers, plastics, thin and similar.

They are named with different words; Turkey; Gecekondu (put in a night), Mexico; Jacale, Panama; Rancho, Brezilia; Macambo, Argentina; Favela, Tunusia; Gourbeville, Algeria; Casbah, Morocco; Bidonville, India; Bustees.

In Turkey, the state behaved flexible in against to the squatters during the 1940s. In this period squatters belonged to the owner who lived there. During the 1970s, the state changed approach about squatting and began to make some regulations to order and provide substructure facilities to the squatting areas. In this period, squatters for rent tended to increase. Mafioza organizations emerged in theirselves. Finally, squatters became planned and regular areas and objected widely by urban renewal or transformation in 2000s due to their land's high rent. Some squatting pictures may give supporting understanding.

4. Concluding Remarks

General characteristics, new regional development approach and organization and urbanization in Turkey during the 2000s show the results and implications of neo liberal structuring which became dominant in all of the world. These characteristics and facts are general un / less developed and developing countries like Mexico, India and similar. These are not good for societies and humans. Majority in the world during the 2000s experinces high levels of unemployment and housing question. There is important gaps in the income distribution and levels. Also it may be said that these may creates very strong riskies for the national development and globalized capitalis system.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Boratav, K. 2007. Türkiye İktisat Tarihi, 1908 – 2005. 11. Baskı, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara.
- [2]. Keleş, r. 2012. Yerinden Yönetim ve Siyaset. 12. Baskı, cem Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- [3]. Keleş, R. 2008. Kentleşme Politikası. 10. Baskı. İmge Kitabevi, Ankara.
- [4]. Keleş, R. 1983. 100 Soruda Türkiye’de Şehirleşme, Konut ve Gecekondu. 3. Baskı, Gerçek Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- [5]. Kepenek, Y. 1990. Türkiye Ekonomisi; Gelişimi, üretim yapısı ve Sorunlarıyla. 5. Baskı, Verso Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- [6]. Kongar, E. 1998. 21. Yüzyılda Türkiye; 2000li Yıllarda Türkiye’nin Toplumsal Yapısı. 2. Basım, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul.