

Urban-Rural Interrelationship and Issues in Turkey

Mehmet GUR, Volkan CAGDAS and Hülya DEMİR, Turkey

Key words: Urbanization, rural development, urban development, illegal construction.

SUMMARY

After the 80's, Turkey has gone into the progress of policies that give importance only the economical growth. Although, some development were realized with these policies, environmental and land usage problems in the rural areas and illegal, crooked and poorly settlements and pollution problems in the urban areas have been occurred.

In this paper, urban-rural interrelationship, problems and studies to solution in this development progression will be considered.

Urban-Rural Interrelationship and Issues in Turkey

Mehmet GÜR, Volkan CAGDAS and Hülya DEMİR, Turkey

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental reasons of the uncontrolled urbanization is economically and socially insufficient living conditions in rural areas. Providing a controlled urbanization depends on interacting urban and rural areas, in other words, balancing them. In this reason, the effectiveness of rural activities should go on, these activities should be diversified and the contribution to the national economics should be increased, agrarian sources and the rural environmental issues should be protected and they should be used reasonably, the people who live in rural areas should be brought together with social, cultural and technical substructures and facilities.

To this purpose in this paper, it will be dealt with the general attributes of rural and urban settlements in Turkey and suggestions will be made for good rural-urban interactions.

2. DEFINITONS AND CONCEPTS

Rural and urban settlements are the units that have different attributions and they do not have similar localities. These settlements have different lifestyles that have distinctive characteristics according to the economical and social activities and the relationship with the nature.

Rural areas are qualified according to density of rural functions. These functions are showed up in using of land, in style of production style, in professional structure, in the characteristics of rural area and in the magnetic field of the producer and the service society. Because hegemony of the rural functions means less urban functions at the same time, '*rural areas*' can be characterized as places that do not belong to urban areas (GUR 2001).

Urban settlements are the area where the activities about merchandizing, industry, laboring and management are ascendant. The size of the settlements qualified as city determined as 20.000 people by State Planning Institution (DPT). Below 20.000 populations is defined as rural areas. Criterions about sociology are used beside population and functional criterions in distinction of rural-urban settlement. Common attributes of the cities made by sociology are, certain population density, job sharing, professionalism and not to be homologous. On the other hand, in rural areas, job sharing is immature, economics depends on agriculture; neighborhood is closely, in this regard, they are settlements separated from the urban areas (KELES 1984).As a management point, places in the borderline of a certain administrative organization unit (municipality) is called urban area, places outside of that borderline is called villages. This definition is taken from the Municipalities Law, which is recognized in 1930.

3. RURAL AND URBAN RESIDENTIAL IN CONTEXT OF POPULATION BEHAVIOUR

Turkey is a developing country with an increasing population density. The population was 13,648,270 in 1927 where the first census was made. This number has reached to 67,844,903 in 2000 census. The data about the census can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Yearly increasing rates of the rural and urban areas and the ratios in the total population (DPT 2000)

Years	Total population (1000)	Rural population (1000)	Share (%)	Annual rate of increase (%)	Urban population (1000)	Share (%)	Annual rate of increase (%)
1927	13,648	10,342	75.8	-	3,306	24.2	-
1935	16,158	12,355	76.5	2.223	3,803	23.5	1.750
1940	17,821	13,475	75.6	1.734	4,346	24.4	2.672
1945	18,790	14,103	75.1	0.912	4,687	24.9	1.510
1950	20,947	15,703	75.0	2.149	5,244	25.0	2.247
1955	24,065	17,138	71.2	1.748	6,927	28.8	5.567
1960	27,755	18,895	68.1	1.953	8,860	31.9	4.921
1965	31,391	20,585	65.6	1.714	10,806	34.4	3.971
1970	35,605	21,914	61.5	1.251	13,691	38.5	4.733
1975	40,348	23,479	58.2	1.379	16,869	41.8	4.175
1980	44,737	25,092	56.1	1.329	19,645	43.9	3.047
1985	50,664	23,799	47.0	-1.058	26,866	53.0	6.261
1990	56,473	23,147	41.0	-0.556	33,326	59.0	4.310
2000	67.844	23.735	35.0	-	44.109	65.0	-

In Turkey, between 1950-1955 and 1980-1985, increase in population had a positive acceleration. While the acceleration of the rural areas that can be seen easily until 1960, it has slowed down after that time and after 1985, it became to its negative value. This means it started to decrease.

After progressing to the multiple political party systems, 1950-1955's are the years that some steps were taken, social and physical mobility was increased by the liberal economic applications, and agriculture was mechanized by putting tractors to country sides and instabilities were occurred in west part of the country and in Istanbul. After 1980's, the big changes in Turkey, employment potentiality and high payments in cities, draining the most of the funds to industry instead of agriculture, finding the educational and medical facilities advanced and security reasons are the most important reasons of the breaking point of rural and urban population (KONGAR 1999).

Approximately 24 million people in 75,631 rural areas consist of 35,014 villages and 40,617 sub-connections live in Turkey by the end of year 2000. When analyzing the urban population that started to increase after the second half of the 1980's, consequently the urbanization process, most of the urban population lives in 46 cities with a population of 100,000. According to census 2000 data, 24% of the total population lives in the three major cities and 67% of the population lives in cities.

As pointed out by KONGAR (1999), on the contrary of the developed countries, the urbanization process in Turkey is formed as an immigration phenomenon where city poorness is preferred to country destitution. This phenomenon cannot be seen as only a population behavior, it is an indicator of a social changing process where the urban-rural interaction cannot be made and it is created under economical, political, social and psychological factors. If urbanization is an indicator of development, immigration is such a negative concept. Productivity of the countryside gives new lifestyles to the people live in there, on the other hand, some people, who cannot shelter anymore, are detached from there. Increasing productivity underlies the urbanization, while decreasing income and according as inevitability underlies the immigration. Immigration phenomena give rise to important social and economical changes in the system and rapidly increasing investment needs of urban.

Increasing urbanization also needs social and technical infrastructures. Existing technical infrastructure equipment, which was not planned according to the increasing population, cannot satisfy the needs of the new coming population. We can count the most important problems for big cities as, traffic and communication problems, water problem, cost of living, cleaning, air pollution, unemployment and unsystematic structures.

Investors consider the closeness to the client numbers and labor numbers instead of closeness to the raw materials while choosing industrial places. As a result of this, industry became expanded in big cities and cities became more wanted. However, the employment potentiality of the cities is not enough for the immigrant population, so, this causes employment problems in economical aspects, causes people work in the marginal sections and causes unregistered employment (CAKILCIOGLU et al. 1997).

Another problem that shows up in cities is resident needs. 80% of the residential need is composed of the residential need of immigrant population. Immigration, which is increased in 1950's, to the cities from the villages, insufficient residential development and the low income of the immigrant population caused unregistered construction and shanty house problems. Shanty house are barrack-style constructions that immigrant people construct to the public lands in one night and settle in it-named by this situation- and they are usually constructed as one-Decker with a small garden around it. In order to solve shanty house issues, 16 development amnesty codes have been put into effect, however, unregistered constructions and illegal urbanization have not been prevented. These legal arrangements provide legality to shanty house by the government and municipalities because of the political and social reasons (DEMIREL et al. 2003). Especially after 1970's, it is seen that the number of shanty houses in cities and the number of population living in there have been accelerated positively (See Table 2).

Table 2: Shanty house and population of slum-houses by years

Years	1955	1960	1965	1970	1980	1990	1995
The number of shanty house	50,000	240,000	430,000	600,000	1,150,000	1,750,000	2,000,000
The population of shanty resident	250,000	1,200,000	21,50,000	3,000,000	5,750,000	8,750,000	10,000,000

The environmental problems caused by the infrastructure equipments that cannot supply the needs of the industry and increasing number of population, annihilates the aesthetic worthiness, also pulls down-especially psychologically- the people who live in big cities. The greenbelts in cities also cleared away by the effect of restraint groups and these greenbelts became insufficient in time. Environmental problems caused by the uncontrolled constructions are one of the most important problems of the habitability of the cities (CAKILCIOGLU et al. 1997).

Additionally, urban disharmony, unhealthy environment, the increase in organizational crimes and urban violence, the increase in number of street urchin and women problems show up caused by the poorness of the city.

4. THE BASIC FACTOR BEHIND URBANIZATION: RURAL AREAS

Agricultural sector in Turkey, have big potential in economics by providing the essential nutriment needs, causing demand for industrial products and contribution to the national income and exportation (GUR 2001). In Turkey, the main structure of the agricultural sector can be summarized by some statistics as: According to the 2001 General Agricultural Census, there are 3,075 millions of agricultural enterprises in Turkey. In 67.42% of these enterprises, both herbal production and farming animals, in 30.22% of them only herbs and in 2.36% of them only farming animals is made. The lands owned by these enterprises; 66.47% is arable field, 14.85% is fallow, 9.79% is fruits and other durable plants, 2.01% is vegetables and flower gardens, 2.30% is meadow, 2.54% is not used although suitable for farming, 0.73% is cattle ranch, 0.51% is small forest and sylvan (brushwood and lemur is included) and 0.80% is unsuitable for agricultural producing.

On the other hand, the unproductiveness of the agricultural activities and the low income of the farming are some of the facts that cause the immigration from the countryside. In our country, the rate of agricultural sector in the Gross National Product (GNP) is starting to decrease in time. When analyzing this ratio between the years 1980-2001, it took its maximum value at 25.79% and after 1980 it started to bearish (Table 3). Although the ratio of agriculture has a tendency of decreasing, important number of people of the population still works in this sector. For example, although the agricultural share in the GNP is 14% in 2001, agricultural employment ratio in the total employment ratio is about 30%. When comparing the employment potentiality of the cities, which is one of the reasons of the attractiveness of cities, and the GNP on one person depending on this with the agricultural income, it can be seen that the latter is much lower (Table 3 and Table 4). The unproductiveness of the agricultural sector can be seen by the import and export statistics. For example, in 1980

agricultural import was 0.64%, however in 2000's it increased to a value of 5.21 % and the exportation of the agricultural products have decreased to 7% from 57.46 % at that time.

Table 3: Gross national product and national income for one person (DIE 2001)

Years	Total GNP (billion dollar)	The Share of Agricultural Sector in GNP (billion dollar)	The Share of Agricultural Sector in GNP (%)	Per capita quota in Agricultural Sector (dollar)
1980	59,418	15,323	25.79%	611
1985	61,586	12,039	19.55%	506
1990	152,306	23,303	15.30%	1,007
1995	171,841	25,776	15.00%	1,146
1996	184,608	28,060	15.20%	1,255
1997	194,094	29,114	15.00%	1,323
1998	203,868	30,580	15.00%	1,384
1999	199,980	27,597	13.80%	1,257
2000	218,073	30,530	14.00%	1,400
2001	147,062	20,589	14.00%	980

Table 4: Gross national product and the growth rate of the sectors (DIE 2001)

Years	Agriculture	Industry	Services	GNP
1993	-1.3	+8.2	+10.7	+8.1
1994	-0.7	-5.7	-6.6	-6.1
1995	+2.0	+12.1	+6.3	+8.0
1996	+4.4	+7.1	+7.6	+7.1
1997	-2.3	+10.4	+8.6	+8.3
1998	+8.4	+2.0	+2.4	+3.9
1999	-5.0	-5.0	-4.5	-6.1
2000	+3.9	+6.0	+8.9	+6.3
2001	-6.1	-7.5	-7.6	-9.4

In rural area the unequal distribution of the lands is another reason for farmers to immigrate. Most of the agricultural enterprises (88%) can work on the 48% of the farmable lands. According to the 2001 General Agricultural Census, average size of the enterprises, minimum 11,51 hectares, maximum 194,85 hectares and average 61,01 hectares around Turkey. In addition to the unequal distribution shown in the Table 5, subdividing the land to very small pieces after the death of the landowner between the rests of the family is one of the fundamental reasons of the immigration from rural areas. The land of the 61% of the farmers consists of four or more pieces.

Table 5: Ownership distribution in rural areas (KONGAR 1999)

Agricultural enterprises	Number	Percent	Greatness (ha)	Percent
Unpossessed enterprises	308,899	8.7	-	-
Small enterprises that all rented	104,347	2.9	-	-
0-1 hektares	744,195	22.0	2,418,935	8.6
1-5 hektares	1,358,093	38.8	5,375,884	19.2
10-15 hektares	391,478	11.1	9,881,670	36.4
50- hektares	15,352	0.5	4,352,501	36.4

Mechanizing the agricultural production is another factor lying under the immigration to cities. In mechanized agriculture, number of the trucks and the share of the lands cultivated by them of the lands increase every day in the total number. Especially in the years after the Second World War, many trucks have been entered to Turkey. The truck number in 1992 was 723,000 while it was 31,145 in 1952. Widely inlet of the trucks to the farming means that machines will be used instead of manpower in time. This situation causes excess work force in farming section. The tendency of increase in mechanizing executes that more agrarian labors will be pushed to other sectors (KELES 1997). Reaching to the limits of cultivable lands is another factor for immigration to cities. In this reason, there is no chance of using new lands. So, there is no other chance for the unemployed labors to immigrate to cities (KONGAR 1999).

Although the basic factors underlie the immigration to cities seems as the inconvenient living conditions, the attractiveness of the cities has important functions about immigration.

For example, according to the statistics of year 2001, the ratio of the agricultural sector in the GNP is 14%; on the other hand, the ratio of industry is about 26%. As KONGAR (1999) stated that, this situation can show that the income of one person who live in cities doubles the income of a person who live in country. In this reason, the high salaries in cities and employment potentialities are the factors in the first instance.

Secondly the facilities about education and health possibilities in cities can be pointed out. For example according to the 2001 statistics of Ministry of Health, there are 713, which mean 12%, village clinic with no doctors in our country. The number of private asylum with no obstetrician is 7,987. The condition of education can be expressed by these statistics: 44% of the total 51,600 schools are located in cities and 56% is in villages. However, 14% of the secondary schools and high schools located in villages. The basic reason that underlies the inefficient technical infrastructures is the settlements are located in the topography of 0-1800 meters. Nevertheless, the potentiality and the quality of education, health and technical infrastructure of our cities are much more advanced than the rural areas with no comparison (KONGAR 1999).

In Turkey there have been no land usage plans for the usage of the land embracing all of the rural facilities. Different institutions and corporations have made researching and planning

for the usage of the land involving their special usage targets. In our country by passing to a planned period since 1963, some different approaches have been developed in regional and local means in order to solve the rural problems. Some of them have been applied partially and some of them had no application at all. The main approaches are arranged as:

- Sample villages (1961-1965),
- Versatile planning of rural areas (1965-1967),
- The approach of development of the society (1963-1967, 1968-1972)
- Centric villages (1973-1977, 2000-),
- The approach of village-cities and rural cities (1970-1980, 2000-),
- Integrated rural development projects (1973 and after),
- Sustainable development approach (1994 and after).

One of the primer reasons of the poorness in Turkey is the difference between regions (Table 6). These differences, caused by the instability of the income has been effected the urbanization process in different intensions in different regions. The Aegean and the Marmara regions are urbanized as a European country level; the other regions are underdeveloped in point of urbanization.

Table 6: The gross national product in regions by sectors (in 1997)

<i>Regions</i>	<i>The distribution of GNP according to sectores</i>			<i>Growth rate (1987-1997)</i>		
	<i>Agriculture</i>	<i>Industry</i>	<i>Services</i>	<i>Agriculture</i>	<i>Industry</i>	<i>Services</i>
The Marmara	13.6	51.8	36.9	-0.3	+6.3	+4.8
The Southeast Anatolia	11.7	4.1	4.5	+5.2	+5.0	+3.6
The Mediterranean	18.0	8.7	12.5	+2.5	+3.6	+5.3
The Aegean	20.4	15.2	16.7	+1.2	+4.6	+5.2
The Central Anatolia	15.6	10.6	17.7	-0.2	+6.1	+3.3
The Black Sea Region	14.5	7.3	8.6	+0.1	+4.4	+4.1
East Anatolia	6.3	2.2	3.1	+0.7	+3.1	+2.1
Turkey	100	100	100	+1.2	+5.5	+4.4

In our country, the government, which is the determinative power of the economical and social life since the constitution of the Republic until the 1980's, has been limited and minimized after 1980's and the economical mechanism has been abandoned to market powers. The Government Planning Institution (DPT) is a product of the planned development approach of the 1960 period. The threesome consist of DPT, Ministry of Industry and Turkey Bourse and Chamber Institution (TOBB), that canalizes the economical planning approach and the mechanism of the source disposition, has lost the functions and has been slipped. Some semi-political, semi-technical corporations, figured in the management and politics, have been slided to the political field as organizational structure and/or functionally and in addition to TOBB some of the force groups of the private capital started to effect government

and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TUREL 1994). Today, the result of sharing the profits by political judgments have been came in view. This situation quickened the tendency of the force groups with aboriginal and foreigner capital choosing the lands according to the places with substructure, market and qualified manpower; on the other hand it gave raise to the instability of the regions.

In the application of the regional planning in our country, the development planning connections cannot be made efficiently and it is not based on the source analysis for location. By connecting the inducements with the reconstruction planning, making the coordination between the institutions will provide a reconstruction with urban-rural interaction that can be long lasting.

Today, the planning system does not work right because superior scaled plans except the city planning cannot be prepared according to the appropriate planning discipline. As a result of the corrosion of planning principles, which is supported by the social state principle of the Turkish Constitution, the unity of the plans can be failed and environmental and cultural worthiness cannot be protected.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In rural development, the problems caused by the multitude and the disorganization of the rural settlements are trying to be solved by the centric village approach, which have been applied again since 2000. In centric village approach, an appropriate village is chosen and all the investments about health, education and service are collected in this village in order to make this village as an attractive center for the villages around it. In this way, all investments are optimized and the surrounding villages can take advantage of these facilities.

The workings on the disparity of the regions are also going on in full career. The Southeast Anatolian Project (GAP) consist of nine cities and sub-settlements, is transformed into a regional development project including the basic principles as subscribing, environmental protection, deployment, locality planning, developing infrastructure. In addition to this, by the help of international association regional development plans have been made and partially started to apply to The East Anatolia and The Black Sea regions. These regional development projects are applied in coordination with the central village approach.

Solving the irregular and uncontrolled urbanization problems are primarily connected to superior scaled plans where the urban-rural interaction is good balanced. Habitable, sustainable settlements are oriented by reconstruction plans and investment programs. In order to make these plans and programs real, country sources should be researched and the connections between the economical and physical data should be executed. In this reason, the development plans and the investment programs should be assisted by regional plans or they should be improved with the regional planning decisions.

In order to provide the urban-rural interaction healthily and to keep going in rural areas; i) production, working and living conditions should be made better, ii) natural, environmental and pastoral view should be protected, iii) immigration should get under control, iv) social

culture should be protected, v) reconstruction under special conditions of Turkey should be made. The cities, the other part of the interaction, should be reshaped that enable a sustainable reconstruction by an integrated planning with principles. In context to this, the sustainable settlements and residential i) should be appropriate for the scientific, technical, cultural, planning and regional requirements, ii) should be sensitive for protecting the natural, historical and cultural precincts, iii) should be endurable for the disasters, iv) the analysis and participation process should work right, the planning should be stayed up by updated and reliable data before the planning decisions, to make quality of life much better (DEMIREL et al. 2003).

REFERENCES

- Cakilcioglu N., Tekkokoglu E. T., Cebeci F., Cakilcioglu M.: İki Binli Yillarda Yerel Yonetimler ve Sehirici Ulasim, Sorunlar ve Cozum Yollari. <http://basarm.com.tr/yayin/malihukuk/ikibinliyillar/>, July 2003.
- Demirel Z., Aclar A., Demir H., Gur M., Kurt V., Cagdas V.: Toprak Duzenlemelerinde Yeni Gelistmeler ve Yapilanmalar. 9.Turkiye Harita Bilimsel ve Teknik Kurultayi, 31 Mart-04 Nisan 2003, Sayfa: 145-169, Ankara, 2003.
- Gur M.: Turkiye Kosullarinda Kirsal Toprak ve Yerlesim Duzenlemelerine Genel Yaklasim. Yuksek Lisans Tezi, Yildiz Teknik Universitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitusu, Istanbul, 2001.
- Keles R.: Kentlesme ve Konut Politikasi. Ankara Universitesi, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakultesi Yayinlari, Sayi: 540, Ankara, 1984.
- Keles R.: Kentlesme Politikasi, Imge Yayınevi, 4.Baski, ISBN 975-533-053-4, Ankara, 1997
- Kongar E.: 21.Yuzyilda Turkiye ve Gercekleri. Remzi Kitapevi, 21.Basim, ISBN 975-14-0624-2, Istanbul.
- Turel O., Ekonomik Istikrar Programlarına Genel Bir Bakis Icinde Turkiye’de ve Dunyada Yasanan Ekonomik Bunalim. Yurt Yayınevi, Ankara, 1994.
- 2001 Yılı Genel Tarım Sayımı. Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü (DİE), Ankara, 2001, www.die.gov.tr.

CONTACTS

Mehmet Gur
Yildiz Technical University,
Civil Engineering Faculty,
Department of Geodesy and Photogrammetry Engineering
Yildiz Main Campus,
34349, Besiktas
Istanbul
TURKEY
Tel. + 90 212 259 70 70
Fax + 90 212 261 07 67
E-mail: gur@yildiz.edu.tr
Web site: <http://www.tyd.yildiz.edu.tr/>