

A CRITICAL APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT  
OF PROVINCES IN THE TURKISH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ALİ ŞAHİN AKTAN

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

DECEMBER 2006

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.

---

Prof. Dr. A. Şinasi AKSOY  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Melih ERSOY (METU,CRP) \_\_\_\_\_

Prof. Dr. A. Şinasi AKSOY (METU, ADM) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Tarık ŞENGÜL (METU, ADM) \_\_\_\_\_

**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.**

Name, Last name : Ali Şahin AKTAN

Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **A CRITICAL APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVINCES IN THE TURKISH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM**

**AKTAN, Ali Şahin**

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

**Supervisor: Prof. Dr. A. Şinasi AKSOY**

**December 2006, 158 pages**

The establishment of new provinces, as administrative divisions of central government, is based on the criteria and principles stated in the Constitution and the Provincial Administration Act numbered 5442. It is argued that the principles in the legislation are not sufficient and objective for establishing provinces. The number of the provinces began to increase after the multiparty period, dated 1946, and gained momentum after 1980s. The aim of this thesis is to explore the justification of the establishment of new provinces: Were they established in conformity with the legislation? Or established with political concerns? In this respect, the last 14 provinces, established after 1980s, are analyzed as a case study.

**Keywords: Province, Provincial Division/System**

## ÖZ

### TÜRK KAMU YÖNETİMİ SİSTEMİNDEKİ YENİ İL KURULMASI UYGULAMASINA ELEŞTİREL BİR YAKLAŞIM

AKTAN, Ali Şahin

Yüksek Lisans, Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. A. Şinasi AKSOY

Aralık 2006, 158 sayfa

Ülkemizde, merkezi idare kuruluşundan biri olarak yeni illerin kurulması, Anayasa’da ve 5442 sayılı İl İdaresi Kanunu’nda belirtilen hükümlere bağlanmıştır. Mevzuattaki bu hükümlerin yetersizliği ve objektif kriterlere dayanmadığı tartışılmalı bir konudur. Öte yandan, idari coğrafyamızda, il sayısı 1946 yılında çok partili dönemden sonra artmaya başlamış ve bu artış 1980’lerden sonra ivme kazanmıştır. Bu tezin amacı, illerin kurulma gerekçelerini ortaya koyarak, bunların mevzuata uygun kurulup kurulmadığı veya politik sebeplerle mi il yapıldığı araştırılacaktır. Bu bağlamda, tez kapsamında alan çalışması olarak, 1980’den sonra kurulmuş olan 14 adet ilimiz incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İl, İl Kademesi/Sistemi

To My Dear Family  
&  
To the memory of my grandmother and grandfather  
Şevkiye&Ali TURUNÇ

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. A. Şinasi AKSOY for his guidance and insights during the preparation of the thesis. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Melih ERSOY and Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Tarık ŞENGÜL for their advice and suggestions throughout the research. Without their comments and guidance, it would be hard to develop and complete this study.

My special thanks go to my teachers from IZTECH, especially to Prof. Dr. Semahat ÖZDEMİR. I also would like to thank my dear teacher Ziyne KAKOÇLAR. Thank you for your teachingS and insights.

I would like to thank the staff of the Ministry of Interior and TBMM Library for their helps and guidance. Without their helps, it would not be easy to find and gather all TBMM Assembly Minutes and the other related official documents.

I also would like to thank Ayşe Kavuncu, Cenap Yoloğlu, Emek Ataman, Gülçin Tunç, Osman Balaban, Sezin Demşek, Yasemin İlkay for their helps and supports.

I offer my thanks to Füsün Taşkınsu and her colleagues in İller Bank, Ahmet Avşar Şimşek, Birgül Süer, Elmas Gürsoy, Erol Yeniler, Mesut Özeltin, who I met in 2002 during my internship. Thank you for your supports and friendships.

I would also like to thank my dear friends, especially Feryal and Yücel, and ‘Zeynep abla’, who were always with me during times of despair. Also, I offer thanks to my friends from the same program; Barış, Evrim, Eylem, Gökhan, Hade, Nihan, and Seçil. Thank you all for your friendships.

I am a lucky person to have wonderful friends, Aras (a(r+s)), Atakan, Ekrem, İbrahim, Mustafa, Turgay (TTT), Yiğit (yiiiit). Their presence in my life is so special. Without their presence, their moral supports, it would be hard to overcome such a diffucult period. Fortunately, I had three months to complete the corrections.

My special thanks go to my friend Kürşat and his family, who always open their home and their hearts to me and behave me as a member of their family. I know that I have a family and a home in Ankara. Thank you for everything.

I offer my sincere thanks to my family who always supported me throughout my life. They always supported me in all my decisions and all my hard times. I offer my deepest love to you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                          |      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| PLAGIARISM.....                                                                          | iii  |
| ABSTRACT .....                                                                           | iv   |
| ÖZ.....                                                                                  | v    |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....                                                                     | vii  |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....                                                                  | ix   |
| LIST OF TABLES.....                                                                      | xii  |
| LIST OF FIGURES .....                                                                    | xiii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....                                                              | xiv  |
| CHAPTER                                                                                  |      |
| 1. INTRODUCTION .....                                                                    | 1    |
| 2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....                                                           | 4    |
| 2.1. Ottoman Empire Period.....                                                          | 4    |
| 2.1.1. From the Establishment of the Empire to Tanzimat .....                            | 5    |
| 2.1.2. Tanzimat Period.....                                                              | 6    |
| 2.1.3. Constitutional Monarchy Period.....                                               | 12   |
| 2.2. Turkish Republican Period.....                                                      | 14   |
| 2.2.1. The 1921 Constitution.....                                                        | 15   |
| 2.2.1.1. Repeal of Sancak Units .....                                                    | 16   |
| 2.2.1.2. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after<br>1921 Constitution ..... | 17   |
| 2.2.2. The 1924 Constitution.....                                                        | 17   |
| 2.2.2.1. Provincial Administration Act dated 1929 and numbered 1426.....                 | 18   |
| 2.2.2.2. Provincial Administration Act dated 1949 and numbered 5442 .....                | 19   |
| 2.2.2.3. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after<br>1924 Constitution ..... | 21   |
| 2.2.3. The 1961 Constitution.....                                                        | 26   |
| 2.2.3.1. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after<br>1961 Constitution ..... | 28   |
| 2.2.4. The 1982 Constitution.....                                                        | 28   |
| 2.2.4.1. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after<br>1982 Constitution ..... | 29   |
| 3. THE TRANSFORMATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION OF CENTRAL<br>GOVERNMENT .....          | 31   |
| 3.1. Criteria of Establishing a Province.....                                            | 31   |
| 3.1.1. Legal Basis .....                                                                 | 31   |
| 3.1.1.1. Constitution.....                                                               | 31   |
| 3.1.1.2. Provincial Administration Act .....                                             | 32   |
| 3.1.1.3. Decree Having Force of Law .....                                                | 32   |
| 3.1.2. Bureaucratic Process.....                                                         | 33   |
| 3.1.2.1. Provisions in Ministry of the Interior.....                                     | 33   |

|                                                                                                                         |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3.1.2.2. Decision Process in Legislative Body.....                                                                      | 33  |
| 3.2. The Views and Attitudes of Governments Regarding the Forming the<br>Provincial Administration Division .....       | 35  |
| 4. ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM EFFORTS IN TURKEY FROM THE<br>PERSPECTIVE OF PROVINCE ADMINISTRATION .....                     | 38  |
| 4.1. Five-Year Development Plans.....                                                                                   | 38  |
| 4.2. Reform Efforts before the Development Plans .....                                                                  | 41  |
| 4.2.1. A Survey on Governors carried out by the Ministry of the Interior in 1945                                        | 41  |
| 4.2.2. A Report on Provincial Administration Act numbered 5442 .....                                                    | 41  |
| 4.2.3. A Report by the Administrative Division Board .....                                                              | 41  |
| 4.2.4. A Research Project on Central Government Organization (MEHTAP) .....                                             | 43  |
| 4.3. Reform Efforts after the Development Plans .....                                                                   | 45  |
| 4.3.1. A Research on the Provincial Organization of the Central Administration                                          | 45  |
| 4.3.2. A Research on the Provincial General Administration.....                                                         | 46  |
| 4.3.3. A Report on the Reorganization of the Administration-Principles and<br>Proposals.....                            | 48  |
| 4.3.4. A Research on the Public Administration (KAYA) .....                                                             | 48  |
| 4.3.5. A Research on the Reorganization of the Provincial Administration<br>Divisions of Turkey .....                   | 50  |
| 4.3.6. A Report on Determining the Formation Criteria of Provinces, Sub-<br>provinces, Metropolitan Municipalities..... | 51  |
| 5. CASE STUDY: THE LAST 14 PROVINCES.....                                                                               | 54  |
| 5.1. Introduction .....                                                                                                 | 54  |
| 5.2. Methodology .....                                                                                                  | 55  |
| 5.3. The Discussion Process of the Related Laws in TBMM General Assembly .....                                          | 57  |
| 5.3.1. Aksaray (68), Bayburt (69), Karaman (70), Kırıkkale (71) .....                                                   | 57  |
| 5.3.1.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly.....                                                | 58  |
| 5.1.2. Batman (72), Şırnak (73).....                                                                                    | 65  |
| 5.1.2.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly.....                                                | 65  |
| 5.1.3. Bartın (74) .....                                                                                                | 72  |
| 5.1.3.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly.....                                                | 73  |
| 5.1.4. Ardahan (75), Iğdır (76).....                                                                                    | 78  |
| 5.1.4.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly.....                                                | 79  |
| 5.1.5. Yalova (77), Karabük (78), Kilis (79).....                                                                       | 80  |
| 5.1.5.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly.....                                                | 81  |
| 5.1.6. Osmaniye (80) .....                                                                                              | 93  |
| 5.1.6.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly.....                                                | 94  |
| 5.1.7. Düzce (81) .....                                                                                                 | 106 |
| 5.4. The Comparison of the Last 14 Provinces .....                                                                      | 108 |
| 5.4.1. The Determination of the Criteria for Comparing the Last 14 Provinces.                                           | 108 |
| 5.4.2. The Evaluation of the Collected Data .....                                                                       | 110 |
| 5.4.2.1. Population .....                                                                                               | 110 |
| 5.4.2.2. Geographical Structure.....                                                                                    | 112 |
| 5.4.2.3. Infrastructure .....                                                                                           | 115 |
| 5.4.2.3.1. Educational Services .....                                                                                   | 115 |
| 5.4.2.3.2. Health Services .....                                                                                        | 116 |
| 5.4.2.3.3. Justice Services .....                                                                                       | 118 |
| 5.4.2.4. Economic Conditions .....                                                                                      | 119 |

|                                                           |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 5.4.2.4.1. Contribute to the Gross National Product ..... | 120 |
| 5.4.2.4.2. The Development Level of the Industry .....    | 124 |
| 5.4.2.5. Lower Level Units.....                           | 127 |
| 5.4.2.6. Special Conditions .....                         | 128 |
| 5.4.3. Conclusion.....                                    | 129 |
| 6. CONCLUSION .....                                       | 131 |
| REFERENCES .....                                          | 137 |
| APPENDICES .....                                          | 142 |
| APPENDIX A.....                                           | 143 |
| APPENDIX B.....                                           | 144 |
| APPENDIX C.....                                           | 145 |
| APPENDIX D.....                                           | 146 |
| APPENDIX E .....                                          | 147 |
| APPENDIX F .....                                          | 150 |
| APPENDIX G.....                                           | 158 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 1. The Dates of the Last Established 14 Provinces with Law Numbers.....                                                       | 54  |
| Table 2. The Criteria for Forming Provinces .....                                                                                   | 55  |
| Table 3. The Central and Total Populations and the Five-Year Growth Rates of<br>Population of the Provinces .....                   | 111 |
| Table 4. The Ranked Values of the Population .....                                                                                  | 111 |
| Table 5. The Geographical Structures of the Provinces .....                                                                         | 112 |
| Table 6. The Qualifications of the Transportation.....                                                                              | 113 |
| Table 7. The Ranked Values of Transportation.....                                                                                   | 114 |
| Table 8. The Ranked Values of Geographical Structure .....                                                                          | 114 |
| Table 9. The Number of Schools.....                                                                                                 | 116 |
| Table 10. The Ranked Values of Educational Services.....                                                                            | 116 |
| Table 11. The Number of Out-Patient and In-Patient Institutions.....                                                                | 117 |
| Table 12. The Ranked Values of the Health Services .....                                                                            | 118 |
| Table 13. The Types of Courts .....                                                                                                 | 118 |
| Table 14. The Ranked Values of Infrastructure.....                                                                                  | 119 |
| Table 15. The Average Dollar Rates of the Related Years.....                                                                        | 120 |
| Table 16. The GNP Prices of Agriculture and their Ranked Values.....                                                                | 121 |
| Table 17. The GNP Prices of Industry and their Ranked Values .....                                                                  | 121 |
| Table 18. The GNP Prices of Services and their Ranked Values.....                                                                   | 122 |
| Table 19. Contribute to the Gross National Product of the Provinces by kind of the<br>Economic Activity .....                       | 123 |
| Table 20. The Ranked Values of the Contribute to the Gross National Product.....                                                    | 123 |
| Table 21. The Value Added and their Ranked Values .....                                                                             | 124 |
| Table 22. The Total Income and their Ranked Values .....                                                                            | 125 |
| Table 23. The Indicators of the Development Level of the Industry.....                                                              | 125 |
| Table 24. The Ranked Values of the Development Level of the Industry .....                                                          | 126 |
| Table 25. The Ranked Values of the Economic Conditions.....                                                                         | 126 |
| Table 26. The Number of the Lower Level Units .....                                                                                 | 127 |
| Table 27. The Ranked Values of the Lower Level Units .....                                                                          | 128 |
| Table 28. The Number of the Priority Areas for Development and the Classes of the<br>Sub-Provinces .....                            | 128 |
| Table 29. The Ranked Values of the Special Conditions .....                                                                         | 129 |
| Table 30. The Pivot Table .....                                                                                                     | 130 |
| Table 31. The Evolution Process of the Field Units of Central Administration<br>throughout the History .....                        | 143 |
| Table 32. The Process of the Province Divisions of Turkey .....                                                                     | 146 |
| Table 33. The General and the Article Grounds of Forming the Last 14 Provinces<br>stated in the Laws and Legislative Proposals..... | 147 |
| Table 34. Legislative Proposals Regarding Forming Provinces and Sub-Provinces.....                                                  | 150 |
| Table 35. Information Procurement Application Form (for Real Individuals) .....                                                     | 158 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|                                                                           |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 1. The Map of Great Expansion Period of the Ottoman Empire .....   | 5   |
| Figure 2. The Total Average Values of the 14 Provinces .....              | 130 |
| Figure 3. The Provincial Division Map of the Ottoman Empire in 1913 ..... | 144 |
| Figure 4. The Present Provincial Division of Turkey .....                 | 145 |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|               |                                                                                                               |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DPT</b>    | : State Planning Organization (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı)                                                     |
| <b>TBMM</b>   | : Turkish Grand National Assembly (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi)                                              |
| <b>TODAİE</b> | : Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East (Türkiye ve Ortadoğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü) |
| <b>TÜİK</b>   | : Turkish Statistical Institute (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu)                                                   |
| <b>BYKP</b>   | : Five-Year Development Plan (Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı)                                                      |
| <b>KHK</b>    | : Decree Having Force of Law (Kanun Hükmünde Kararname)                                                       |
| <b>AKP</b>    | : Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi)                                                  |
| <b>ANAP</b>   | : Motherland Party (Anavatan Partisi)                                                                         |
| <b>AP</b>     | : Justice Party (Adalet Partisi)                                                                              |
| <b>BBP</b>    | : Great Unity Party (Büyük Birlik Partisi)                                                                    |
| <b>CHP</b>    | : Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi)                                                         |
| <b>DYP</b>    | : The True Path Party (Doğru Yol Partisi)                                                                     |
| <b>DSP</b>    | : Democratic Left Party (Demokratik Sol Parti)                                                                |
| <b>DP</b>     | : Demokrat Parti (Demokratik Parti)                                                                           |
| <b>FP</b>     | : Virtue Party (Fazilet Partisi - FP)                                                                         |
| <b>MÇP</b>    | : Nationalistic Study Party (Milliyetçi Çalışma Partisi - MÇP)                                                |
| <b>MHP</b>    | : Nationalist Movement Party (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi - MHP)                                               |
| <b>ÖDP</b>    | : Freedom and Solidarity Party (Özgürlük ve Dayanışma Partisi)                                                |
| <b>RP</b>     | : Welfare Party (Refah Partisi)                                                                               |
| <b>SHP</b>    | : Social Democrat People's Party (Sosyal Demokrat Halkçı Parti - SHP)                                         |
| <b>SODEP</b>  | : Social Democracy Party (Sosyal Demokrasi Partisi - SODEP)                                                   |
| <b>YTP</b>    | : New Turkey Party (Yeni Türkiye Partisi)                                                                     |

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The provincial system, which is the basis of the field organization of central administration, has evolved through different phases since the beginning of the formation of the Ottoman Empire to date.

This system was inaugurated in 1864 as a pilot project in Tuna province with “Tuna Province Regulations”, which was inspired by the centralized French provincial administration. After one and half decade of experiment, it was implemented in the whole country. At first, the units of the administrative division had been “eyalet”, sancak which was the main unit of the central government, liva (autonomous sancak - mutasarrıflık), kaza and karye. With the 1864 regulations, the administrative units of the Ottoman Empire became province (vilayet), sancak/liva, kaza and karye.

Essentially, the establishment of this provincial system came as a result of reform movements starting with the Tanzimat Edict of 1839. But with the Tuna Province Regulations proclaimed in 1864, the foundations of Turkish provincial administration were established.

Although the names of the main administrative units were the same, the boundaries of them were different. The provinces of Ottoman Empire were larger than today’s provinces. The boundaries of the most province units overlap with the sancak and liva units of Ottoman Empire.

In 1920, there were 15 provinces (vilayet) with 53 sancak/liva units. With the 1921 Constitution, sancak/liva units were put together into a form of the province. Then, the country was divided into 74 provinces.

After the founding of the Turkish Republic, the 1924 Constitution made no alterations about the form of the provincial administrative division; on the contrary, it acknowledged the criteria for establishing the provincial units, which were stated to be geographic and economic factors.

In 1926, the number of provinces decreased from 74 to 63, with transforming the eleven provinces into sub-provinces, the number of provinces continued to decrease from the foundation of the Turkish Republic until 1936. However, the change made in 1936 was made up of forming five provinces, three of which had been made sub-province before. In 1939, the number increased to 63 with the annexation of Hatay to Turkey.

With the beginning of the multiparty system, the number of provinces increased again in 1954 and in 1957, with one exception. After the 1954 elections, Kırşehir was made sub-province. It has been claimed that it was a punishment for this province that did not vote for Demokrat Parti, as a result of this, Kırşehir was demoted down to a sub-province and made subordinate to Nevşehir province. However, in 1957, Kırşehir was made province once again. It can be easily said that political considerations began to play an important role in forming new provinces with the transition to the multiparty system.

There have been no significant changes in the number of provinces between 1957 and 1989. Nevertheless, after the multiparty system, there were more than one hundred sub-provinces, which demanded to become a provincial center. As the 1960 elections neared, more and more promises regarding the realization of these demands were made by the party leaders, but this issue did not come to the agenda in Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (TBMM - Turkish Grand National Assembly). As a result, the number of provinces continued to remain 67 until 1989.

Only the number of sub-provinces increased in this period by transforming districts into sub-provinces. In 1957, the numbers of sub-provinces were 570 and of districts were 930. Later on, these numbers were 696 and 793, respectively.

The number of the provinces began to increase after the multiparty period, dated 1946, and gained momentum after 1980s. In 1989, this number became 71, with the establishment of four provinces, and it continued to increase rapidly. In the years 1990,

1991, 1992, 1995, 1996, and lastly in 1999, fourteen provinces were added, so today, there are in total 81 provinces in Turkey. By considering the ambiguity of the criteria defined in the Constitution and the laws for setting up new provinces, this number for a ten-year period is thought provoking.

The aim of this thesis is to examine two things. The first one is to evaluate the sufficiency of the criteria for forming new provinces as stated in the Constitution and in Provincial Administration Act dated 1949 and numbered 5442. The second one is to examine the legal grounds of newly formed provinces to find out whether they were established in conformity with the legislation or they were established with political considerations. In examining the reform efforts made in the Turkish administration from the perspective of forming a province, the origin of the provincial system, accordingly, the amendments made in the Constitutions and the related laws, also the views and attitudes of both governments and political parties will be discussed.

For this purpose, in the following chapter, the historical background of the provincial system will be analyzed to understand the evolution since the Ottoman system . It will be discussed under two headings: Ottoman Empire Period and Turkish Republic Period.

In the third chapter, the legal basis and the bureaucratic processes will be explained. In addition, the reasons of the demands to become a province will be investigated.

The fourth chapter is devoted to the review of the major efforts to reorganize the administration and the results obtained from the perspective of forming a new province. Within this context, the Development Plans and Programs, also the views and attitudes of governments regarding forming provinces will be referred to.

The fifth chapter deals with the last 14 provinces established after 1980s and will be the concern as a case study. In order to understand the real reason behind the establishment of provinces, their discussion processes undertaken both in TBMM Committees and in the TBMM general assembly will be evaluated, as well as, the legal grounds stated in the law proposals and in the draft bills of concerned laws will be investigated.

In the final chapter, the findings obtained from the case study will be critically discussed.

## CHAPTER II

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The main administrative unit of central government is the province. Today, there are 81 provinces in Turkey's administrative geography and most of these provinces overlap with *liva* or *sancak* units of the Ottoman period. The existing provincial system is in principle based upon the Ottoman Constitution and this administrative system has changed since the Ottoman Empire. The province system, having a 140-year-history, firstly implemented in Lebanon and in the Balkan's. Therefore, before analyzing the existing situation of the provinces, the Ottoman administrative structure will be explored in order to answer how the present provincial system evolved.

In this part of the study, the historical process is analyzed in two main sections such as before the Turkish Republican Period and the Turkish Republican Period. By considering the Constitutions, acts and laws, the historical evolution of the provincial administration will be interpreted.

#### 2.1. Ottoman Empire Period

The Ottoman Empire, founded in 1299 as a principality, was governed by firmans/edicts of the sultans at the beginning until the Tanzimat period. In other words, there were no constitutional arrangements like today in the literal sense. Accordingly, the legal basis of the provincial system can be traced back to the Tanzimat period.

The historical evolution will be discussed into three main periods. The first comprises a period from the establishment to Tanzimat, in order to give the origin of the provincial system. Second and the last one comprise Tanzimat period and the Constitutional Monarchy period, to analyze the provincial system within a legal context.

### 2.1.1. From the Establishment of the Empire to Tanzimat

From the date of establishment, the territory became larger with the conquests, and the control from the center became difficult. As a result, in 1301, the country was divided into military-administrative regions with Osman Gazi's firman/edict, and administrators were appointed to take the administration of these regions. Then, in Orhan Beğ Period (1326-1360), these first divisions transformed into units called *Sancak*. Later, because of the straits, which divided the country geographically into two, sancak, units -headed by *sancakbeyi*- were made subordinate to the *eyalet* units (*Beğlerbeğilik*) in Yıldırım Beyazıt Period (1389-1402). Consequently, there were two *eyalet* units named *Rumelia* and *Anatolian Eyalet*, which were headed by *beylerbeyi*. Beylerbeyi and sancakbeyi had both judicial and military missions/authorities other than administrative authority (Sanal, 2000:17). However, the main purpose of the *eyalet* units was to support the military coordination (Ortaylı, 2000: 61).



Source: <http://www.theottomans.org/english/maps/map.asp>

Figure 1. The Map of Great Expansion Period of the Ottoman Empire

Although the *eyalet* level has been the upper administrative level in the classical Ottoman Administrative structure, the main unit has been *sancak* (Ortaylı, 1979; Çadırcı, 1991; Yücel, 1974; Kalabalık, 1999). In fact, the provincial administration system was based on the *sancak* units until 19<sup>th</sup> century. The *eyalet* unit had only the audit and coordinator function over the *sancak* units. By the *eyalet* level, the Ottoman Sultans could keep down the farthest lands of the Empire; in any case, *eyalet* units were not an incorporated body and they did not have an independent administrative body (Anık, 1999: 13).

Unlike *sancak* units, the number and the structure of *eyalet* level had changed all along the Ottoman Empire period. At first, the number of *eyalet* units increased from two to six, such as *Greek: Amasya-Sivas-Tokat, Karaman* (Behlülgil, 1992: 181). Then, from 1520 to 1610, the numbers of *eyalet* units (*beğlerbeğilik*) reached to 32 (Aldan, 1990: 45). Although this level of the field organization continued until turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, its character began to change after the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century and began to lose its military character, which was the original objective of the unit, as mentioned earlier (Sanal, 2000:17). In addition, despite the *eyalet* units, the division of field organization, which was principally based on the *sancak* units, continued to 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, after Tanzimat Edict, the field organization of central administration was restructured making the main level unit of administration system *province (vilayet)*, rather than *sancak* (Ortaylı, 1979: 184; Kalabalık, 1999: 76).

### **2.1.2. Tanzimat Period**

Tanzimat Period starts with Gülhane Hatt-ı Hümayunu (Rescript of Gülhane - 1839) and ends with the proclamation of 1<sup>st</sup> Constitutional Monarchy in 1876. Gülhane Hatt-ı was the beginning of the modernization process of the Ottoman Empire within the *eyalet* administration context (Kılıç, 1995; 4). Before this period, there were some volitions and intense pressures on the Ottomans from the Western countries about rearranging the empire like a Western administration system (Sanal, 2000: 20). Also, the *eyalet* administration was decaying and protests increased for the central authority. That is why the reformists tried to centralize the administration and bureaucracy and to achieve this difficult process despite a strong opposition for modernization (Kılıç, 1995; 4). The main concern was the reorganization of the administration and also the administrative

organization to secure the authority of central government over the field organizations (Kılıç, 1995: IX).

The new policies were started to be applied in 1842 and spread out all over the Empire gradually. The main stages of this modernization process, following the Gülhane Hatt-ı Hümayunu, can be listed as follows (Sanal, 2000:20):

1. Firman dated 28<sup>th</sup> November 1852
2. Rescript of Reform dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 1856 (Islahat Fermanı)
3. Administrative Directives dated 4<sup>th</sup> December 1858
4. Tuna Province Regulations proclaimed on 8<sup>th</sup> October 1864
5. Province Regulations proclaimed on 7<sup>th</sup> November 1864
6. General Regulations for Province dated 1867 (Vilayet-i Umumiye Nizamnamesi)
7. General Administration Regulations for Province dated 22<sup>nd</sup> January 1871 (İdare-i Umumiye-i Vilayet Nizamnamesi)

Firstly, the **Firman** was proclaimed in 1852 to remedy the inconvenience that emerged with centralization efforts. Because, governors became a civil servant incidental upon the central government; that is, they had no authority as before. To give back the authority to the governors, the dependency of eyalet units to the central government was reduced with this edict (Kılıç, 1995: 10-11).

As for administrative organization of province, it remained, as has been the case in 1842. Namely, the main administrative unit of central government was the *eyalet*, and eyalet units were further divided into *sancaks*, and sancaks into *kaza* units. In addition, with the 1852 edict, the *independent sancak* units were established called *mutasarrıflık* (liva) that was headed by mutasarrıf (Kılıç, 1995: 13). The authorities of mutasarrıf and governors were the same. These units directly affiliated to the central government, so they were not hierarchical subordinate units of the eyalet units. The other type of sancaks was headed by sub-governors (kaymakam) and kaza units were headed by the *kadı* (kaza directors), as before (Kılıç, 1995: 11).

Secondly, **Islahat Fermanı (Edict of Reform)**, proclaimed in 1856, was based on equal treatment of all subjects disregarding citizens' religions. With this firman, the minorities were given rights, especially in administrative issues. The administrative organization of province was remained the same: eyalet, sancak, livas, kazas, and karyes.

Thirdly, **İdari Talimatlar (Administrative Directives)**, which were detailed descriptions of the powers delegated to the field officials of the central government, was proclaimed on 4 December 1858. On the other hand, the field units of central government state above were not changed again with this directive. The only change was for the governors that they were given a full representative capacity of the government (Kılıç, 1995: 13).

On another note, according to government yearbooks, there were no significant changes in the number of the field units of the central administration in this period. It is only noteworthy that in 1860, some of the sancak units were transformed into mutasarrıflık, and the dependencies of the some sancak units were changed. The number of eyalet units decreased to 23, and the number of the mutasarrıflık increased to 11. Nevertheless, the main and the radical change in provincial administration were implemented with **1864 Vilayet Nizamnamesi (Province Regulations dated 1864)**. The centralization efforts, which had been made by during the last 20 years, resulted with the transition from the eyalet system to the provincial (*vilayet*) system in field organization.

It can be said that the origin of all these efforts to reorganize the administration, essentially, was derived from the notices and even pressures of the European powers. Beginning the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Empire was in bad conditions, such as rebellions, a series of defeats in wars. Apart from this, there were also irregularities, corruptions, and inconsistencies with the established rules of procedure in the judicial system, the eyalet finances, and the provincial administration. In the event of any local confusion in any eyalet units, they were generalized to the whole Empire and thought that all the confusions derived from the problem of the provincial administration system. Likewise, this situation gave resulted in complaints not only from the local, but also from the European countries and the Empire, on all occasions, was warned to take measures against the inappropriateness by these countries (Kılıç, 1995: 65).

Under these circumstances, throughout the Tanzimat Period, several acts and regulations were issued, but none of them stated a radical change in Ottoman administration. On grounds of the ascending local discontent and foreign complaints, the thought of the radical reform necessity in administration became widespread.

On the other hand, at that time, Midhat Pasha appointed as a governor in 1861, was governing the Nish Eyalet successfully. Aside from his accomplished works in environment, his policies about taking measures against the conflicts between Muslims and the others maintained the public order and there were no irregularities in administration or confusions unlike in the other eyalet units during his governorship (1861-1863).

Due to Midhat Pasha's achievements, the central government entitled him to rectify the administration by considering his implementations in Nish Eyalet (Kılıç, 1995: 66). So, the new administrative model was prepared primarily by the efforts of Midhat Pasha.

In accordance with the decisions of the Committees for reforming the administration and also with Midhat Pasha's opinions, the Province Regulation of 1864, which is titled "*Teşkilat-ı Vilayet Nizamnamesi*" in Ottoman-Turkish, was approved and it was published in the first volume of *Düstur* in 1872-3 (Ortaylı, 2000). Consequently, the first systematic regulation in field organization, which was inspired by the centralized French provincial administration, was constituted after Tanzimat (Ortaylı, 2000, 54). With the regulation, the Empire was divided into provinces (*vilayet*), which were called eyalet formerly. The administrative units in field organization were stated in the Province Regulation as follows (*Düstur: I. Tertib*, 608):

*Division into many, of the imperial dominions, shall be through separation into numerous regions, based on **the proximity of the counties? (units)**<sup>1</sup>, and each region shall be called a "province".*

*Article one: General administration of each division shall be in the authority of the administrative arrangement to be defined in the forthcoming articles, and this administration is established at a single center.*

*Article two: Each division shall be divided into counties (units) including the county (unit) that is the administrative center and in every county (unit) there will be an administration of a sub-governor (*mutasarrıf*); and the city that is the head of the county (unit) will be the seat of authority<sup>2</sup>. (Saraçoğlu)*

---

<sup>1</sup> County is a local government unit particularly in the European examples. Not to confine concepts, the appropriate one is '**unit**', that is what is going to be used in this thesis.

<sup>2</sup>*Düstur: I. Tertib*, 608 In:  
[http://www.cas.bg/obj/downloads/3\\_7/Mehmet%20Safa%20Saracoglu%20project%20results\\_ed%201.doc](http://www.cas.bg/obj/downloads/3_7/Mehmet%20Safa%20Saracoglu%20project%20results_ed%201.doc)

Two important changes were made in field organization, provided that it is pertinent to the thesis. The first one is restructuring the basis of the administrative units with province as stated previously. The further divisions were *liva/sancak* headed by sancak beyi (*mutasarrıf*), *kaza* headed by the sub-governor (*kaymakam*) and village headed by the headman (*muhtar*) (Aldan, 1990: 46), the same as before, but with two differences: the terms *liva* and *sancak* refer to the same administrative unit and are used interchangeably. Formerly, *liva* was an independent from *eyalet* units while *sancak* was not. Besides that, in accordance with the Regulation of 1864, the sub-governors were appointed as *kaymakam* by the central government (Kalabalık, 1999: 88; Kılıç, 1995: 69).

The second important thing was in the determination of the provinces. As was pointed out in the beginning sentence of the Regulation, each province would be based on the proximity of the administrative units. Although it was not a concrete criterion in determining the provinces as an administrative unit, it can be said that it was a concrete step for standardizing the determination of the provinces.

Meanwhile, before the declaration of the Province Regulation, the imperial center wanted to implement this new provincial system in a pilot area for the whole Empire. They hesitated to apply this system throughout the Empire because they believed the necessity of considering the differences among the regions of the Empire (Kılıç, 1995; Ortaylı, 2000). Therefore, to test the new system the Tuna province, or the Danube province, was set up and Midhat Pasha was designated to carry out the experiments as the first governor of the first province. This first province consisted of the former three *eyalet* units: Nish, Vidin, and Silistria (Ortaylı, Kılıç, 1995; Ortaylı, 2000).

Fourthly, **Tuna Vilayeti Nizamnamesi (Tuna Province Regulations)** was finally issued on October 8, a month earlier than the Province Regulation of 1864. Tuna Province Regulation was actually a verbatim copy of the 1864 Province Regulation, with two

---

The original text is as follows:

“*Memalik-i mahruse-i şahanenin kıta’at-ı müteaddidesi livaların münasibatına göre devair-i müte’addideye göre taksim ile her daire vilayet ismiyle yad olunacaktır.*

*Birinci madde:* Her dairenin idare-i umumiyesi mevadd-ı atiyede mu’ayyen olan hey’et-i idareye muhavvel ve bu idare bir merkezde mukarrredir.

*İkinci madde:* Her daire idare-i merkeziyyenin bulunduğu sancakla beraber livalara münkasim olarak her bir sancakda bir mutasarrıflık idaresi olub, re’s-i liva olan şehir makarr olacaktır.”

exceptions. The first one was about who would head the administrative units. According to the second article of the Province Regulations, as stated above, provinces would be divided into *sancak/liva* units and each would be headed by the *mutasarrıf*. However, in the same article of Tuna Province Regulation, it was stated that Tuna Province would be divided into 7 sancak units and the sub-governor (*kaymakam*) would head each (Ortaylı, 2000: 57). The second difference was in the article three of both Province Regulation and the Tuna Province Regulation. The kaza units would be headed by the sub-governor (*kaymakam*) in the former, but by the district director in the latter (*kaza müdürü*) (Ortaylı, 2000: 57). In addition, it is a matter of course that there were terms utilized differently in those two regulations such as changing “*all provinces*” to “*this province*”.

Fifthly, the Province Regulation was proclaimed on November 7, 1864, following the success of the new provincial system in Tuna Province. In 1865, it started to be constituted in several territories of the Empire systematically such as provinces from Anatolia, Arabia and from Rumelia (Ortaylı, 2000: 54). Namely, the second implementation was Bosnia Province, consisted of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Rumelia; the third one was Adrianople Province; the fourth one was Halab Province; the fifth one was Syria Province, consisted of Damascus and Saida Eyalets in Arabia; then Tripoli Province; and the seventh one was Erzurum Province in Anatolia (Kılıç, 1995: 68).

Sixthly, in the year 1867, **Vilayet-i Umumiye Nizamnamesi** (**General Regulations for Province**) was promulgated to generalize the provincial system to the whole Empire. Essentially, this 22-article regulation was the same as the Province Regulation of 1864, so it can be said that this regulation was issued almost as an acting order. Actually, it was the next step to apply it in the rest of the territories.

In this way, territories of the Ottoman Empire in Europe divided into 10 provinces and 44 *sancaks*. In addition, territories of the Ottoman Empire in Anatolia divided into 16 provinces and 74 *sancaks*, and lastly one province with five *sancaks* was set up in Africa. In short, the whole empire had 27 provinces and 123 *sancaks* (Ortaylı, 2000: 63). Besides that, some units were made subordinate directly to the imperial center, independent from the provinces. These autonomous liva units (*müstakil livalar*), which are called “*elviye-i gayri mülhaka*” in Ottoman Turkish, were highly populated and ethnically heterogeneous such as Jerusalem, Canik, and Şehr-i Zor (Ortaylı, 2000: 63).

Lastly, a new regulation was proclaimed on January 22, 1871, called **İdare-i Umumiye-i Vilayet Nizamnamesi (General Administration Regulations for Province)**. The centralization process was more clearly specified in this 130-article regulation than it was in its 1864 counterpart. It reduced the executive independence of provincial units.

Moreover, it realized the separation of the judicial institutions from the administrative ones. It was clearly stated at the beginning of the regulation as follows: “...*does not focus on the administration of the courts of order (mehakim-i nizamiye) but determines only the duties of executive clerks, administrative councils, municipal and regional councils because a special regulation has been issued and established for the courts of order*” (Saraçoğlu).

In the matter of field organization, the regulation added one more unit called *nahiye* (district) above the village units (Aldan, 1990). Consequently, the field units were hierarchically became as follows: vilayet, sancak/liva, kaza, nahiye/bucak, and karye/köy. Apart from these units, there were also independent liva units (*elviye-i gayri mülhaka/müstakil liva*) as mentioned above and the number of these units increased in the Second Constitutional Period, which strengthens the Ottoman centralization (Ortaylı, 1976: 22).

### 2.1.3. Constitutional Monarchy Period

In 1876, as First Constitutional Monarchy promulgated called “*Kanun-ı Esasi*”. According to the Constitution, it was accepted was that the provinces would be executed with the basis of the “deconcentration of authority” (*yetki genişliği*) principle. In the article 108: “*The administration of provinces shall be based on the **principle of deconcentration**. The details of this organization shall be fixed by a law*”. Nevertheless, in fact, the provinces did not gain a corporate status as a local government and the centralized administration continued in the field organization until 1913. After the 1876 Constitution had been in effect for one year, the Second Constitutional Period, which started in 1908, laid the foundations of a parliamentary system by adopting the 1876 Constitution with some amendments made as well.

After the Second Constitutional Period, the number of provinces and *sancaks* was 28, but out of 28 provinces, 14 are only within the present boundaries of Turkish Republic. These were:

1. Edirne Province: Edirne, Tekirdağ, Gelibolu, Gümölcine, Dedeağaç, Kırklareli
2. Hüdavendigâr Province: Bursa, Karesi, Afyonkarahisar, Kütahya, Ertuğrul
3. Aydın Province: İzmir, Aydın, Saruhan, Menteşe, Denizli
4. Ankara Province: Ankara, Yozgat, Kayseriyye, Kırşehir, Çorum
5. Konya Province: Konya, Niğde, Hamitabat, Teke, Burdur
6. Kastamonu Province: Kastamonu, Bolu, Sinop, Kengari
7. Sivas Province: Sivas, Amasya, Karahisar-ı Şarki, Tokat
8. Trabzon Province: Trabzon, Gümüşhane
9. Erzurum Province: Erzurum, Erzincan, Bayezit
10. Van Province: Van, Hakkari
11. Diyarıbekir Province: Diyarıbekir, Mardin, Ergani
12. Bitlis Province: Bitlis, Muş, Siirt, Genç
13. Mamuretülaziz Province: Mamuretülaziz, Malatya, Dersim
14. Adana Province: Adana, Kozan, İç-il, Mersin, Cebelibereket

In 1913, **İdare-i Umumiye-i Vilayat Kanun-u Muvakkatı** (*Temporary Law on General Administration of Provinces*) was enacted. This temporary law consisted of two sections covering regulations of “provincial general administration” in the first section, and “provincial local administration” in the second. The rules specified in the first section did not repeal in the general features of the regulation of 1864, so there were no changes for the provincial general administration. This section would be repealed later with the proclamation of Provincial Administration Act, dated 1929 and numbered 1426, in the Turkish Republican Period. On the other hand, the second section was entirely new and it brought large-scale responsibility and span of activity to provincial local administrations. Unlike the first section, the second one has reached to date with some modifications at different times after the Turkish Republican Period, which also established provincial local administration as a unit of local administration system in the country in addition to “*Şehremaneti*” (*municipality*) system.

In summary, the administrative system in the late Ottoman period changed from *Eyalet* to *Province* according to the 1864 Tuna Province Regulations and spread to the

countryside by the 1864 Province Regulations. The field units of central administration were vilayet, sancak/liva, kaza, karye, and in 1871, one more field unit level called nahiye, was added above the karye unit by the *General Administration Regulations for Province* (İdare-i Umumiye-i Vilayet Nizamnamesi). Consequently, there were five levels in the field organization; namely, vilayet, sancak/liva, kaza, nahiye, karye before the foundation of the Turkish Republic.

## **2.2. Turkish Republican Period**

As is known, at the end of the First World War, the Ottoman Empire has been broken up and the period of second constitutional government had totally ended with the establishment of the Turkish Grand National Assembly in 1920. The Turkish National Assembly had the authorities to legislate and execute.

All the provinces and its administrative principles inherited from the Ottoman Empire. For instance, it can be said that the most of the provinces were established based on the Regulation of 1864 and at the same time, the principles of provincial administration were laid down in the Constitutional of 1876 and in the Provincial Administration Act of 1913.

In the year 1919, pre-Republic, there were 15 provinces, 52 sancaks, and there were 17 independent *livas* out of these 52 sancaks (Erdeha, 1975: 44; Sanal, 2000: 35-36). These were:

1. Aydın Province: İzmir (province center), Aydın, Saruhan (Manisa), Denizli
2. Ankara Province: Ankara, Kırşehir, Çorum, Yozgat
3. Adana Province: Adana, Mersin, Kozan, Cebelibereket (Osmaniye)
4. Bitlis Province: Bitlis, Muş, Siirt, Genç
5. Diyarıbekir Province: Diyarıbekir, Ergani, Mardin, Siverek
6. Edirne Province: Edirne, Gelibolu, Kırklareli, Tekfurdağı (Tekirdağ)
7. Erzurum Province: Erzurum, Erzincan, Bayazıt (Doğubeyazıt)
8. Hüdavendigar Province: Bursa (province center), Ertuğrul (Bilecik)
9. İstanbul Province: İstanbul, Beyoğlu, Üsküdar
10. Kastamonu Province: Kastamonu, Sinop, Çankırı
11. Konya Province: Konya, Isparta, Burdur
12. Mamuretülaziz Province: Elazığ (province center), Malatya, Dersim (Tunceli)

13. Sivas Province: Sivas, Amasya, Tokat, Karahisar-ı Şarki (Şebinkarahisar)
14. Trabzon Province: Trabzon, Rize, Gümüşhane
15. Van Province: Van, Hakkari

The independent administrative units were Niğde, Silifke (İçel), Canik (Samsun), Karahisar-ı Sahip (Afyon), Eskişehir, Kütahya, Antalya, Menteşe (Muğla), Biga, Çatalca, Karesi (Balıkesir), İzmit, Bolu, Kayseri, Urfa, Maraş, and Ayıntap (Gaziantep).

### 2.2.1. The 1921 Constitution

During the years of the “War of Independence”, the Grand National Assembly promulgated the Constitution of 1921 (*Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu*). It was very short in comparison with both the Constitution of 1876 and the Constitutions of the other countries. This 23-article Constitution consisted of two sections. In the first section, the essential provisions were defined and called “*Mevâd-i Esasiye*”. The latter section was about the administration covering the field units of central administration, provincial assemblies, and general inspectorships (*umumi müfettişlik*).

According to the article 10, “*Turkey is divided into provinces; provinces are subdivided into kaza units and kaza units into nahiye units on the basis of geographical situation and economic relationship*”<sup>3</sup>.

In this way, the large provinces, which had been inherited from Ottoman Empire, were abolished and that title was given to the old sancaks. In other words, the *sancak/liva* units were abolished from the field organization (Aldan, 1990: 47), and their boundaries were rearranged as province. Thus, the Constitution of 1921 decreased the level of the field units from five to three, and established the divisions as province, sub-province, and district. To illustrate, there were 15 provinces and 53 sancak units in 1920, after that, the total number of provinces reached 71. Additionally, due to annexing of the three territories, namely Artvin, Kars, and Ardahan, this number increased to 74 in the year 1921 (Sanal, 2000: 38). Nevertheless, this process could eventually lead to the abolishing of the sancak units in the 1924 Constitution. By the Constitution of 1924, the sancak level was effectively repealed.

---

<sup>3</sup> The original text is as follows: “*Türkiye, coğrafi vaziyet ve iktisadî münasebet noktai nazarından vilâyetlere, vilâyetler kazalara münkasem olup kazalar da nahiyelerden tereküp eder.*” In: <http://www.anayasa.gen.tr/1921tek.htm>, 5 December 2005.

### 2.2.1.1. Repeal of Sancak Units

As noted, before the issuance of the Constitution of 1921, there had been five divisions in field organization as *vilayet (province)*, *liva/sancak*, *kaza*, *nahiye*, and *karye/köy (village)*. Sancaks were designated as *liva* which had some degree of special autonomy from the center.

Mutasarrıfs, heading autonomous territories, had the same authorities as governors. This situation facilitated the relationship between the public at large and the public authorities. Therefore, becoming an autonomous sancak was seen sufficient instead of becoming a province by the people in sancak units (Behlülgil, 1992: 166).

The 1921 Constitution organized the field organization as three, and it abolished both *sancak/liva* and autonomous *liva* units. Some sancak units at a certain levels of development were transformed into provinces. The others, which had not reached a certain levels of development, were either transformed into *kaza/ilçe* units by law or laws. Those that are made provinces made on the grounds that they had some historical and administrative statuses to be protected (Behlülgil, 1992: 166).

However, a long-standing organization could not be changed in a short time due to the very difficult conditions of War of Independence. Some parts of the country were occupied and it was not very easy to break the administrative units, which were used to carrying the honor of being the first and the basic provincial organization of the Ottoman-Turk State (Behlülgil, 1992: 166).

In fact, while forming the field organization for the places that were returned to Turkey with Moscow Treaty, namely Artvin, Kars, and Ardahan. They were again given the status of *sancak* according to the law dated 1921 and numbered 133 that was issued after the Constitution of 1921 (Behlülgil, 1992: 166). Nevertheless, these sancaks were accepted as provinces because of the fact that there was no decree having force of law (Behlülgil, 1992: 166-167).

The autonomous *livas* did not have any differences in function from provinces apart from their names. Thus, the number of the steps the constitution required was obeyed (Behlülgil, 1992: 167). However, this situation caused a very peculiar and interesting

thing in the field organization. In addition to making the units provinces, the subordination of these *livas* to their old provinces were continued; hence, there happened to be provinces subordinated to provinces, and it continued until 1924 (Behlülçil, 1992: 167).

After forming provinces, there existed 74 provinces, 15 of which were formed directly, 33 of which were independent and 26 of which were annexed. These 74 provinces were the first provinces of the Turkish Republic (Behlülçil, 1992: 167).

#### **2.2.1.2. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after 1921 Constitution**

As stated above, the number of the provinces increased from 71 to 74 in the year 1921 with the annexation of the three territories. These were; Adana, Afyonkarahisar, Aksaray, Amasya, Ankara, Antalya, Ardahan, Artvin, Aydın, Bayazıt, Beyoğlu, Bitlis, Bolu, Bozok (Yozgat), Burdur, Bursa, Canik (Samsun), Cebelibereket (Osmaniye), Çanakkale, Çankırı (Kangırı), Çatalca, Çorum, Dersim (Tunceli), Denizli, Diyarbakır (Diyaribekir), Edirne, Elazığ (Elaziz), Ergani, Ertuğrul (Bilecik), Erzincan, Erzurum, Eskişehir, Gaziantep, Gelibolu, Genç, Giresun, Gümüşhane, Hakkari, İstanbul, İzmir, Isparta, Karesi (Balıkesir), Kars, Kastamonu, Kayseri, Kırklareli, Kırşehir, Kocaeli, Konya, Kozan, Kütahya, Malatya, Maraş, Mardin, Menteşe (Muğla), Mersin, Muş, Niğde, Ordu, Rize, Saruhan (Manisa), Siirt, Silifke, Sinop, Sivas, Siverek, Şarkikarahisar (Şebinkarahisar-Karahisarışarki), Tekirdağ, Tokat, Trabzon, Urfa, Üsküdar, Van, and Zonguldak (Sanal, 2000: 37-38).

#### **2.2.2. The 1924 Constitution**

The 1921 constitution was prepared in haste; it had technical deficiencies. In the meantime, Republic had been declared. A new Constitution dated 16 Ramazan (the ninth month in the Arabic calendar) 1342 namely, 20 April 1340 (1924) numbered 491 was formed.

The arrangement of the field organization was stated in the article 89 of the 1924 Constitution. According to the article, “*Turkey is divided into provinces (vilayet) based upon geographic situation and economic relationship. The provinces are subdivided into kaza, the kaza units into nahiye, nahiyes into karye (villages).*” (Gözler, 1999: 73-79)

As seen from the article 89, the criteria adopted for forming provinces were the same with the criteria of the 1921 Constitution.

Field Organization Committees were formed in order to rearrange the field units. The responsibility of these committees was to observe and examine the present organization in the country and to suggest the necessary changes (Behlülgil, 1992: 169). The basic factor taken into consideration in determining the field organization during these observations and examinations was the need for national defense (Behlülgil, 1992: 169).

Making good use of the studies and the suggestions of the Field Organization Committees, the first **Teşkilat-ı Mülkiye Kanunu** (*Civil Administrative Organization Law*) was passed. By the Civil Administrative Organization Law, dated May 30, 1926, numbered 877, the administrative divisions changed as follows: Eleven provinces were transformed into sub-provinces, 27 sub-provinces were made districts, and 60 districts were abolished. Eighteen new districts were formed by this law again and an authority to form 100 additive districts was delegated to the Ministry of Interior, and lastly, for the seventeen districts, their related sub-provinces have been changed to other sub-provinces (Behlülgil, 1992: 169).

#### **2.2.2.1. Provincial Administration Act dated 1929 and numbered 1426**

According to the provisions of the 1924 Constitution and upon considering the needs of the time, **Vilayat İdaresi Kanunu** (*Provincial Administration Act*), dated April 18, 1929 and numbered 1426, was issued. It was stated in this law that, the provinces would be governed with the fundamental principle of deconcentration of authority, and Turkey would be divided into provinces, the provinces into districts; the districts into sub-districts, and sub-districts into villages according to their geographical situation and the economic relations (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi - 18.04.1929, Devre: 3, İçtima: 2, Cilt: 10, p.12).

When the 1924 Constitution was in effect, the first article of the law repeated the article 10. The administrative units consisted of provinces, sub-provinces, and districts. There was no change in the structural parts of the field units. In order to solve the local problems in their respective locality, deconcentration of authority has been granted to

these units. The law also aimed at the unity and consistency in the administration as a whole.

In the second article it was stated, “*Forming a province, or repealing of one of the provinces, or changing the center of the province is realized by passing a law after taking the advice of the Council of State.*” (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi - 18.04.1929, Devre: 3, İctima: 2, Cilt: 10, p.12)<sup>4</sup>.

During the discussions of this law in the general assembly, the Minister of Interior stated that the administrative divisions were based on the geographical situations and the economic necessities; and he continued as follows: “*Although the geographical situation does not change, with the development of our highways, railways and our ports the economic situations will change without a doubt. Therefore, changing provinces from time to time is essential. In order not to realize this without a reason, the necessary arrangements were constituted in this law*” (TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi - 18.04.1929, Devre: 3, İctima: 2, Cilt: 10, p.73).

#### **2.2.2.2. Provincial Administration Act dated 1949 and numbered 5442**

After this law, a new **İl İdaresi Kanunu (Provincial Administration Act)** has been passed in 1949, numbered 5442 and it became operative on July 1, 1949 and is still in effect today although amended a few times since.

But before the issuance of Provincial Administration Act, the Constitution dated April 20, 1924 and numbered 491, was rewritten in contemporary Turkish without making any modifications in the meaning and concepts, with the law dated in 1945 and numbered 4695 (Official Gazette 15/1/1945-5905). There were only the terms were utilized differently such as changing “*vilayet*” (province) to “*il*”, “*kaza*”(district) to “*ilçe*” (sub-province), “*nahiye*” (sub-district) to “*bucak*” (district) and “*karye*” (village) to “*köy*”<sup>5</sup>. So, the same article was expressed with contemporary Turkish as follows: “*Turkey is*

---

<sup>4</sup> This law was cancelled with the article 68 of the Provincial Administration Law dated June 10, 1949 and numbered 5442.

<sup>5</sup> This situation was changed by the next government and the Constitution of 1924 numbered 491, was brought into force again. With the law dated 1952, the complete text of the Constitution was translated into previous one. For instance, “*il*” was changed with “*vilayet*” again; likewise, “*ilçe*” was changed with “*kaza*”, “*bucak*” with “*nahiye*”, and “*köy*” with “*karye*”. In other words, all the terms referring the same administrative unit and were used interchangeably in the 1924 Constitution and in the Provincial Administration Act dated 1949.

*divided into provinces (il) based upon geographic situation and economic relationship. The provinces are subdivided into sub-provinces (ilçe), the sub-provinces into districts (bucak), the districts into villages (köy).” (Gözler, 1999: 73-79).*

As a result, the Provincial Administration Act also leveled the administrative units as provinces, sub-provinces and districts in compliance with the contemporary Turkish text of the 1924 Constitution, which was valid during the time it was passed.

This new Act dated 1949, did not aim at rearranging the field units but tried to bring up provisions that would enable the implementation of using the principle of deconcentration of authority which was set by the Constitution and which was constituted the basic principle of the field organization of central administration (Behlülilgil, 1992: 173). This law did not bring provisions regarding the administration of the provinces like the previous Provincial Administration Act dated 1929, and the validity of the law dated as 1913 continued.

Notwithstanding, in TBMM Internal Affairs Committee Report during the discussions of the legislative proposal in the Committee, it was mentioned that how the areas, population and transport facilities of the province, sub-province, and districts differ in different parts of the country. Then, the following idea was brought forward: *“Since the foundation of the Republic, the administration division has always been formed as small-sized provinces. Our base line is also like that. Also, it may make us think about forming new provinces in case of the development of the railway, maritime line, highway and airway transportations.”* (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 27.05.1949, Dönem: 8, Cilt: 19/2, Sıra Sayısı: 208, p.33)

During the discussions in TBMM general assembly regarding the law numbered 5442, few critiques were made about the first article of the law, which defined the criteria of the administrative divisions of Turkey. These are as follows:

**G. Sadık Aldoğan (Afyonkarahisar)** - “...the matter of the division of the country into the provinces, the division of the provinces into the sub-provinces, the division of the sub-provinces, and the division of the sub-provinces into the districts were not determined scientifically. The present divisions laid down in

the totalitarian period (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem - 27.05.1949, Dönem: 8, Cilt: 19/2, Birleşim: 94, Oturum: 1, p.934).

**Emin Soysal (Maras)** - We are legislating the Provincial Administration Act. But what is the situation of our provinces? I see the definition of the provinces in the Constitution as follows: the province brings an economic and geographical wholeness. In other words, it is defined that the province is an integrity both economically and geographically. But friends, we have some provinces that have no integrity neither economically nor geographically. We must think all these. I would like to learn the provisions made in this respect from the Minister of Interior during the codification of the Provincial Administration Act. What do they think about the small provinces? (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem - 27.05.1949, Dönem: 8, Cilt: 19/2, Birleşim: 94, Oturum: 3, pp.958-959)

**Emin Erişirgil (Zonguldak-Minister of Interior)** - Some of our friends mentioned about the administrative organization. We are considering this subject to eliminate the difficulties of the developing economic and geographic situations. Therefore, we are investigating this and we will adjust the defective sides of our administrative organization (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem - 27.05.1949, Dönem: 8, Cilt: 19/2, Birleşim: 94, Oturum: 3, p.967).

### **2.2.2.3. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after 1924 Constitution**

There were many changes in the provincial divisions from the time of the issuance of the 1924 Constitution until the 1961 Constitution. This period can be divided into two: the first one is, the years between 1924-1933 and the second is 1933-1957. In the first sub-period, the number of provinces decreased, but in the second, this number gradually increased.

In 1926, Üsküdar, Beyoğlu, Çatalca, Gelibolu, Ardahan, Muş, Dersim, Genç, Siverek, Ergani and Kozan were made sub-provinces with *Teşkilat-ı Mülkiye Kanunu* (Field Organization Law), accepted on May 26, and numbered 877 (Official Gazette, June 26, 1926, no. 404). As a result, the total number of provinces decreased from 74 to 63.

There was no change in the number of the provinces after the elections held on September 2, 1927 and May 4, 1931. They remained as 63. These were; Adana, Afyonkarahisar, Aksaray, Amasya, Ankara, Antalya, Artvin, Aydın, Balıkesir, Bayazıt, Bilecik, Bitlis/Muş<sup>6</sup>, Bolu, Burdur, Bursa, Cebelibereket (Osmaniye), Çanakkale, Çankırı, Çorum, Denizli, Diyarbakir, Edirne, Elaziz (Elazığ), Erzincan, Erzurum, Eskişehir, Gaziantep, Giresun, Gümüşhane, Hakkari, Isparta, İçel, İstanbul, İzmir, Kars, Kastamonu, Kayseri, Kırklareli, Kırşehir, Kocaeli, Konya, Kütahya, Malatya, Manisa, Maraş, Mardin, Mersin, Muğla, Niğde, Ordu, Rize, Samsun, Siirt, Sinop, Sivas, Şebinkarahisar, Tekirdağ, Tokat, Trabzon, Urfa, Van, Yozgat and Zonguldak.

In 1933, the provinces of Aksaray, Cebelibereket (Osmaniye), Artvin, İçel, Şebinkarahisar and Hakkari were repealed with the law numbered 2197. Additionally, Mersin and Silifke provinces were united and a new province named İçel was established; Rize and Artvin were united and another new province named Çoruh was established. As a result, the total number of the provinces decreased to 57.

In the general justification of this legislative proposal which was presented to the Prime Minister as an attachment to the letter dated March 20, 1933 numbered 6/761, it was stated that Silifke, which is the center of İçel province, could not improve enough because of its low income, its low population, and its geographical location. As for Mersin, it was mentioned that it does not have the specification of a province because of its low population, few sub-provinces and small geographical area. That is why these two provinces are united, and Mersin was made the center of İçel province, Silifke was made a sub-province.

Like Mersin and Silifke, the provinces of Artvin and Rize had a low general income, small population and unsuitable geographical location, which was not suitable for economic development. However, the need to establish provinces arose due to the geographical administrative and political importance of this region and the boundary with Soviet Union. Therefore, these two provinces were united, Rize was made the

---

<sup>6</sup> The reasons why Bitlis or Muş were written interchangeably in the list was that Muş was made a sub-province in 1926 and was made subordinate to Bitlis. Muş was made a province again on September 10, 1929 and this time Bitlis was made a sub-province with making subordinate to Muş.

center of this newly formed province named Çoruh, and Artvin was made a sub-province.

Aksaray was made a sub-province associated with Niğde because of the same reasons mentioned for Artvin, Mersin and Silifke like having a small population, not having enough general income, not being suitable for development due to its geographical location.

Hakkari, owing to the same reasons was made a sub-province subordinate to Van. Another reason for this was to maintain security in the region.

Likewise, Cebelibereket (Osmaniye) was made a sub-province subordinate to Adana again due to the same criteria. It was also necessary for Osmaniye to be governed by a northern province due to the political importance of this region. Osmaniye was made subordinate to the province of Seyhan and Adana was made the center of Seyhan.

Another province Şebinkarahisar was demoted to a sub-province status that was subordinate to Giresun because of not having any military importance as well as reasons concerning general income, suitability for economic development, and geographical location.

In 1936, Artvin, Hakkari, Bitlis, Bingöl and Tunceli were re-established as a province in compliance with the law numbered 2885, thus, the total number increased to 62.

With the exception of Tunceli, the statements of reasons in the general justification section of the legislative proposal for establishing the last four provinces which are Tunceli, Hakkari, Bitlis, Bingöl are stated as follows:

*Due to the small amount of population that Tunceli has compared with the other provinces in the eastern region, reductions were realized in the administrative structure. Although it was not necessary to form an organization in most of the places, considering the security, organization of social and cultural affairs and reinforcing the relation between the citizens and the government, it was found necessary to increase the number of the units in the organization (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 6/3411, 20.11.1935).*

As for Hakkari: *“Due to the fact that it has a vast area, and is situated between Iran and Iraq, to provide better relationship between the people of Hakkari and the government, Hakkari has been found suitable to be made a province again”* (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 6/3411, 20.11.1935).

Concerning the grounds for establishing Bitlis as a province:

*Muş has an extensive area. Because it does not have paved roads, everywhere gets muddy when it rains. The plain and the mountains around Bitlis are covered with snow in most of the months of the year. These mountains are so long that it is hundreds of kilometers from one side to the other. It is very difficult to govern this kind of a place as a province. Apart from all these reasons, Bitlis which is located in the west side of Van Lake, is a very significant center for Turks and is always in touch with the villages in its south and is believed to be able to play the representative role. Hence, Bitlis province has been formed again and Bitlis has been made the center of the province* (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 6/3411, 20.11.1935).

According to the statement of reason for Bingöl:

*After Bitlis province was separated, the area left in the province of Muş was still too vast for a province; therefore, in order manage and direct the authority of the government and to ensure security, to run the people’s affairs more easily, to, it has been decided to form a province in Çapakçur. To serve this purpose, Çapakçur, Genç, Solhan, Bingöl of Muş and Kiğı of Elazığ were seperated and a new province named Bingöl has been established”* (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 6/3411, 20.11.1935).

For Artvin (Çoruh);

*While Artvin was being administered as a province before; it was demoted to a sub-province and was made subordinate to Çoruh in compliance with the law dated May 27, 1933 no 2197. Because the communal districts of the province of Artvin was so far away from Rize -the main province then- no communication can be established between them due to the very high mountains, it has been seen necessary to promote Artvin to a province again with Borçka, Şavşat, Hopa and*

*Yusufeli subordinating it. Other reasons for this transformation included security purposes and social reason, Artvin became the center and was made Çoruh. The old Çoruh, different from the new one, had consisted of only Rize and Pazar, however, after the transformation, it was named the province of Rize (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 6/3411, 20.11.1935).*

In 1939, the number of provinces increased to 63 with the annexation of Hatay to Turkey in accordance with the law dated July 7, 1939 and numbered 3711 (Official Gazette dated July 11, 1939 no.4255). The main factor in forming a province in Hatay was to maintain law and order in that area. In the general reasoning section of the legislative proposal, regarding making Hatay a province, the following was stated: *“It seemed necessary to form an administrative structure in Hatay through a law and to arrange the services in compliance with the Republican laws after Hatay’s joining to the mother land. While carrying out this arrangement, the present administrative structure was kept and a province with four sub-provinces was formed. Antakya was decided to be the center of the province”* (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 6/3459, 29.06.1939).

In 1953, Uşak was made a province by the governing party, Demokrat Parti. In the general justification section of this law regarding Uşak the following was mentioned: *“It has been found beneficial that more services should be provided to the centers of sub-provinces which have an economic potential and deserve to have more services than the status they have. Therefore, it was decided to make Uşak a province, because Uşak has primary and secondary schools, Girls’ Vocational and Boys’ Vocational Schools, High Schools, a Post Office, other state institutions and cultural organizations”* (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 71-2404, 6/1141, 10.04.1953).

In 1954, Adıyaman and Sakarya provinces were established in accordance with the laws numbered 6418 and numbered 6419, respectively. Moreover, with the law numbered 6429, Kırşehir was demoted to a sub-province and made subordinate to Nevşehir province because of the number of the votes in the elections; namely, it was a punishment for this province that did not vote for Demokrat Parti.

In the general reasoning of the law regarding establishing the Adıyaman province, it is stated that due to the improvements in all areas in the country, some sub-provincial centers were so much socially and economically developed that they exceeded their limitations and, so, started to expect more service than their own status required. For instance, Adıyaman was assessed within this framework and it was found necessary to make it a province. Similarly, in the general justification section, explaining why Sakarya was formed as a province, the same reasons given for Adıyaman were repeated (TBMM Assembly Minutes of the meeting C.I dated June 14, 1954, 8<sup>th</sup> Session).

As for the explanations regarding Nevşehir, in the general justification section of its legislative proposal, it is stated that the Kızılırmak Valley showed geographical and economical integrity. Owing to this reason; Avanos, Gülşehir and Hacıbektaş, which were subordinate to different provinces, had economic relations with Nevşehir. By making Nevşehir a province, it would be easier for these sub-provinces to benefit from the public services and their commercial and economic activities would improve (TBMM Assembly Minutes of the meeting C.I dated June 14, 1954, 8<sup>th</sup> Session).

In 1957, when the governing party was again the Demokrat Parti, Kırşehir was elevated to a province again in accordance with the law numbered 7001; and the number of the provinces increased to 67. In the general discussion section of the above-mentioned law, it is stated that there was an immediate need for administrative restructuring in Kırşehir.

Although 1924 Constitution stipulated geographical and economic reasons as essential for the establishment of provinces, practice however, indicated some additional and variety of reasons counted for the policy regarding the founding of provinces in this period.

### **2.2.3. The 1961 Constitution**

The regulations about the field organization were stated in the article 115. According to this article; *“In terms of central administrative organization, Turkey is divided into provinces based on geographical and economic factors and on the requirements of public service, and provinces are further divided into smaller administrative units.”* (Gözler, 1999: 117-215)

With this article, the Constitution specified only the first administrative level and showed that other divisions and extensions can be created. Since it was impossible to have a fourth division, the position of the districts was left for the lawmakers to decide. The ground of this first clause of the 115<sup>th</sup> article was defined as follows:

*This article, which is laid down the 1924 Constitution, reflects more comprehension. Our former Constitution defined the sub-province (kaza) and district (nahiye) units as an administrative division under the province (vilayet) unit. In our country, especially in recent years, there have been tendencies towards transforming districts (nahiye) into sub-provinces (kaza). As a result, it may be required to form middle echelon in mentioned division in the future or merge these two echelons. For this reason, the 115<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution was consigned to writing to answer such requirements. (Öztürk, 1966: 3163)*

In addition, different from the former Constitutions, there is one more criteria “the requirements of public services” for establishing provinces in the 1961 Constitution. However, there were no other explanation regarding what the public services was as an supplementary legal requirement. Similarly, this matter was repeated in the Provincial Administration Act dated 1949 and numbered 5442, in spite of its amendments issued in different years such as 1953, 1959 and also 1964. Specifically, the 5442-numbered Act with its amendments by the law dated 1953 and numbered 3125; the law dated 1959 and numbered 7267; and the law dated 1964 and numbered 469; did not include any scientific and/or any specific criteria regarding establishing provinces.

Among these amendments, only the last one was about the first article of the Act, which defines the criteria for forming the provincial administrative divisions of Turkey. With the amendment done by the law dated 1964 and numbered 469, ‘the requirements of public services’ criterion was added to the first article of the Act numbered 5442, in order to conform to the 115<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution. During the discussions of this law regarding amending some of the articles of the Provincial Act numbered 5442, there were no contributions or serious reactions as to the necessity of developing additional objective criteria to be used for the founding of provinces (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi – 12.05.1964, Cilt: 30, Birleşim: 101, Oturum: 1, pp.372-373).

#### **2.2.3.1. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after 1961 Constitution**

The field divisions continued to stay as 67 provinces until 1989. But the number of sub-provinces increased in this period by transforming districts into sub-provinces. In 1957, the number of sub-provinces were 570 and of districts were 930. Later on, these numbers were 696 and 793, respectively.

#### **2.2.4. The 1982 Constitution**

The provisions of the 1961 Constitution regarding forming the provinces were totally accepted and taken into the 1982 Constitution. According to the article 126; *“In terms of central administrative structure, Turkey is divided into provinces on the basis of geographical situation and economic conditions, and public service requirements; provinces are further divided into lower levels of administrative units.”*

The article 123 of this Constitution states that: *“the administration forms a whole with regard to its structure and functions, and shall be regulated by law. The organization and functions of the administration are based on the principles of centralization and local administration. Public corporate bodies shall be established only by law, or by the authority expressly granted by law”*.

Although the Constitution went into details of the entire subject due to the system followed, there was no comment on the numbers of the level of the field divisions. Behlülgil (1992: 177) explains the reason why the Constitution maker left this to the Lawmaker is just out of courtesy. The Constitution, with this provision, shows that at least the districts will continue. According to the justification of this article, it is stated that the administrative levels were not explained in detail, because it was a controversial issue how some of the sub-levels of the administrative units respond the present needs. Therefore, the province level is admitted as a base of the field organization of the central administration, and the determination of the other unit levels were left to the lawmaker (TBMM Kütüphanesi, DEM.863708: 189).

On the other hand, the Lawmaker did not find it necessary to issue a new law regarding the task given to them for grading the administrative structure and found the provisions of the law numbered 469 passed after 1961 Constitution sufficient. In accordance with this law, as mentioned above, the field units of central administration following provinces were sub-provinces and districts.

#### **2.2.4.1. Administrative Divisions of Central Government after 1982 Constitution**

The number of the provinces increased to 81 from 67 in the last of Constitution period, which is still valid with some amendments. Essentially, the increase in the number of the field units starts with the law dated November 29, 1983 and numbered 2963, which was passed at the end of the government of the September 12 period. In this way, establishing new sub-provinces started, and this was continued along with the establishment of provinces as well as transforming of districts into sub-provinces after the September 12 period.

After 1980s, it was witnessed to the increases in the number of provinces. To date, there are fourteen provinces that have been established by law. Out of these 14 provinces, four provinces were established by a decree having force of law<sup>7</sup>.

In 1989; Aksaray, Bayburt, Karaman and Kırıkkale were made provinces in accordance with the law numbered 3578 (Official Gazette dated July 21, 1989, no. 20202), then the number of the provinces became 71. In 1990, Batman and Şırnak were declared provinces in accordance with the law numbered 3467, and the number of the provinces became 73 (Official Gazette dated May 18, 1990, no. 20522). In 1991, Bartın was added accordance to the law numbered 3760, and the number of the provinces increased to 74 (Official Gazette dated September 8, 1991, no. 20984). In 1992, Ardahan and Iğdır were made provinces in accordance with the law no 3806, and the number of the provinces became 76 (Official Gazette dated June 3, 1990, no. 21247). In 1995, Karabük, Kilis and Yalova were added to the list in accordance with the decree having force of law numbered 550, and the number of the provinces became 79 (Official Gazette dated June 6, 1995, no. 22305). In 1996, Osmaniye was made a province in accordance with the law numbered 4200, and the number of the provinces became 80 (Official Gazette dated October 28, 1996, no. 22801). In 1999, Düzce was made a province in 1999; in accordance with the decree having force of law numbered 584, and the number of the provinces became 81 (Official Gazette dated December 9, 1999, no. 23901).

To sum up, in the first ten-year-period of the Turkish Republic, the number of provinces, whose boundaries of the most overlap with the sancak and livas units of Ottoman Empire,

---

<sup>7</sup> The reasonings of the laws for establishing provinces will be mentioned in the fifth chapter under the heading of “Case Study: The Last 14 Provinces” in details.

decreased. But in 1936, this number increase from 57 to 62 with forming five provinces. Then, the number of the provinces began to increase after the multiparty period dated 1946. From the year 1989 to 1999, 14 provinces were added. There are also ambiguities for the criteria defined in the Constitutions and the laws regarding the founding provinces. Nevertheless, there have been no amendments on determining objective criteria on forming provinces, as seen from the above. By considering these situations, establishments of new provinces, especially for the last 14, are thought that they were formed with political concerns. In order to examine this issue, in the following chapters, these fourteen provinces will be analyzed in terms of the criteria set forth in the Constitutions, and the relevant legal and scientific frame of reference.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **THE TRANSFORMATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT**

#### **3.1. Criteria of Establishing a Province**

It is compulsory to state the grounds why provinces and sub-provinces are established according to the article 126 of the Constitution. In compliance with this, it is necessary to show and declare the grounds that comply with the stated reasons shown in the Constitution while proposing a law regarding forming new provinces or sub-provinces.

##### **3.1.1. Legal Basis**

###### **3.1.1.1. Constitution**

The principles relevant to the provincial organization of the general administration stated in the article 126 of the Constitution. According to the article;

*In terms of central administrative structure, Turkey is divided into provinces on the basis of geographical situation and economic conditions, and public service requirements; provinces are further divided into lower levels of administrative units.*

*The administration of the provinces is based on the principle of deconcentration of authority.*

*Central administrative organizations comprising several provinces may be established to ensure efficiency and coordination of public services. The functions and powers of these organizations shall be regulated by law.”*

No detailed arrangements have been made for all the civil administration units only the province unit was specified. The other units, namely sub-provinces and districts were left to the decision of the Lawmaker.

#### **3.1.1.2. Provincial Administration Act**

The Provincial Administration Act, dated 1949 and numbered 5442, specified that the field units of central administration of Turkey should be determined in accordance with the requirements of the public service, its geographical location and economic conditions and provinces can be established by law based on the principles stated in the Constitution (Art. 1-2).

According to article 1, Turkey has been divided into provinces, the provinces were divided into sub-provinces; sub-provinces into districts. As mentioned above, establishing or repealing sub-provinces and provinces are carried out by law, and the districts are established or abolished by the decision of Ministry of Interior and the approval of the President of the Republic.

Although, the law numbered 5442 constitutes the basis of the principles stated in the 1982 Constitution, essentially it goes back to the principles related to the provinces of the 1924 Constitution. Because, as seen from the above articles, the subdivisions of the provinces were clearly stated in 1924 Constitution like in the law numbered 5442; but 1961 and 1982 Constitutions state only “...*provinces and the provinces are further divided into lower levels of administrative units.*” Secondly, in the article 89 of the 1924 Constitution it was mentioned that the provinces and their subdivisions would be organized according to their “*geographical position*” and “*economic conditions*”; apart from those, “*the requirements of the public service*” was added in the relevant articles of the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions. Therefore, the first article of the Provincial Administration Act was amended in 1964 (12/05/1964 - 469/1), and the mentioned criterion was added to the first article.

#### **3.1.1.3. Decree Having Force of Law**

The third legal foundation for forming a new province is the decrees having force of law, which were made operative by the Council of Ministers relying on the authority delegated by TBMM. According to the sixth clause of the article 91 of the Constitution, the decrees having force of law become operative on the same day they are published in the Official Gazette. Again, according to the seventh clause, it is made necessary for the decrees having force of law to be discussed in the TBMM Commissions and the general assembly the same day they were proposed.

### **3.1.2. Bureaucratic Process**

#### **3.1.2.1. Provisions in Ministry of the Interior**

The responsible for arranging the field organization of central administration is the Ministry of Interior. In accordance with the article nine of the law regarding the functions and organization of the Ministry of Interior numbered 3152, the “General Directorate of the Provincial Administration”, which is one of the main service units of this Ministry of Interior, is held responsible for carrying out the necessary studies regarding this subject.

*According to this law, “General Directorate of the Provincial Administration will form field units of central administration, may change the boundaries and names of these units, and change will implement the duties related to field unit annexing and separations and change the names of important places, districts or villages and realize publishing with the field units of central administration.”*  
([http://birimweb.icisleri.gov.tr/teftis/mevzuat/01\\_kanun/k-3152-icisleri\\_bakanligi\\_tes\\_gor\\_hk.doc](http://birimweb.icisleri.gov.tr/teftis/mevzuat/01_kanun/k-3152-icisleri_bakanligi_tes_gor_hk.doc))

These studies normally take a start by the political instructions and/or then with the legislative proposal given. The legislative proposal on making sub-provincial center cities a province is prepared by carrying out studies on all the information, documents and reports, in accordance with the regulation of the Ministry of Interior. The “General Reasoning” and “Article Justifications” are specified in the draft legislative proposal and the subject is put into a form to be discussed in the TBMM Internal Affairs Committee and Planning, and Budget Committee by the Minister of Interior.

#### **3.1.2.2. Decision Process in Legislative Body**

The legislative proposal draft prepared by the Ministry of Interior, is turned out to be a legislative proposal in compliance with the article 88 of the Constitution and is submitted to the Presidency of TBMM. In the article 88, it is stated that, “*The Council of Ministers and deputies are empowered to introduce laws.*”

*The procedure and principles relating to the debating of draft bills and proposals of law in the Turkish Grand National Assembly shall be regulated by the Rules of Procedure.”*  
(<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/constitution.htm>)

According to the 73<sup>rd</sup> article of the Internal Regulations (İçtüzük) of the TBMM, it is stated that, *“A legislative proposal is submitted to the Presidency of TBMM with its reasonings and signed by the Ministers. If it is a legislative proposal submitted by the members of parliament, it should be signed by one or more than one members of parliament.”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

According to the 74<sup>th</sup> article of the Internal Regulations of the TBMM, it is indicated that, *“These proposals are transferred directly to the Commissions by the mentioned presidency.”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

According to the 23<sup>rd</sup> article of the Internal Regulations of the TBMM, it is said that, *“Those Commissions form sub-commissions in their bodies if necessary.”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

According to the 37<sup>th</sup> article of the Internal Regulations of the TBMM, it is pointed out that, *“The proposal transferred to the main commissions by the president of the TBMM, should be discussed in the general assembly in 45 days and a decision should be made with the approval of the absolute majority after the Committee reports were prepared.”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

According to the 51<sup>st</sup> article of the Internal Regulations of the TBMM, it is stated that, *“The Committee reports and the legislative proposal decided by the Commissions in the assembly are included in the incoming papers list in the TBMM General Committee.”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

In the 45<sup>th</sup> article of the Internal Regulations of the TBMM, it is stated that, *“The representatives of the Government and the relevant Commissions should be ready during the discussions in the General Committee and express their opinion on behalf of the Government and the Commissions.”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

The 86<sup>th</sup> and 87<sup>th</sup> articles of the Internal Regulations of the TBMM, stated that, *“Before the discussion of the legislative proposal, the members of parliament who wish to express opinions on the subject are given opportunity to talk and then the proposals are voted. The Members of the Parliament can give amendment proposals before the*

*proposal vote. However, in such a situation, the amendment proposal should be signed by at least five members of the Parliament.”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

If the proposal is accepted by the General Assembly, it becomes a law and is put into force by being published in the Official Gazette.

According to the 128<sup>th</sup> article of the Internal Regulations of the TBMM, it is stated that, “*Upon realizing making a sub-provincial center cities a province through a decree having force of law, this process is shortened because the decrees having force of law are discussed and decided with a priority in both Commissions and the General Committee.*” (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ictuzuk/ictuzuk.htm>)

### **3.2. The Views and Attitudes of Governments Regarding the Forming the Provincial Administration Division**

The provisions of the programs of the governing political parties are also important to determine the intent of the parties for reorganizing and/or forming provinces. Therefore, in this section the government programs, which were read in the Grand National Assembly, will be analyzed.

After the foundation of Republican Regime in 1923, 59 governments were established to date. The subject of forming provinces was first mentioned by the thirty-fourth government, called the Second Erim Government (11.12.1971-22.05.1972). According to the program, it was stated that the Provincial Administration Act and Village Law and administrative divisions would be revised, and necessary legislative precautions would be taken (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp34.htm>).

Secondly, the same subject was stated in the program of the forty-third government, called the sixth Demirel Government (12.11.1979-12.09.1980) as follow: “The Provincial Administration Act will be revised considering the present conditions and the authorities of the governors will be clarified” (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp43.htm>).

Thirdly, in the program of the forty-fourth government, namely Uluşu Government (20.09.1980-13.12.1983) the same statement as the previous government was mentioned stated. According to this, the Provincial Administration Act will be revised by considering the present conditions and the authorities of the governors about law and order will be clarified (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp44.htm>).

Fourthly, while presenting the government program (forty-sixth government/ 21.12.1987-09.11.1989) at TBMM the Prime Minister Turgut Özal said, *“It is the basic principal of the public administration to execute the public services fast, in an effective and productive way. Our aim is to take all public services to our people in the best way possible. In the forthcoming term, in parallel with the development of Turkey, the number of the provinces, sub-provinces and municipalities will be increased regarding the specific rudiments”* (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp46.htm>).

Fifthly, in 1989, the program of the forty-seventh government (09.11.1989-23.06.1991) was presented by the Prime Minister Yıldırım Akbulut. Akbulut first accepted the decision of the previous government, which was establishing 4 provinces and 120 sub-provinces. Then, it was repeated in the same program that: “It is the basic principle of the public administration to execute the public services fast, in an effective and productive way. Our goal is to take all public services to our people in the best way possible. Parallel with the development and growth of Turkey, the numbers of the provinces, sub-provinces and the metropolitan areas will be increased” (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp47.htm>).

Sixthly, in the program of the forty-eighth government (the First Yılmaz Government, 23.06.1991-20.11.1991), it was stated that the geographical, economical factors and the requirements of public service would be taken into consideration and new provinces, sub-provinces, and municipalities would be established (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp48.htm>).

Seventhly, in the program of the fiftieth government (the First Çiller Government, 25.06.1993-05.10.1995), there were no statements about forming provinces, it was only stated that a new provincial local administration system would be formed to support the provincial administration (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp50.htm>).

After the fiftieth government, there were no considerations with regard to establishing and/or reorganizing the provincial division with the exception of one government, which is the fifty-seventh government. According to the program of the fifth Ecevit Government (28.05.1999 - 18.11.2002), establishing a province, sub-province will be regulated on the basis of the objective criteria (<http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hp57.htm>).

In sum, ambiguity as to the criteria to be used for establishing provinces. With the exception of Ecevit's period, all the others emphasized an increase in the number of provinces disregarding objective factors to be used for this purpose.

## CHAPTER IV

### ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM EFFORTS IN TURKEY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF PROVINCE ADMINISTRATION

#### 4.1. Five-Year Development Plans

The 1961 Constitution made it compulsory to plan the development of Turkey by, the five-year development plans were began to be prepared, adopted at the aim of helping the Turkish People live in a contemporary and free environment, in a democratic system, dependent on justice and full employment principles and also in a suitable way for the honor of human beings (Güney, 1976: 83).

In the first five-year development plan (1963-1967), it is stated that the present organization of the administration derived from the system taken over from the Ottoman Empire with some amendments. However, since these changes did not rely on systematic and scientific principals, a system, which is incoordinate and insufficient in the sharing of responsibility and duties, occurred (1<sup>st</sup> FYDP, 1963: 79). It is an unavoidable necessity for the central administration with its central and provincial organizations to be brought into a form in which the requirements of a developing economics will be met in a rational manner and as fast as possible (1<sup>st</sup> FYDP, 1963: 80). There were no studies to carry out regarding the re-forming of the provinces and specifying objective criteria for this reason during the period of the first five-year plan was implemented.

In the second five-year development plan (1968-1972), there are no suggestions or arrangements about the re-forming of the field units of central administration, and also there were no implementations regarding the foundation of new administrative levels.

In the third five-year development plan (1973-1977), there were no specifications about as to the criteria for the restructuring of province administration. Only, it is stated in the “Principles and Precautions” section of the plan that *“the reform will take the central*

*administration, provincial administration, the local administration and the structure, functioning, supply and the personnel of the civil organizations as a whole*” (3<sup>rd</sup> FYDP, 1973: 918). However, no implementations were carried out regarding re-arranging the provincial organization of the central administration.

The fourth five-year development plan (1979-1983), the development and restructuring of the public administration mentioned under the heading of “Institutional and Administrative Principles” in the fourth section (4<sup>th</sup> FYDP, 1979: 298). It is clearly stated that certain principles would be set at the regional and province unit levels of the central administration to this end (4<sup>th</sup> FYDP, 1979: 298).

In the fifth five-year development plan (1985-1989), there is no suggestion either concerning the topic. It is stated in general that the public services will be distributed among the institutions in such a way that the service would be in compliance with the principles of unity in service and would avoid excess expenditure (5<sup>th</sup> FYDP, 1985: 173).

In the sixth five-year development plan (1990-1994), there is no suggestion regarding the field organization in the level of province. It is only stated that the geographical locations, the exchange of goods, services, population, and the communication facilities will be taken into consideration in deciding the influence zones of the settlements (6<sup>th</sup> FYDP, 1989: 318).

In the seventh five-year development plan (1996-2000), it was clearly stated that while organizing the field units of central administration, determining the boundaries and the numbers of both the provinces and sub-provinces is gradually getting irrational. From now on, the provinces and sub-provinces should be formed in compliance with the necessities derived from public services (7<sup>th</sup> FYDP, 1996: 27). Moreover, in the report of the specialized committee, which contributed to the preparation of this plan, it is specified that it was necessary to rely on the objective criteria in establishing provinces and sub-provinces (7<sup>th</sup> FYDP, 1996: 27). But no suggestions were made what and how this objective criterion would be developed and implemented.

Furthermore, according to the report by the Specialized Committee, which was formed in 1994 within the context of the seventh five-year development plan, the Constitutional

provision stating that the divisions would be formed based on geographical situation, economic conditions, and public service requirements takes place in the 1<sup>st</sup> Article of the Provincial Administration Act numbered 5442. However, there is no detailed information what is meant by these principles neither in the Constitution nor in laws. This situation resulted in not considering the legal criteria and the administrative needs while forming new provinces and/or sub-provinces or repealing/dividing them, and the political considerations became more effective (DPT, 1994: 11). The present provinces have great imbalances in respect to their square kilometers, population, and the number of the sub-provinces (DPT, 1994: 11). Therefore, the provincial organization of the central administration should be re-formed and concrete criteria should be applied in forming provinces and sub-provinces (DPT, 1994: 42-43).

In the eighth five-year development plan (2001-2005), it is stated that the field administration will be organized in accordance with the principles of the provincial system and the deconcentration of authority based on the Provincial Administration Act numbered 5442. Then, those administrative units not needed any longer will be abolished (Art. 1841, p.192). Moreover, it is added in the articles 1919 and 1920 that the local governments, which have many small-scale units cause inefficiency in production and waste of money/resources, will be restructured. The criteria for establishing new provinces, sub-provinces and municipalities will be determined by considering the economic potential of the settlements, and their demographical structures, also historical, geographical and cultural features (p.198). According to the report, the rational and objective criteria of forming new provinces and/or sub-provinces should emphasized in the light of increasing number of politically indicated province establishments (DPT, 2000: 36).

In the ninth five-year development plan (2007-2013) too, there are no suggestions or arrangements on the re-forming of the field units of central administration, except the statement that the necessity of the objective criteria for establishing new municipalities are urgently needed (Art. 690, p.95).

Despite the emphasis in the Development Plans, there has been no serious and systematic study to come up with criteria “objective” in nature in the forming of provinces as administrative units.

## **4.2. Reform Efforts before the Development Plans**

In Turkey, there have been many efforts and/or researches to reorganize the administration since 1933, whether carried out by the central governments, ministries or by the universities/ institutions, especially by Türkiye ve Ortadoğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü (TODAİE – Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East). Therefore, in this section, the major attempts for reorganizing the province administration will be explained in chronological order in relation to discussions and results obtained.

### **4.2.1. A Survey on Governors carried out by the Ministry of the Interior in 1945**

In 1945, a survey carried out by the Ministry of Interior among the governors regarding their ideas on the change of boundaries, populations and the space of the geographical area. It was gathered from the replies that 70 per cent of the governors favored the change in the boundaries of provinces (Sanal, 2000: 125).

### **4.2.2. A Report on Provincial Administration Act numbered 5442**

In 1949, Provincial Administration Legislative Proposal was prepared and sent to TBMM. During its discussions in the Committee of Ministry of Interior, some opinions mentioned below were expressed. In the Republican countries where pluralist democracy is adopted, the field divisions are basically province with relatively small space (square kilometers). Turkey follows the same path, and the development of the transportation requires establishing new provinces. Progress in the transportation system in the country necessities the establishment of provinces, which in turn allows closer links between provinces and sub-provinces.

### **4.2.3. A Report by the Administrative Division Board**

In 1960, the Committee formed by the Ministry of Interior, carried out a study on the provincial division. This Committee was delegated the task of the following<sup>8</sup>: The repeal of some of the present provinces and/or sub-provinces whether it is necessary or not; the determination of the boundaries, areas, and populations of the newly to be established provinces and the decision of their centers, sub-provinces/ districts.

---

<sup>8</sup> This subject is compiled from the studies: Sanal (2000) and Demir (1993), because the original study could not be reached.

In the report, there are some important statements about the administrative division of the country. Firstly, the small provinces increase the current expenditures of the government. For this reason, the number of the provinces should not be increased. In addition, the central institutions, organized in the regional levels of the state, are responsible for the investments of large-scaled infrastructure; such as ports, dams, big water plants, highways, bridges etc. Hence, there is no need for a province that its boundary is so much wide as to cover the whole region.

Therefore, in this report, some criteria are prepared to make the process relatively more objective, such as;

- The numbers sub-provinces with a province should be at least five, except for the sub-provincial center cities, and 15 at the most.
- The area of each sub-province should at least 600 square kilometers.
- The square kilometer of the province should not exceed 24.000
- The population of the municipality of sub-provincial centers should not be less than 12.000, the sub-provincial centers should not be less than 45.000, the rest sub-provinces should not be less than 13.000, as for the population of the provinces, it should be at least 210.000.
- The total of the base income in the budget of the provincial local administration should not be less than 750.000 Turkish Liras (Türkiye Mülki Taksimatı Hakkında Rapor, 1960).

8.7 TL falls to the share of each person from the aid given from the general budget that has the specifications mentioned above. This figure is 2.1 TL. per person as the personnel expenditures from the Provincial Local Administration Budget. That is, 10.8 TL. per person should be put aside from any current expenditures (for the year 1960) of the province that carries the above mentioned specifications.

If the region has the above-specified characteristics and if they all constitutes a unity in terms of geographical, economic, social, industrial and cultural features, there can be a province there. If one or more than one of these features are lacking, these places can only be made provinces according to the traditions, the domestic and foreign security requirements and the national benefits.

#### 4.2.4. A Research Project on Central Government Organization (MEHTAP)

In 1962, the Council of Ministers upon the request of Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı (DPT - State Planning Organization) issued the decree numbered 6/209. According to the decree, the research called “*Merkezî Hükümet Teşkilâtı Araştırma Projesi*” (MEHTAP - Research Project on Central Government Organization) began to be conducted. The goal of the MEHTAP research is: “*To determine the distribution of the duties of the Central Government, to study whether or not this distribution permits the fulfillment of the public services in the most efficient way and to develop proposals and recommendations in this regard*”. The project was completed in one year by the Project Board of Administrators whose members were appointed by the Prime Minister, and in April 1963, it was presented to the Prime Ministry.

In the MEHTAP report published by TODAİE in 1963, it is stated in the article 10 under the heading of ‘The Prerequisites of Establishing Provincial Units’:

*...the 115th article of the Constitution took the geographical location, economic conditions and the requirements of the public service as the main factors for the organization of the field units. However, it is necessary to carry out a research on how much the present provincial administration is suitable to the exact definition made in the Constitution because, the already altered conditions of today, such as the speedy development in the economic and social conditions, improvements in the transportation systems affected the mentioned factors. It is quite natural that these developments will affect the system applied in establishing provincial units of central administration and require alterations in it (Art. 10, p.44).*

Furthermore, in the article 15 under the heading of “Provincial Units” it is specified:

*The provinces, the numbers of which is 67, will have an important role in coordination of the planning and implementing the activities of public development. It is necessary to review the positions of the current provinces in order to provide the suitability of their main aims defined in the Constitution and the regained tasks. Since the division tasks of the provincial local administration started to be dealt by the Central Government, it will also be necessary to transfer the limited tasks, except for the ones that are compulsory to continue, with their financial means” (Art.15, p.45).*

In the seventh part of the report, it is stated under the subheading of The Field Units of the Central Government:

*The field organization of the central government is formed in accordance with the provincial administration units and regional organizations. It is observed that while forming provincial administration units, the requests of the people of the districts were taken more into consideration than the geographical, economic conditions and the requirements of the public service; accordingly, the formation of these units is systematically wrong (Art.e, p.362).*

*Some of the provinces are a lot bigger than the others and some are almost too small. Apart from this incoherence, by considering the factors, such as the increase in population, emergence of the new economic regions/centers, and improvements in the transportation facilities, this incoherence and unsystematic implement will be able to partly be corrected by reorganizing the bigness and largeness of the provinces” (Art.1, pp.362-363).*

The recommendations of this report have reflected on the Administrative Reform of the First Five-Year Plan. The principles of the reform related to the local administration and the provincial organization of the central administration was published in compliance with this report in 1965. Recommendations on reorganizing the provinces were proposed in this report. Besides that, in 1974, a research was conducted by TODAİE to evaluate the implementation of the recommendations made in the MEHTAP report. Although, the research (Dinçer, Ersoy; 1974) affirmed the recommendations made in MEHTAP report, it asserted that there were no preparations for the reorganization of the provincial administration. In addition, it was stated that in the explanation letter sent to the researchers by the Ministry of Interior, it was necessary to carry out a reorganization regarding the provincial administration divisions but it was almost too difficult to realize such an objective.

### **4.3. Reform Efforts after the Development Plans**

#### **4.3.1. A Research on the Provincial Organization of the Central Administration**

In 1965 and 1966, a research group under the chairmanship and responsibility of Prof. Dr. Arif Payaslıoğlu conducted a research called “A Research on the Provincial Organization of the Central Administration” within the context of the studies of the Reorganization of the Administration and the Administrative Methods Committee.

In the report, it is stated that the provincial administrative divisions of Turkey are far from enlightening the problems of area, boundary, number, and center systematically; for this reason, the necessity to continue such an examination continues.

Payaslıoğlu (1966) draws some conclusions from his previous studies; according to him; there are imbalances and vast differences among the present province divisions in terms of the population, the economic activities, the income levels and social services.

In the report, it also stated that it would be beneficial to take the criteria, set forth by the Constitution as the starting point while researching the provincial administration divisions whether or not in present divisions, these legal and scientific variables are taken into consideration. However, the criteria issued by the Constitution, are general statements with regard to the divisions of the provinces so, it is very difficult to use them in either evaluation or reorganization of province administration. For this reason, these criteria should be made objective, concrete and suitable for use in the evaluative studies, before anything else (Payaslıoğlu, 1996: 29).

Furthermore, the report also analysis that the studies to be carried out on the provincial administrative divisions need to be realized by a group of experts in the field of interest. Various factors such as historical and political factors, traditions, feelings, and interests effect the formation of the administrative divisions as well as the geographical and economic conditions, and the requirements of the public service. These constitute the technical obstacles. On the other hand, the experiences lived through proved that there are difficulties in a wide spread re-organization of the administrative divisions even if the researches were carried out successfully. This would require a political will and

support without which, however powerful the government in the Parliaments are the reorganization projects could not be realized (Payaslıoğlu, 1996: 29).

#### **4.3.2. A Research on the Provincial General Administration**

In 1967, with the decision of the Council of Ministers, dated September 29 and numbered 6/8747, re-organization studies started in the body of the Ministry of Interior. The aim of this study, which is about the provincial general administration, is to execute the government services within the boundaries of the provinces. To set the principles of the reorganization of the provincial general administration; to determine and examine the problems of both the center and field organizations of the Ministry of Interior, and to suggest solutions suitable for the modern public administration required by the developing economic, social and cultural conditions (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: XLIII).

According to the report, it is stated that Committee principles and the laws related to the establishment of provinces should be clarified so as to no ambiguity remains, as much as possible. During the determination of objective criteria for the provincial divisions based on the relevant principles of the Constitution and the Provincial Administration Act, the secondary factors should also be taken into consideration, and these should be stated clearly with a regulation to be prepared (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 406).

Although governments may initiate the forming a province, this remains a specific research and analysis of the sub-provinces under consideration in terms of some objective criteria (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 405).

According to the report, secondly, there should not be any limitation on the number of the population and on the size of the area for provincial divisions. Both the present geographical location and the economic micro regions should be taken into consideration. The criteria of population and the size of the area should be considered as the elements of cost and the requirements of the public service and the sufficiency calculations. In order to implement these recommendations, the studies carried out regarding transport, geographical location, agriculture and economics should be considered, and then an expert committee should determine the geographical and economic micro divisions of Turkey. While establishing a provincial division, the sub-provinces and provinces should be placed in one of these micro regions or in a few

regions, which are very similar to each other. The cost of the public service its suitability to the Turkish cost average should be examined in detail, by considering the number of population of the relevant place while establishing a provincial division. An area which goes above the average at a great extend, should be examined if it is possible to increase the population by extending it a bit more, and then the suitability of the area and population should be provided. In cases when this suitability is not provided, the decision should be left to the political instinct (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 396).

Thirdly, the transportation facilities among the allocation units should be carefully examined in establishing provincial divisions. In order to realize this, geographical and economic researches should be carried out. The position of the area, the cost of constructing the transport ways, the position of the transport with regard to distance and time, economical, social, and the cultural attraction of the place should be examined in detail (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 397).

Fourthly, the geographical location should be considered as an important factor. Geographical identity and unity should be taken as base. So organize as to provide a meaningful geographical unity (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 398).

Fifthly, the economic conditions should be considered together with the geographical location. These conditions should be decided by a committee of experts by considering the opinions of DPT and the other relevant institutions (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 399).

Sixthly, there should not be any definite numbers for the sub-divisions of the provinces. A sub-division should be in such a form that it would make the best, easiest, fastest and the most productive organization possible by considering the natural, geographical, economic and transport conditions. If the allocation units are monotonous or extremely different, more than one province divisions should be carried out by considering the factors of speed, easiness, political preference, and accomplishing affairs (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 401).

Lastly, the requirements of the public service should be determined beforehand, and the factors and criteria should be decided. To realize this, the opinions of the scientists, ministry, and the independent general directorates, experienced administrators should be

obtained. An inter ministries committee should be gathered to decide the requirements of the public service (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1972: 403-404).

#### **4.3.3. A Report on the Reorganization of the Administration-Principles and Proposals**

In 1971, the government took a decision dated May 29 and numbered 7/2527 regarding forming the ‘Prime Ministry Advisory Board’ for reorganizing the public sector and determining its general direction and strategy in accordance with the government program. The report, published by TODAİE, was prepared in three months and submitted to the Prime Ministry; however, it was not put into practice.

According to the report, it was stated that increasing the number of the provincial divisions vertically and horizontally; and making the service units of the other institutions work at all provincial levels without considering whether the service is really needed, causes in losing the effect and dispersing the facilities of the service power (TODAİE, 1971: 74).

In addition, it is specified that the principles of the 1961 Constitution had not been taken into consideration while establishing province. The present provincial division (in 1971) based on the factors, which were not objective and rational such as historical occurrence, traditions, the needs and the pressures of the people, or the political opinions relying completely on the results of the elections (TODAİE, 1971: 174).

Due to the mentioned factors, it is recommended that the provincial system should be preserved; but the present provinces should be reorganized in compliance with the definition of the 115<sup>th</sup> article of the 1961 Constitution by considering their geographical and economic factors, and the requirements of the public service (TODAİE, 1971: 175).

#### **4.3.4. A Research on the Public Administration (KAYA)**

In 1988, TODAİE was asked to carry out a research by DPT, to improve the Turkish Public Administration. Then a project called “*Kamu Yönetimi Araştırma Projesi*” (KAYA - A Research on the Public Administration) started. The reason of the request of DPT was stated as follows:

*TODAİE was asked to carry out this research to improve the Turkish public administration, to find out how much the studies have been put into practices, what parts of the studies are not working, what kind of problems it has, and what arrangements should be made. Thus, this research will also be beneficial for the sixth five-year development plan. Besides, by considering the decision of Turkey about becoming a membership of mentioned community, the Turkish Public administration should be adapted to the conditions of the European Community (KAYA Report, 1991: 4)*

It was mentioned in the article three under the heading of ‘Province Administration’ that the number of the provinces was gradually increasing and it will be 100 provinces in the future under the influence of the political factors (KAYA Report, 1991: 75). In the article three, it was added that there was implementation ambiguity in the criteria to be taken into consideration (KAYA Report, 1991: 75). As a result, scientific researches should be carried out before establishing new provinces and sub-provinces (Art.10, p.78).

The Provincial and International Institutions Research Group, formed within the framework of KAYA Project, carried out a research on “Reorganizing the Formation and Functions of the Provinces”. The aim of the study was to decide the basis of the reorganizational principles of forming provinces. The report mentioned about the statement of the present government regarding the number of provinces without specifying any criteria or reasonings: “*It will be 100 in the near future*”. So, it is not wrong to say -even it is theoretical- such statements are politically oriented and this will continue under any governments in the past, present, and the future (Art.2, p.7).

In the ‘Rudiments of Forming Provinces’ section of the report (Ar, 1991: 9), it is recommended that the expert groups or the institutions that have authorities should carry out the researches in the establishment of new provinces, they should not be formed because of political considerations. Within the context of this report, a questionnaire was developed for getting the views of governors on matters relating to provincial administration. According to the responses on the convenience of the size of provinces for provide services, approximately 85 per cent of the governors rated their provincial sizes ‘sufficient’; seven per cent rated for ‘small size’ and eight per cent rated for ‘large

size' (Ar, 1991: 9). On the other hand, the numbers of the responses both on 'forming new provinces is beneficial for providing the public service' and 'strengthening the equipments, financial resources, human resources and authorities of the present provinces instead of forming new ones' are the same (Ar, 1991: 10).

The recommendations on the forming new provinces are listed in the report as follows:

- The expert groups or the institutions that have authorities should carry out the researches.
- Provinces should not be formed because of political considerations. The political considerations should be examined by this expert groups.
- The total population of the province should be over 150.000.
- The total area of the province should at least be 15.000 kilometers square and its topographic situation should form a whole with its surrounding.
- Transportation and communication facilities (the distance from the provincial center and transportation difficulty) should be taken into consideration.
- The possibility of being economic, social, cultural and tourist centers; also showing the commercial and industrial development should be considered.
- The number of the sub-provinces should be at least 8 and at most 12; and 10 in average.

Besides, it is emphasized that it was necessary to come to a combined decision by applying a suitable analysis and synthesis between the above-mentioned factors to form a province (Ar, 1991: 12-13).

#### **4.3.5. A Research on the Reorganization of the Provincial Administration Divisions of Turkey**

In 1988, the Board of Inspectors (Mülkiye Teftiş Kurulu) was asked to do a research by Mustafa Kalemli, Minister of Interior, for the aim of determining the sub-provinces, which would be made provinces.

In the evaluation process of the study, out of 683 present sub-provinces, 103 were eliminated in the first evaluation because of the impossibility to have enough knowledge about these newly founded sub-provinces. Then, the sub-provincial center cities of

Ankara, İstanbul, İzmir, Adana, Bursa, and Konya were also left out in the second evaluation for the reason that they might mislead the averages of Turkey.

The 174 sub-provinces, left out of the evaluations, were eliminated again by taking various criteria into consideration, such as central and total population, the population growth rates, the development levels, the number of the subdivision centers and their zones of influence, the number of the foundations in production, commerce and service sectors, the level and the numbers of the educational units, the number of the health institutions, the urbanization level and the number of the municipalities, transportation facilities. After this evaluation the number of the sub-provinces decreased to 73.

These 73 sub-provinces were taken into a last elimination by considering some other criteria, such as their economical and commercial impacts on their ex-provinces after the new division also, the distance between them and their ex-provinces, their development levels and their features as being an acceptable center. In this way, out of 683 sub-provinces, 39 were found worth establishing provincial centers.

At the end of the study, a ranking was realized among 39 sub-provinces and a prediction was made about the expectations of the people living in these sub-provinces. In the socio-psychological evaluation assessment, the subjects such as the demands of the people regarding being made a province, the efforts of the non-governmental organizations and political parties for making this dream come true, the situation of creating a public opinion through media, the fact that a legislative proposal was submitted to make the sub-province a province, the situation of being a province in the past were all accepted as positive points.

#### **4.3.6. A Report on Determining the Formation Criteria of Provinces, Sub-provinces, Metropolitan Municipalities**

In 1996, the Internal Affairs Committee of the Parliament formed a sub-committee to make a solution on a scientific ground in the subject of forming provinces and sub-provinces and to avoid the political effects and pressures. The sub-committee started working on April 18, 1996 and asked for information from some organizations regarding the objective criteria on forming provinces, sub-provinces, and metropolitan areas. These institutions are Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Environment,

Ministry of Finance, Undersecretariat of DPT, İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality, İstanbul Governorship, İzmir Governorship, Ankara Governorship, Regional Governorship of Emergency (Olağanüstü Hal Bölge Valiliği), Rectorate of METU, Rectorate of ITU, İstanbul University Faculty of Political Sciences, Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences, Ankara Chamber of Industry, Ankara Chamber of Commerce, Chamber of Architects (Sub-Committee of Internal Affairs, 1996).

The information sent by these institutions has been examined and the following criteria were determined to be used in forming provinces:

1. Population

- a) Central Population (At least 100.000),
- b) Total Population (At least 250.000),
- c) Population Growth Rate in the last five years,

2- Geographical Structure,

- a) Distance to its province (At least 100 kilometers),
- b) Transportation (the situations of Airways, Highways, Maritime-lines, and Railways),
- c) Situation of the Land/Terrain,

3- Infrastructure,

- a) Educational Services,
- b) Health Services
- c) Justice Services
- d) Safety Services,
- e) Military Organization,
- f) The sufficiency of the service buildings,

4- Economic Conditions

- a) Contribute to the Gross National Product,
- b) The amount of collected tax,
- c) Industry (the development level of the industry)
- d) The development level of the agriculture,
- e) The development level of the tourism,

5- Lower Level Units,

- a) Sub-provinces,

- b) Municipalities,
- c) Villages,
- 6- Special Conditions,
  - a) The establishment of supreme power,
  - b) Security of boundaries,
  - c) The demands of private and public institutions,
  - d) The classes of the sub-provinces,
  - e) Priority areas for development.

These criteria were determined but were not put into practice. Because the criteria the committee determined were open to interpretation, it was decided to grade them and then make the provinces that have enough grades to become provinces. The Ministry of Interior would do the grading.

In the light of the reports cited above, some remarks can be made: It is very difficult to say that these reports and analyses are qualified and in-depth studies of the subject-matter. With the exception of two, they seem to elaborate some general issues associated, but not necessarily they try to propose new objective criteria to be used for this purpose. In the two, specific suggestions have been developed, but not acted upon in any way in the political decisions/policy making circles.

From among these studies, particularly in the last one, some criteria are offered, which are taken into consideration in the case studies of the 14 provinces in the following chapter of the thesis.

## CHAPTER V

### CASE STUDY: THE LAST 14 PROVINCES

#### 5.1. Introduction

The chapter on the case study consists of two sections. In the first section, the discussion process of the laws concerning the 14 provinces will be mentioned. Then in the second, in order to substantiate the arguments and to discuss the subject of forming the last 14 provinces within the scientific framework, the data of these 14 provinces (the detailed table is given in the Table-1) are taken into consideration and compared with each other. In the final, the results of the comparison are discussed.

**Table 1. The Dates of the Last Established 14 Provinces with Law Numbers**

|    | Name of the Province |           | Date of Acceptance | Date of Issue in the Official Gazette | Law No  | Title of the Law                                                               |
|----|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | 68                   | Aksaray   | 15.6.1989          | 21.6.1989                             | 3578    | A law regarding forming 4 Provinces and 5 Sub-Provinces                        |
| 2  | 69                   | Bayburt   |                    |                                       |         |                                                                                |
| 3  | 70                   | Karaman   |                    |                                       |         |                                                                                |
| 4  | 71                   | Kırıkkale |                    |                                       |         |                                                                                |
| 5  | 72                   | Batman    | 16.5.1990          | 18.5.1990                             | 3647    | A law regarding forming 2 Provinces and 5 Sub-Provinces                        |
| 6  | 73                   | Şırnak    |                    |                                       |         |                                                                                |
| 7  | 74                   | Bartın    | 28.8.1991          | 7.9.1991                              | 3760    | A law regarding forming Bartın Province                                        |
| 8  | 75                   | Ardahan   | 27.5.1992          | 3.6.1992                              | 3806    | A law regarding forming 13 Sub-Province and 2 Province                         |
| 9  | 76                   | Iğdır     |                    |                                       |         |                                                                                |
| 10 | 77                   | Yalova    | 3.6.1995           | 6.6.1995                              | KHK.550 | A decree having force of law regarding forming 8 Sub-Provinces and 3 Provinces |
| 11 | 78                   | Karabük   |                    |                                       |         |                                                                                |
| 12 | 79                   | Kilis     |                    |                                       |         |                                                                                |
| 13 | 80                   | Osmaniye  | 24.10.1996         | 28.10.1996                            | 4200    | A law regarding forming 3 Sub-Provinces and 1 Province                         |
| 14 | 81                   | Düzce     | 03.12.1999         | 9.12.1999                             | KHK.584 | A decree having force of law regarding forming 1 Province and 2 Sub-Provinces  |

## 5.2. Methodology

The data used in the comparison part are based on the criteria regarding establishing provinces determined in 1996 by the sub-committee of the Internal Affairs Committee of the Parliament. The aim of the study mentioned in the end of the previous chapter, was to find out a solution on a scientific ground in the subject of forming provinces, sub-provinces; and to prevent the political considerations and pressures. In this context, it is the most comprehensive study to date done in Turkey, because of this reason, the objective criteria and their categorizations stated in the Table-2, are used in the comparison process.

**Table 2. The Criteria for Forming Provinces**

| Criteria               | Sub-Criteria                                                                       |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Population             | Central Population (At least 100.000)                                              |
|                        | Total Population (At least 250.000)                                                |
|                        | Population Growth Rate in the last five years                                      |
| Geographical Structure | Area                                                                               |
|                        | Distance to its province (At least 100 kilometers)                                 |
|                        | Transportation (the situations of Airways, Highways, Maritime-lines, and Railways) |
|                        | Situation of the Land/Terrain                                                      |
| Infrastructure         | Educational Services                                                               |
|                        | Health Services                                                                    |
|                        | Justice Services                                                                   |
|                        | Safety Services                                                                    |
|                        | Military Organization                                                              |
|                        | The sufficiency of the service buildings                                           |
| Economic Conditions    | Contribute to the Gross National Product                                           |
|                        | The amount of collected tax                                                        |
|                        | Industry (the development level of the industry)                                   |
|                        | The development level of the agriculture                                           |
|                        | The development level of the tourism                                               |
| Lower Level Units      | Sub-provinces                                                                      |
|                        | Districts                                                                          |
|                        | Municipalities                                                                     |
|                        | Villages                                                                           |
| Special Conditions     | The establishment of supreme power                                                 |
|                        | Security of boundaries                                                             |
|                        | The demands of private and public institutions                                     |
|                        | The classes of the sub-provinces                                                   |
|                        | Priority areas for development                                                     |

*Source: A Report on Determining the Formation Criteria of Provinces, Sub-provinces, Metropolitan Municipalities, the Sub-committee of the Internal Affairs Committee of the Parliament*

The criteria that are needed in making a sub-province province do not exist in consistent systematic manner. In the research, the criteria and the available information for each

criterion has been secured. For meaningful comparative purposes, only the information available for each and every criterion, and if repeated in all cases, has been considered.

As shown in the table above, there are 27 criteria as categorized in six groups, on determining the formation of provinces. 20 of them (**bold** face in Table-2) which are more objective than the other seven criteria, are taken into consideration in the case study. In addition, the *area* and the *districts* items are the extra criteria out of those 27 items that are not stated in the sub-committee report; they are also in an ordinal scale, which supplies quantitative information, like the other selected criteria. However, some of the other criteria; namely *transportation, educational, health, justice and safety services, the development level of the industry and tourism* are still too general statements to make the quantitative analysis possible. For that reason, these most general criteria are made more specific by defining sub-criteria for each other (it will be mentioned in detail in the second part of this chapter); but consequently, the last 14 provinces will be compared according to the 20 criteria in the final.

In order to compare the last 14 provinces according to those criteria, the statistical data must be in sub-province level. Hence, for each province, the dates of the data belong to the year before the province establishment dates stated in Table-1.

After determining the criteria regarding forming provinces and its scope, the second step of this section is the data collection process. In this process, each datum is collected from both related Ministries and their Provincial Directorates; as well as Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TUIK - Turkish Statistical Institution). These Ministries were Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of National Education, Ministry of National Defense, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Initially, the applications for the concerned data were made to the Ministries, but it was met with no response, except Ministry of National Education.

Secondly, the other way was tried, and the telephone inquiries were made to each field unit of the related Ministries for the last 14 provinces. This way did not supply definite information, so it was also problematic way to gather any data. Then, within the meaning of the *Information Procurement Act* (the application form can be seen in Appendix G), petitions were written to the related departments for the statistics required. The

correspondences were done via e-mail instead of mail in order to receive information more quickly. But some of the departments of the field units of the Ministries in the 14 provinces do not have internet services. Therefore, the necessary information were tried by telephone, even though the information required were not collected precisely. Among the replies submitted for the petitions, it is understood that:

- a. The statistical data are not held nor stored properly by the government institutions in Turkey,
- b. Still information kept at the level of Ministry is not consistent with the information kept at the provincial directorates,
- c. Data collected in some provinces are not available in the other than causing meaningful comparisons in between.

The discrepancies in statistical information are neutralized as far as possible and the inadequate data are ignored. Within this context, the evaluation is made only on the basis of the precise information to compare the 14 provinces accurately.

The following part is devoted to the discussion process of the related laws in TBMM General Assembly. In this part, firstly, the general and article justifications are given and then the Member of Parliament's discussions are quoted in order to understand their view points regarding forming provinces.

In the second part of the case study, the evaluation is made by comparing the 14 provinces. Within the context of the determined criteria which are specified objectively, how much and in what ways they resemble each other for being a province will be discussed; besides, which one and/or ones of them is/are more convenient for being a province will be examined.

### **5.3. The Discussion Process of the Related Laws in TBMM General Assembly**

#### **5.3.1. Aksaray (68), Bayburt (69), Karaman (70), Kırıkkale (71)**

In 1989; Aksaray, Bayburt, Karaman and Kırıkkale were made provinces in accordance with the law numbered 3578. The law regarding forming four provinces and five sub-

provinces was passed on June 15, 1989 and was published in the Official Gazette dated June 21, 1989.

The reasonings for making these sub-provinces provinces were explained as follows in the General Grounds section of the mentioned law:

*The grounds for making these sub-provinces provinces are, running the public service in a more effective and more productive way; to be able to follow the changes seen in the socio-economic and socio-cultural balances in time as much as evaluating the geographical structure of Turkey.*

*On the other hand, it is necessary to reflect the modern administration approach that is reached upon realizing the reforms in the central administration system to the provincial administration.*

*Also, the number of the people immigrating from the rural area to the urban areas; the negative impacts of the areas which are weak and have insufficient development possibilities and the need for new administrative attraction centers in the country (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 29, Yasama Yılı: 2, p.2).*

Therefore, it was stated that Aksaray, which is subordinate to Niğde, Bayburt, which is subordinate to Gümüşhane, and Karaman, which is subordinate to Konya, and Kırıkkale, which is subordinate to Ankara, were decided to be made provinces because they were developed with regard to their socio-economic and cultural positions.

#### **5.3.1.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly**

During the discussion in TBMM general assembly, no important objections were made regarding establishing provinces, only it was stated that this was a way to do political vote hunting (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 15.06.1989, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 29, Yasama Yılı: 2, Birleşim: 102, Oturum: 1, pp.220-257).

**President of the Assembly** - If only ANAP had made proposals for all the sub-provinces that are expecting to be made provinces and we would have all have supported them.

We, as DYP, are not in favor of ANAP government's criteria for declaring a territory as sub-province, which is founded on bargaining. Because we know that they went to some places, they promised during the elections but forgotten their promises afterwards.

Aksaray was a province 56 years ago, and did not deserve being turned into a sub-province from being a province by the law dated 20.3.1933 and numbered 2197.

Being from Aksaray, I also proposed that Aksaray should be made a province on February 1, 1988. **The passion of being a province has always been burning in my heart since my childhood.**

**M. Ö. (Niğde-DYP)** - Aksaray comes before forty provinces of Turkey when we take into consideration tourism, transport, industry, agriculture, education, communication, small industry, and other economic and social values. All the state institutions and establishments have this information regarding Aksaray.

Another specification of Aksaray is that it has approximately 20 boroughs. Some of these boroughs have a population of more than 18.000 people.

**M. T. B. (İzmir-SHP)** - It is natural that the economic, social and cultural improvements the public is experiencing will make changes in the administrative structure. The desired order of this change is the one that starts from the bottom and goes towards the top systematically. That is, the boroughs should become sub-provinces and the sub-provinces should become provinces, in order.

Mr. Y.Y. - Member of Parliament of SHP with his 67 friends submitted a legislative proposal in 1988 stating that Kırıkkale should become a province. If the government had been sincere and if the government had not exploited this matter politically, this proposal should have been evaluated, amended and the relevant law should have been passed. If only they had realized it then. By talking about this explanation, I would like to highlight the approach of today's government for forming new sub-provinces and provinces. In the second article of the first clause, it is stated that a new sub-province named "Pazaryolu" will be founded.

Will it (not) come true that making subordinate to a province of this sub-province? If yes, then How? Because, the temporary sixth clause mentions that "Pazaryolu" will

make subordinate to either Erzurum or Bayburt and a referendum will be carried out to decide which one it will make subordinate to.

This is not the procedure, which the Turkish Constitution allows. Referendums are not the means of deciding on these kinds of matters. This formula proves that the political worries of the government are dominant to realizing this administrative structure.

**H. K. (Ankara-ANAP)** - The renewing of the local administration structure started with ANAP period in 1983 and this kind of renewing requires such a very strong government. The legislative proposals submitted individually were issued just for the purpose of verbal precedence. I am telling this to prove that how much political this approach is.

The legislative proposal we are discussing now, came up to the agenda of Turkey with the siTBMMure of the Prime Minister, Mr. Turgut Özal, on March 13, 1989.

The basic reforms regarding renewing the provincial administration happened during ANAP government period. Establishing 103 sub-provinces was the beginning of these reforms. As the Prime Minister stated on TV on March 13, 1989, the number of the provinces will be increased to a hundred and as many sub-provinces as necessary will be formed.

Presently, Aksaray, which belongs to Niğde, is an important and effective settlement unit of the area with the central population of approximately 100.000 people. Its population is more than 230.000 when the population living in its boroughs and villages are taken into consideration. Aksaray's being situated on E-5 international highway is a good factor for creating dynamism on its development and its population also increases due to these factors. Because of the present dynamism of Aksaray, it is impossible to administer with the sub-provincial organization. By declaring Aksaray as a province, we are returning its province status that was taken away from it once and, thus, the people in Aksaray will reach their long desired target.

Bayburt, which is already subordinate to Gümüşhane, is a center with its surroundings due to its historical past and its location. Bayburt people, which we will form as Bayburt being a provincial center, will revive the long lasting dreams.

Making Kırıkkale, which is already subordinate to Ankara, a province will not only lessen the burden of Ankara because of making Keskin, Delice and Sulakyurt sub-provinces subordinate to the provincial center of Kırıkkale; but also, will realize the dreams of Kırıkkale.

This is what I think about Kırıkkale: “Kırıkkale sub-province has been craving for being a province since 1965 like a young man whose clothes are three sizes too small for him”

**A.A. (Diyarbakır - Minister of Interior)** - We not only fulfill the dreams of three of our sub-provinces but also give them the long deserved status. Bayburt, which has accomplished a considerable development in industry and fast improvement and has turned out to be a modern province with a population of 200.000 from a village in the last fifty years, will succeed in getting its deserved status.

In our study, you will see that all the sub-provinces within the boundaries of the metropolitan area, except for the ones founded in 1987, have been examined in details.

In the first phase of these studies, the sub-provinces that have the population of less than 15.000 and other 174 sub-provinces that do not take place among the “small sub-provinces” which are accepted as “the lower scale sub-provinces” according to the research realized by State Planning Organization dated 1982 were handled.

After that, the number of these 174 sub-provinces was dropped to 73 being graded according to their central population, total population, number of villages and municipalities, urbanization level, the institutions of commerce, education, health and industry and also the investing.

Later on, these 73 sub-provinces were reexamined according to their centralization, distance, development conditions and also their potential economic effects on the provinces they will separate to. As a result, it was decided that only 39 of these sub-provinces could be made provinces.

Kırıkkale, Aksaray, Karaman and Bayburt have been chosen among these 39 sub-provinces by taking the following reasons into consideration: Kırıkkale and Aksaray are at the front rank in mentioned evaluation; as for Karaman, it will lessen the burden of Konya by considering to geographical position of Konya. In addition, Bayburt has been chosen because it is thought to become an important center in the development of the area.

They will develop faster due to the change in their administrative structures.

**D. B. (Niğde)** - The people of Aksaray, which was made a sub-province and subordinate to Niğde in 1933, have tried to express themselves towards their wish to become a province again for many years and, at last, their attempts to become a province has come to the agenda of the General Assembly after going through the relevant committees of the Grand National Assembly .

With an arrangement made in 1954, Nevşehir, which is subordinate to Niğde was declared a province and today, Niğde is being reduced by half by separating Aksaray from it. This situation is not only humiliating Niğde but also reducing it by half in respect of its historical development, population, area

.

**Ö. Ş. (Konya)** - I also have submitted a proposal regarding making Akşehir a province. My proposal is still pending at the Presidency of Assembly and the President of the Assembly somehow has not transferred it to the committee yet. I think it became the object of the government's rage.

We should not make our citizens think that we want their votes in return for every service we take to them.

**İ. T. (Ankara - SHP)** - Making changes in the administrative structure of our country was suggested by the governing party. We all know that the government has already given extravagant promises of making the sub-provinces and boroughs provinces and sub-provinces during the local election campaigns, referendums and within the framework of all kinds of vote bargains. It is announced that a legislative proposal will be submitted to propose to make for or five sub-provinces provinces according to the

number of the votes given for the governing party just before the local elections. That is the motto was *'vote for us and become a province!'*, or, *'if you do not vote for us, you can never become a sub-province or province'*. We heard these words during the election speeches very often. The administrative structure of Turkey cannot be within this framework.

Although increasing the numbers of the sub-provinces and provinces takes place in the policy of the government clearly, there is no explicitness in the matters regarding in accordance with which aims, principles and precedence these will be carried out and what the results of these will be.

Increasing the number of the provinces will mean making provinces sub-provinces. You cannot handle each sub-province separately. It is something that has its own drawbacks. I have a strong belief that these drawbacks will bring many mistakes to the administrative situation of Turkey in the future.

If 39 sub-provinces are suitable to be made provinces, why have only four of them been proposed?

Many provinces mean many small provinces. The administrative organization problem of our country cannot be solved by creating many small provinces. This problem can be solved by setting up a system of coordinating governorship.

New provinces and new sub-provinces will of course be formed, but not by following this logic.

Making changes on the administrative structure and the divisions should be based on local researches, the surveys realized with the people and the administrators of the area and be decided as a result of very detailed, long term and serious examinations.

**M. Ö. (Niğde-DYP)** - We hope Kırıkkale will be a province that has great refinery, production industry and petrochemical industry like Kocaeli and İzmir. This can only be realized by making Kırıkkale a province.

**R. D. (Niğde-ANAP)** - The new sub-provinces and the provinces will of course contribute a lot to the Turkish economy in the area of employment and they will be the factors that will lessen matter of unemployment.

**H. Z. P. (Aydın)** - Your impatient attitude before an election put Turkey into a jigsaw puzzle on June 18, 1987. How many of the 103 sub-provinces have you appointed judges and public prosecutors? We saw that on those days, that is, a year before now, those appointments had not been carried out and those positions are still empty even today. Therefore, the sub-province status of those places is jammed.

He mentioned about the technicality of the researches carried out during his ministry and the accuracy of their political decisions. We also know about those reports. There are two different reports. The first is the technical report and the other is the report, which shows the votes given to the governing party in the election, not the list of the sub-provinces, which should be proposed to be made provinces. Two different lists were prepared because the order of the places in the first list was not in concordance with the lineage of the votes. That's why they also prepared the second list.

Just look at the map of Turkey: Ermenek is subordinate to Karaman Province. If Ermenek is subordinate to Karaman, people of Karaman will have to go through another province to reach their own province. If they prefer the way from Anamur, they will have to go through İçel and if they prefer to take the other way, they will have to go through Konya.

In both of the researches, Kırıkkale is the first and Aksaray is the second. Where is Bayburt? In the 35<sup>th</sup> row in one and in the 27<sup>th</sup> in the second.

There is a word spent by Mr. Prime Minister regarding İskenderun on March 14, 1989: *"İskenderun is the first in line among the sub-provinces to be made provinces. You support us in the coming elections and we will support you, too."*

When saying *'we are making subordinate sub-provinces to the provinces'*, let us not make the same mistake we made in Pazaryolu or Ermenek. Today, if you want to go to Bayburt from Ermenek you can only use the air passage.

**Ü. G. (Gümüşhane)** - When we study the legislative proposal in details, we are glad to see that objective criteria have been set while forming new provinces. The socio-cultural structure and the historical development of that sub-province have been taken into consideration. Of course, these places will become attraction points after this law passes. Thus, migration from these places will lessen, too.

The migration from the rural area to the big provinces, which is the natural result in the industrializing countries, will be balanced, by means of making provinces. As is known, this migration is only the result of the lack of infrastructure. By the help of this law, we will give the opportunity to the sub-provinces that are psychologically ready to become provinces. These sub-provinces, which are already in the process of development and urbanization, will be good examples and impulsive power for the other sub-provinces.

#### **5.1.2. Batman (72), Şırnak (73)**

In 1990, Batman and Şırnak were made provinces in accordance with the law numbered 3647. The law regarding forming two provinces and five sub-provinces was passed as the attachment to the decree on May 16, 1990, was proclaimed in the Official Gazette on May 18, 1990 with numbered 20522.

The reasonings for making these sub-provinces provinces were explained in the General Grounds section of the Law numbered 3647 as follows: *“The geographical position, population potential and the requirements of the public service made it necessary for Batman and Şırnak to become provinces”* (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 16.05.1990, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 45, Yasama Yılı: 3, p.1).

##### **5.1.2.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly**

According to the discussions regarding forming two provinces and one sub-province in the general assembly, it is understood that the real reason is the problem of security in the Southeastern Region. Upon the demand of the State of Emergency District Governorship, established in 1986, this subject was discussed in the National Security Council and this council advised the government to fulfill this demand. This situation was mentioned especially by Ali TOPUZ, Member of Parliament for Social Democratic People’s Party from İstanbul and by Zeki ÇELİKER, Member of Parliament for ANAP

from Siirt during the discussion in the general assembly of TBMM (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 16.05.1990, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 45, Yasama Yılı: 3, Birleşim: 114, Oturum: 1, pp.246-256)

In fact, according to the summarized report of the Meeting of the National Security Council, which was held on March 28, 1990, it was stated that the general evaluation of the security problems throughout the country and especially the increase of the terrorist and anarchic events in the Southeastern Region, were made; and it was decided to promulgate the additional necessary precautionary measures to the Government (<http://www.mgk.gov.tr/Turkce/basinbildiri1990/28mart1990.htm>).

The other discussions can be summarized as follows (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 16.05.1990, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 45, Yasama Yılı: 3, Birleşim: 114, pp.239-270):

***İ. K. (Erzurum-DYP)*** - These three places have their own characteristics. One of them has been suffering from economic, social and especially the security problems for a long time. The other is an especially very important place due to the petrol reserves, population and economic situation and the last is continuously restless because of PKK and definitely needs to be made a province for security reasons. We have always emphasized that these sub-provinces should be made provinces due to their importance.

We do not care whether Batman or Şırnak were made provinces, or other sub-provinces were left as sub-provinces or boroughs were made sub-provinces. What we are after is that the moral pressure on the people of these places should be ended. We are not for such a moral pressure. If you apply moral pressure on people, you bring our citizens to the point of bargaining with the government. You bring people to the point of not voting for the party that they really believe in and support. Instead of voting for the party they support they start following their interests and sacrifice from their own political thoughts. This may harm the stability of the political parties and may result in weaknesses while governing the country in the future. I hope we will never live through such things and witness that these things are all realized just because those places have really deserved becoming sub-provinces or provinces.

I am addressing to the mayors, members of the local councils and members of the provincial councils; The Members of Parliament of the governing party deny and say that they are not applying any pressure and add that they do not intend to break people from their own parties. Just hear this. I definitely ask you to stick to the parties you trust. Your self-respect and honor orders you to serve the party that you trust in.

So, do not go to the door of another party by feeling under pressure. This kind of an attitude is not proper for my citizens.

To utter such sentences as follows is completely wrong. “We are declaring this place a province. We are declaring a place a sub-province. We are giving you 90 thousands permanent job positions. We are giving you this much opportunity, so, have a string to this country”. “We will make your sub-province a province, so, stick to your country. Don’t support PKK”

We will be persecutor of those 90 thousands permanent job positions. We will follow if at least some these jobs will be given to the people whose relatives died while serving the Turkish State. If this is done, our support is with them.

Passing and executing this law will help solving the problem of restlessness in that area and this is one of the biggest problems of our country. That is why our support is with this decree except for objections on one or two articles of it.

There has been no service taken to Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia except for GAP project.

Each detained service will give opportunity to the plotters and underdevelopment will be shown as the reason of all restlessness. Therefore, by looking at the subject from this angle, we are for taking service to this area as soon as possible.

**H. Ç. (Antalya-ANAP)** - Some people are trying to find fault with the services carried out by ANAP and trying to send messages to the people living in the areas which are going to be declared as provinces, to our voters, from here, stating that there is moral pressure on them and say that they should not vote for ANAP but vote for themselves,

although ANAP proposed their sub-provinces and boroughs to be made provinces and sub-provinces. These are futile attempts of trying to humiliate ANAP before people of Turkey.

My dear friends, on June 3, 1990, municipal elections will be held through 51 municipalities. We have come together as ANAP group, and as ANAP Members of Parliament, and said that 43 of these 51 municipalities had voted for the opposition party Members of Parliament. If ANAP had wanted to use this as a pressure factor, or if ANAP had wanted to get votes from them by putting moral pressure on them, they would not make these places sub-provinces, now. While ANAP was changing the status of the places as sub-provinces or provinces, they never had a slightest intention of applying any kind of pressure on them and never carried out partisanship.

In this regard, although only seven or eight of the boroughs voted for ANAP, we feel proud of making 43 of the allocation units boroughs although they did not vote for ANAP.

In 1990, -only a week ago- 103 boroughs were made sub-provinces by ANAP.

We know that our citizens living in the places that were made sub-provinces and provinces will appreciate the policies of ANAP.

Each allocation unit or village would like to become boroughs. Each borough would like to become sub-provinces and each sub-province would like to become provinces. This is their expectation that they wish it to come true as soon as possible.

Beytuşşebab and Uludere, which are two sub-provinces of Hakkari, have no connection with its province for eight months due to the weather conditions. The people living in these sub-provinces have to go through four provinces in order to settle their affairs in Hakkari.

Let us consider Silopi, Cizre and İdil, which are three sub-provinces of Mardin. Silopi is 240 kilometers away from Mardin and the closest village to the provincial center of Mardin is 300 kilometers Cizre is more than 200 kilometers and İdil is 200 kilometers

away from Mardin. It was really a great necessity for Şırnak to be made a province and these sub-provinces have been made sub-provinces of Şırnak for both security and economic reasons.

It is our job to serve our country and citizens and to take all kinds of facilities to even the smallest parts of Turkey. Then, when the time comes, our citizens will appreciate the importance of what we did.

**A. T. (*İstanbul-SHP*)** - With the additions made by the Planning and Budgeting Committee, a legislative proposal was prepared regarding forming two provinces and five sub-provinces.

I regretfully would like to state that, except for bringing up the matter of two provinces, I understand that they are still maintaining their insincere and facetious attitude regarding bringing up the matter of five sub-provinces.

The most important ground for making provinces of these two sub-provinces is the advice of the National Security Council. In the National Security Council meeting held under the leadership of the President of the Republic, this advice was given to the government, as '*You should definitely do this*'.

I am sorry to have to say but the grounds given in the General Grounds section of this legislative proposal are stereotype grounds. You can write down the same grounds whenever you want to propose to make a sub-province a province. If you want to make a borough, which has the population of 1500 or 2000, you can write down the same grounds for it, as well. As a matter of fact, for the proposal regarding 131 sub-provinces, the same grounds were written.

Moreover, the proposal is regarding Şırnak, but while Şırnak is being made a province, Batman is also being declared as a province so that there won't be any political disorders and instability because the politicians had promised to make Batman a province long before and people of Batman have long been expecting this to happen. This is why Batman is also being declared as province next to Şırnak. This is the reality. We are not

against making Batman and Şırnak provinces. If we had been against, you would have taken advantage of it.

I think what you are doing is not renewing the administrative structure. What you are doing is expanding the units in the administrative structure. It is growing in numbers and as a result, it is creating an administrative structure, which turns all the balances upside down.

We, as SHP group, think that, in order to change its status, we should revise the desired development and growth levels of an allocation unit by comparing it with the present development level of the country.

Come and let us both realize these demands and set criteria, which the whole world knows and applies for the places to change their status.

Making Şırnak and Batman provinces might give relief to the local people for a while, but this will be a temporary relief. If making a place a province had helped the development of that place, Tunceli, Hakkari, Siirt, Muş and Bingöl would have been developed cities until now.

**Z. Ç. (Siirt - ANAP)** - As Mr. Topuz mentioned, the matter of making provinces of these two sub-provinces is a necessity brought up by National Security Council (NSC) and came into existence after the decision made as a result of it.

Güçlükonak is a village and you are making it a sub-province now, which is extraordinarily worthwhile for reasons of security, but it is necessary to make subordinate this sub-province to Siirt province, not Şırnak.

If you want to go to Siirt from Güçlükonak, you have to follow a 100 kilometers highway, which is in use only in summer. If you want to go there from Şırnak, you have to go 230 kilometers.

You are disconnecting quite a few of villages of Kurtalan and making subordinate Beşiri to Batman. Presently, those villages can reach Kurtalan after a 15 km travel. They can

reach their administrative bodies. However, when they are subordinate to Batman, they will have to go 60-70 kilometers for the same purpose. Moreover, there is a geographical boundary created by a river. Despite this, they get involved in this matter just for partisanship observations.

**S. Ç. (Mardin)** - This proposal was prepared by the ANAP government without considering the following points: There is the River Dicle between Batman, Hasankeyf and Gercüş as a natural boundary. After finishing the body foundation of the Ilısu Dam, which will be fourth biggest dam in the GAP project, this valley, will turn into a lake area and this will disconnect Gercüş-Hasankeyf-Batman link. Thus, people of Gercüş and Hasankeyf will have to follow the path of Diyarbakır through Mardin or from Mardin border through Şırnak in order to go to Batman. This has not been taken into consideration at all. Therefore, these prove that the reasons they had put forth for realizing their proposal, do not seem to be reliable reasons.

Which one of you would be happy if four of the sub-provinces, and five including Hasankeyf, which was made a sub-province later on, are separated from your province and made subordinate to another province? We deduce that ANAP would like to punish Mardin. Are you treating Mardin like this, just because the people of Mardin made you the first party in the 1987 elections? Or is it because you know that Mardin will not be your fortress again and you won't be able to go to Mardin with political thoughts anymore, and, so, you are looking for ways to punish Mardin?

If you had made one of the five sub-provinces, which were subordinate to two separate provinces a province, at least my citizens living in that sub-province would still have been considering themselves as Mardin People.

They stated that the town of İdil is 200 kilometers away from Mardin and 70 kilometers away from Şırnak. The information is not correct. İdil is 120 kilometers away from Mardin.

İdil has connection with Midyat and Mardin socially, economically and transport wise. I would like to express that the people of İdil never ever wish to get close to the people of Şırnak, let alone going to Şırnak to settle their affairs.

You are trying to make subordinate the 15 villages of Kurtalan, which are only 15 kilometers away from Kurtalan, to Batman, which is in 60 or 70 kilometers in distance. On the other hand, you are making subordinate İdil, which is bound to Mardin in all senses, to Şırnak despite the fact that there is a danger of being harmed or killed and it was my personal request.

**K. H. (Siirt)** - The people of Batman, who appreciate the given service, will also appreciate the decision of being made a province more than anything is. People of Batman will always remember this historical decision with gratitude and will never forget.

By forming two separate provinces out of Siirt, the share we get for service will increase three times, which will mean that we will be able to serve our people faster, and this will make us more than happy.

I would like to eyalet for your information that Hasankeyf, the newly formed sub-province of ours, has been made subordinate to Batman because it is 35 kilometers away from Batman and 120 kilometers away from Mardin.

### **5.1.3. Bartın (74)**

In 1991, Bartın was made a province in accordance with the law numbered 3760. The law regarding forming Bartın province was passed on August 28, 1991 and was proclaimed in the Official Gazette on September 8, 1991 with numbered 20984.

The justifications for making these sub-provinces provinces were explained in the General Grounds section of the Law numbered 3760 as follows: “*As the continuation of the previous implementations regarding forming six provinces, being the center of its surroundings made it necessary for Bartın to become a province apart from the criteria issued in the Constitution*” (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 28.08.1991, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 62, Yasama Yılı: 4, p.1).

#### 5.1.3.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly

According to the discussions regarding forming Bartın province in the general assembly, it is understood that the real reason of this law proposal came into the agenda is the forthcoming local election on grounds of the death of Davut Fırıncıoğlu, who was the mayor of Bartın. Therefore, Mesut Yılmaz, who became the leader of the party after Turgut Özal became the President of the Republic, wanted to keep his promise he made to the people of Bartın to prove his power. This was mentioned by Mahmut Öztürk, Member of Parliament for Niğde, Hilmi Ziya Postacıoğlu, Member of Parliament for Aydın and Kemal Anadol, Member of Parliament for İzmir during the discussion in the general assembly of TBMM (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 28.08.1991, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 62, Yasama Yılı: 4, Birleşim: 135, Oturum: 1, pp.277-286).

The relevant discussions can be summarized as follows (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 28.08.1991, Dönem: 18, Cilt: 62, Yasama Yılı: 4, Birleşim: 135, pp.277-299):

**M. Ö. (Niğde-DYP)** - The matter of forming of new sub-provinces and provinces just before the elections has become a habit for the last seven years for the ANAP government and this, for some reason or other, makes some places very happy and some places so sad.

When in trouble sometimes, Çankaya declares from behind the TV screens that Alanya, İskenderun, Tarsus, Akşehir, Bandırma, Darende, Şebinkarahisar and Konya-Ereğli will be made provinces and takes the pulses of these sub-provinces.

Approximately three or four months ago, Mr. Özal gave a piece of good news to Alanya people and stated that Alanya would be made a province. People of Alanya were so happy that day that they all took to the streets and celebrated. DYP, ANAP, MÇP, RP and SHP supporters in Alanya celebrated this good news all together. In the last municipal elections held in Bartın Mr. Yılmaz said that he was promising for forming the Bartın province. Then the legislative proposal regarding this followed the promise. Nevertheless, no proposal supporting the promise of Mr. Özal regarding Alanya is brought up here today. This is what we are sorry about and we wonder why there is no proposal for Alanya.

Why does a president of the Republic promise making provinces through the TV screens although he knows that he has no authority to realize this kind of a promise. Why does he give such good news although he knows that they cannot be realized? If he is certain that he can do it, why is the proposal regarding making Alanya a province not being discussed here today? So, what is wrong with Alanya? What is wrong with Akşehir? What is wrong with Konya-Ereğli?

I am requesting an answer from the government and from Mr. Minister: If there had not been the municipality elections in Bartın and if Mr. President had not gone to Bartın before these elections and said *‘Vote for me. This is my first test. If I win, Bartın will become a province’* would Bartın have still been made a province?

Some of the places are not made sub-provinces due to their political views. In addition, this is used as a bargain matter. Now, all the members of political parties living in that sub-province are in deprivation and in the agitated state of bargaining for the elections to be held in October 20.

I wonder if Mr. Minister will be able to say *‘the people of Bartın, from now on, the status of Bartın is province and this is your allowance from the budget. Here is your 10 billion Liras, your table, your chair and your car’* while declaring Bartın a province.

**P. A. (Zonguldak-ANAP)** - In 1957, a crowded committee that came from Bartın to Ankara forwarded their wish regarding making Bartın a province to Mr. Adnan Menderes, the president for that period, and received the promise that Bartın would be made a province. However, our Prime Minister, Mr. Mesut Yılmaz went to Bartın personally and promised the same thing and now that promise is being kept.

**H. Z. P. (Aydın-SHP)** - You are bringing up a supplementary budget as big as one fifth of a budget. Do you think that the Turkish people will forget what they have gone through in the last ten years with the 21 trillion liras in this supplementary budget?

Mr. Özal once said in Nazilli, *‘Make it 3 to null. Make us win the elections here. We will make Nazilli a province’*.

We, as SHP, will keep your promises which you did not keep when we become the governing party with only one difference that we will keep our promises not just before the elections but in the first months of the government.

I ask Bartın to take part in the elections as the 74<sup>th</sup> province but as a part of Zonguldak because the election areas have already been announced. I also wish the people over there not to forget what they had seen and lived through before the municipal elections.

**K. A. (İzmir)** - Should Bartın have been made a province before? Should it be made a province just before the elections? Should Bartın be remembered right now? This is why I wanted to address you and wanted my words to be in the minutes of this Grand Assembly.

If there were no general elections, would Bartın be made a province?

When I was a CHP Member of Parliament, late Davut Fırıncı of CHP was the Mayor of Bartın. Since he became a mayor when he was a member of SODEP, he was not allowed to make use of the services of the ANAP government, which started ruling on November 6, 1983. Then the People's Party united with SODEP, but Mr. Davut Fırıncıoğlu did not wish to be transferred to SHP and stayed independent for some time. After some time, hoping that he can get service for Bartın, he transferred to ANAP.

Now I am telling that if Mr. Fırıncıoğlu did not die, Bartın would never become a province.

A sub-province should be made province just because it deserves it due to its economic, sociological and geographical conditions not because this or that person is a minister. If you continue declaring sub-provinces as provinces like this, as in the example of Kırşehir, the mentality of making deals walks into the political life and starts hanging like sword of democracy above the sub-provinces and provinces. Please, let us not do this, my friends.

Why are Bergama and Ödemiş, which are in my election zone, not provinces? If you cannot give answer to this question to me, you cannot make me understand why Bartın is

being made a province, which is in the old election zone of mine. I want Bergama to become a province. I am the Member of Parliament for Bergama. It is Bergama's long deserved right to become a province as much as Bartın's is. If Sefa Taşkın died, I regret giving this as an example; you would also go to Bergama to promise that you would make that place a province, too. I am astounded with this understanding. I really am sorry.

On the other hand, I will say "yes" for Bartın because I know Bartın deserves this.

**Ş. A. (Zonguldak)** - My dear friends, the matter of making Bartın a province is really due to the death of late mayor. I wish the death of a mayor had not been used as a political preference. This is very strange.

There were also promises of making two sub-provinces in the boundaries of Zonguldak provinces by the ANAP government during the 1987 elections. These are Karabük and Karadeniz Ereğlisi. These promises gained speed during the 1988 referendum and reached to their peak in 1989 local elections.

ANAP will also go to Karabük before the early general elections and say," If you make us a government, we will make you a province after October 20." We will all see that these promises will be convincing enough in the evening of October 20, after 21:00 hours when the poll results are announced.

We, as the Members of the Parliament from Zonguldak, handed in a legislative proposal regarding making Karabük and Karadeniz Ereğlisi provinces. These proposals could at least be united with the proposal of Bartın, but, unfortunately, even this was avoided.

**M. K. (Kütahya) - Minister of Forestry and Deputy Minister of Interior** - During the determination of the allocation units, which will be subordinate to the sub-provinces and which are going to be made provinces, we made use of the criteria such as their economic relations, transportation, geographical conditions, the distances to the already subordinate to their provinces and the sub-provinces.

When we carried out a general evaluation according to the provinces in Turkey, we found out the following results:

1. The sub-provinces that can be made provinces are situated more densely in the economically developed regions. For example, 12 of these sub-provinces are in Western Anatolia, 8 are in Central Anatolia, 9 are in the Mediterranean Region, 6 are in the Black Sea Region and 4 are in the Eastern or South Eastern Region.
2. More than one province can be formed out of Ankara, Konya, Adana, İçel, Balıkesir, Zonguldak, Manisa and Samsun.
3. If more than one province is formed out of especially Ankara and Konya, there will not be important economic and administrative structure losses.
4. The newly founded provinces in the developing regions will become centers for attraction and so, this will contribute to the improvement of the place.

The studies for forming new provinces will continue. For this reason, our government will do its best to declare the sub-provinces determined by the government and if necessary other sub-provinces apart from these as provinces. The targeted number is over a 100 and may be about 110.

You all said, '*Bartın should be made a province!*' but now, we have the power and we are doing it now. Are you jealous of it? You are right when you say you will make 50 sub-provinces provinces but are we wrong when we bring up this proposal here with the power we have.

Citizens will tell you one thing: '*You could not do anything about this matter, but they did!*'

**K. G. (Tunceli)** - Now you know that we made the decision of early general elections and the election calendar has already started. Since we made Bartın a province, have you calculated how many Member of Parliament would that city give to the Parliament? How many of the provinces will give less members of parliament?

#### 5.1.4. Ardahan (75), Iğdır (76)

In 1992, Ardahan and Iğdır were made provinces in accordance with the law numbered 3806. The law regarding forming 2 provinces and 13 sub-provinces was passed on May 27, 1992 and was proclaimed in the Official Gazette on June 6, 1992 with numbered 21242.

The reasonings for making these sub-provinces provinces were explained in the General Grounds section of the Law numbered 3806 as follows:

*Running the public services in an effective way is closely related to the geographical situation, conditions of transport and communication, and the density of the population of these sub-provinces and provinces. In the places where there is no geographical wholeness, no organization parallel to the density of the population and no transport and communication systems suitable to the conditions of the day, no other services can be operated properly.*

*Therefore, it will be necessary to make changes suitable to the geographical condition and population density in the provincial administration division (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 27.05.1992, Dönem: 19, Cilt: 12, Yasama Yılı: 1, p.1).*

The reasoning continues as follows:

*Ardahan was a province between the years of 1921 and 1926, it was made a sub-province and subordinate to Kars in 1926 in accordance with the law numbered 877.*

*The total population of Ardahan province was 71438 in 1955, and it decreased to 52574 according to 1990 census of population. The reason why the people of Ardahan are migrating is that the only way they can make living in Ardahan is cattle breeding. By considering the fact that Russia broke up into small republics last year, and border commerce is carried out with these republics and Hopa-Ardahan-Gürbulak-Dilucu transit passengers pass through Ardahan, it was found necessary to form a province in Ardahan in order to be able to use the facilities of the area and to provide social development and for the reasons of geographical difficulties.*

*On the other hand, Iğdır realized a big development after the watering network founded on the wide and flat plain of Iğdır. Because Iğdır that has the most*

*fertile soil of the Northeast Anatolia and that has a microclimate with storing of vegetables and fruits for the region, it has become the economic center of its surroundings. It will be suitable to make it a province by taking the distance between it and its province.*

*As a result, it will be useful to make Ardahan and Iğdır provinces due to the reasons deriving from their geographical and economic conditions. (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 27.05.1992, Dönem: 19, Cilt: 12, Yasama Yılı: 1, pp.1-2).*

#### **5.1.4.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly**

No opinions were made by the governing and the opposition parties on the accuracy and the objectivity of above-mentioned grounds during the discussion in TBMM. On the other hand, there are remarkable statements promoting forming new provinces, except two counterviews. The ones that is worth mentioning can be listed as follows (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 27.05.1992, Dönem: 19, Cilt: 12, Yasama Yılı: 1, Birleşim: 81, Oturum: 1, pp.38-50):

**Z. N. (Kars-SHP)** - With the formation of the new republics, it is one of the most important targets of ours to establish border gates in Kars and create a commercial improvement.

Dear Members of Parliament, dividing Kars into three provinces will help many services such as the services of the national education; the country roads, highways and the health reach the region faster.

**H. K. (Bingöl-RP)** - If there were standards for forming sub-provinces and provinces, everybody would be consent with what they had and believe that the formation was fair. As a result, there would not have been these big unnecessary expenses.

**H. O. E. (İstanbul-ANAP)** - There are 40 thousand villages and 538 sub-provinces in Turkey. We would like all of them to be provinces because province means civilization, creates sources and brings health.

Province means governor. Governor means the man of the government, means intellectual man. It means Provincial Local Administration will be founded. All the

investment directors will come to that sub-province and economic and social life will start there.

**C. B. (İzmir)** - Today, we are all focusing our attention on making places provinces. What will happen when they are made provinces?

Let us give more vesting power to the sub-governors and reduce the dependency to the provinces.

In my opinion, becoming a province, having directorates and titles do not provide service for that place.

#### **5.1.5. Yalova (77), Karabük (78), Kilis (79)**

In 1995, Karabük, Kilis and Yalova were made provinces in accordance with the decree having force of law numbered 550. The law regarding forming three provinces was passed as the attachment to the decree having force of law on June 3, 1995, and proclaimed in the Official Gazette on June 6, 1995 with numbered 22305.

In the general grounds of the decree having force of law, it is mentioned that Karabük was a central allocation unit among Ankara-İstanbul-Middle East Black Sea Regions, and the foundations of Karabük Iron and Steel Factory was laid in 1937. Since then, the number of both the industrial plants and the population of the sub-province gradually increased. The central population of this sub-province increased to 103.373 and the total population increased to 123.361. With the present administrative structure, not enough service could be taken for this population. With the sub-provinces to be subordinate to Karabük province, it would become an important center in the area, and its development level would increase with the new investments (Directorate General of the Decisions and Acts of the Prime Ministry, Archives File, 1995: 1)

In the general grounds of the decree having force of law, it was mentioned that Kilis, whose central population was 82.882 and the total was 121.752, was the most developed sub-province; however, people had been migrating especially to İstanbul. Making this unit a province would help reducing unemployment with the increase investments and,

would help present the service more effectively (Directorate General of the Decisions and Acts of the Prime Ministry, Archives File, 1995: 1).

In the general grounds of this decree having force of law, it is stated that the central population of Yalova was 65.823 and the total was 113.417 according to 1990 census of population, and it went up to a million in the summer months due to its being a touristic region. Although it was subordinate to İstanbul in administration, there was no suitable highway connection to İstanbul. The highway transport to İstanbul was realized via Kocaeli, which is 176 kilometers. This connection was realized via sea most of the time and this was both expensive and time consuming and also delays happen very often. This caused problems to the people in making benefit of the public service. There was an increase in population both in Yalova and in its districts and villages. This administrative organization, which was in the level of sub-province, cannot reply the needs of this population (Directorate General of the Decisions and Acts of the Prime Ministry, Archives File, 1995: 1).

#### **5.1.5.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly**

Since these provinces were formed by the Counsel of Ministers in accordance with the Empowering Law numbered 4109, it was not followed the procedure of legislative proposal and were not discussed in detail in the TBMM General Assembly.

In the general ground of the law proposal, it is stated as follows: *“All other services are delayed in the areas where there is no geographical entirety, an organization parallel to population density is not formed and the transportation and communication conditions are not updated in compliance with the standards of the time. Therefore, it will be worthwhile to make changes suitable to the density of the population and geographical structure in the administrative division.”* (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, No. B.02.0.KKG/101-886/2220)

In the article ground section, it is stated that it was aimed to form a new province and sub-province in order to have our citizens make use of the public services more effectively and widely, parallel to the economic and social developments of the recent years; to be able to realize this aim, the Council of Ministers demanded the authority of

passing decrees having force of law to be delegated to them (TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, No. B.02.0.KKG/101-886/2220).

With these grounds, the law proposal went to the Committee of Internal Affairs. Then, the Committee have examined and discussed this law proposal in the meeting held on May 24, 1995 with the participation of the representatives from the Ministries of Justice, Interior and Finance.

During the general discussions on the draft bill, the following ideas were brought forward (TBMM İçişleri Komisyonu, Esas No:1/860, Karar No:25):

- The Council of Ministers should make use of this authority in accordance with objective criteria,
- The period mentioned in the fourth article of the draft bill, was found too long and is against the specification of decrees having force of law,
- The names of the places to be made provinces and/or sub-provinces should be mentioned in the authority to be delegated to the Council of Ministers.

In addition, the verbal proposal regarding to the fourth clause was made. According to this verbal proposal, the authority delegated to the Council of Ministers should not be until October 1996 but should be valid for three months after the law was made operative. However, it was not accepted.

Moreover, there is a '*Minute of Dissent*' (Muhalefet Şerhi), issued/signed by M. Keçeciler (Konya) and B. Kibar (Ordu). According to this minute of dissent, the reasons why the proposal is against the Constitution, are listed as (TBMM İçişleri Komisyonu, Esas No:1/860, Karar No:25):

- With this draft bill the government is being delegated the authority of making all sub-provinces of Turkey provinces and all boroughs sub-provinces. The draft bill means that the authority of the Turkish Grand National Assembly is transferred to the government, more than delegating the government with a separate authority. The seventh article of the Constitution *eyalets*, "*Legislative power is vested in the Turkish Grand National Assembly on behalf of the Turkish Nation. This power cannot be delegated.*" The demanded authority is very wide and limitless.

- The fourth clause of the draft bill delegates an authority of almost a 15-month-authority. However, The Constitutional court explains in the decision dated 05/07/1994 and no 1994/50 and 1994/44-2 and in the numerous decisions that the Empowering Laws can be passed on condition that there is an urgent, emergency and compulsory matter and this became a permanent decision.

The law proposal went to the Planning and Budget Committee, after the affirmation by the Committee of Internal Affairs, without any changes. This subject was discussed in the 49<sup>th</sup> coalescence of the Planning and Budget Committee, held on 24/05/1995 under the heading of the Ministry of Internal Affairs representing the government and with the participation of the representatives from Ministries of Internal Affairs and Finance, and also the Undersecretariat of State Planning Organization. During the discussions on the draft bill, the following ideas were brought forward (TBMM Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonu, Esas No:1/860, Karar No:124):

- The draft bill has some parts against the constitution and it looks interfering with the legislative right of the parliament,
- There are no criteria specified for making sub-provinces and provinces in the enclosure article.
- The authority duration is found to be too long.
- How much financial load these new provinces and sub-provinces will cause? Are there enough sources to meet this load?
- Will it be possible to form new provinces and sub-provinces despite the economic difficulties our country is going through?
- There are criticisms and proposals stating that it is important and necessary to bring the matter to the parliament in the form of draft bill and pass a law.
- The draft bill does not consist of any political expectation,
- It is stated during the discussions made to represent the government that the draft bill has been prepared in compliance with the measurements anticipated in the Constitution, there is no disagreement with the Constitution,
- The authority to be delegated by the draft bill will be dealt diligently and there are enough resources in the budget.

Following the discussions on the general points of the draft bill, the proposal, which was about the points in the draft bill that were against the second and the seventh articles of the Constitution, was not accepted and denied.

The fourth article of it was accepted on condition that the authority delegated to the Council of Ministers will be valid for one year after the law was made operative and the other articles were accepted as they were, without any changes.

On the other hand, there are four ‘Minute of Dissent’ given in the Committee. The first one is issued by M. N. Budak (Ankara), S. Hatinoğlu (Artvin), E. S. Gaydalı (Bitlis) and M. D. Ölmeztoprak (Malatya). It is the same as the previous minute of dissent made in the Internal Affairs Committee. The second one is issued by S. Maruflu (İstanbul) and G. Çelebican (İstanbul). In this minute of dissent, it is stated that they -as ANAP- were against the Empowering Law, which was about delegating authority to the Çiller Government to form new provinces and sub-provinces. It continues as follow (TBMM Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonu, Esas No:1/860, Karar No:124):

*“This Empowering Law passes the legislative authority to the Council of Ministers and sidelines the Turkish Grand National Assembly.*

*This law was submitted to the Turkish Grand National Assembly in great haste and on the same day, on 24/05/1995, it was presented to the Turkish Grand National Assembly Planning and Budget Committee at 10:30 hours. The same day the Committee gathered and completed the tasks in their agenda and the same day at 20:00 hours, another meeting was called in great haste. Is this matter this urgent?*

*The matter is urgent for the government because this will be used as a means of bribe in the by elections to be held on 04/06/1995 and in the possibly to be held elections in the future.*

*There is no clear explanation with regard to which sub-provinces will be made provinces or which boroughs will be made sub-provinces. The Prime Minister and the government have the right of initiative.*

*Besides, what is the cost of forming provinces and sub-provinces? While the eyalet budget is having a continuous deficiency in the cash in the term of this government, delegating the government this authority, the true nature and the criteria of forming provinces and sub-provinces of which are vague is quite wrong. That is why we put a minute of dissent here.”*

The third minute of dissent is issued by A. Gül (Kayseri), M. Ünalı (Konya) and Z. Ergezen (Bitlis). According to this minute of dissent, the reasons why they are opposing the draft bill of Empowering Law, are listed as follow (TBMM Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonu, Esas No:1/860, Karar No:124):

- The aim of this law is to exploit the elections coming soon; not to form provinces and sub-provinces in accordance with the necessities, principles and criteria,
- The validity period of the law is demanded to be until October 1996 that definitely means the devolution of the authority of the Turkish Grand National Assembly. No authority may be delegated to the Council of Ministers for 17 months. This means that decrees having force of law will be passed before all the elections to be held during this period by the courtesy of this law.
- The members of SHP who are attending our committee meeting still have the illegal conditions in compliance with the 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> articles of the internal regulation. (They have no relation with their previous parties anymore, and were not elected again)

The last minute of dissent is issued by M. Şemsek (Çorum). According to this minute of dissent, is stated: *“Certain principles and criteria should be determined regarding forming provinces and all the sub-provinces meeting these criteria should be made provinces. All our citizens should be informed of these criteria. Injustice that will harm the conscience of the society should not be allowed.*

*With this draft bill, the government would like to pledge the votes of the electors in the elections to be held on 04/06/1995. This will also mean violation of the provisional and unchangeable rules of the democratic elections such as carrying out the elections away from all kinds of pressures and threat with the participation of all the political parties under equivalent conditions.*

*The draft bill is clearly against the 126<sup>th</sup> and 91<sup>st</sup> articles of the constitution, with this draft bill, the Turkish Grand National Assembly is sidelined and its authority is transferred to the government.*

*There is no information with regard to which sub-provinces will be made provinces and which boroughs will be made sub-provinces. Forming the provinces and sub-provinces like this is no good for our country in spite of the fact that our country needs forming new provinces and sub-provinces.”*

Finally, the draft bill of the Empowering Law was submitted to TBMM, after passing from the Committee of Planning and Budget with only one change: the validity of the mentioned law was decreased from one and a half years to one year. Then, it was submitted to TBMM in compliance with the seventh clause of the article 91 of the Constitution with giving priority to discuss in the general assembly. However, the main subject was mostly about Kilis during the discussions for the Empowering Law. The discussions about the Law can be summarized as follows (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi – 31.05.1995, Dönem: 19, Yasama Yılı: 4, Birleşim: 117, Oturum: 1-2, pp.226-315):

**M. O. S. (Gümüşhane- ANAP)** - With this Empowering Law, the government wants us to delegate them with the authority to pass a decree, firstly for one and a half years and later for one year. That is, they ask for the authority at the point whichever sub-province they want to make a province or whichever borough they want to make a sub-province. They are for realizing this issue not by means of an ordinary law but by means of a decree having force of law and they demand such a thing without even mentioning which sub-provinces they would like to declare provinces and which boroughs they would like to declare sub-provinces. The government paid attention to almost none of the draft bills but somehow, now, when the elections are very close, they asked the parliament to donate them with such an authority.

When the draft bill of the Empowering Law was forwarded to the parliament, delegations started to visit us, although we are the opposition party, with regard to their wishes to become provinces. The government has also made a declaration that over a hundred allocation units would like to become provinces. This means that this parliament will not be able to work for a year. Everyday buses, minibuses and the planes will carry people to the parliament. There are proposals made by our friends as an attachment to this draft bill. We proposed to make 60 places to be made provinces in 15 days.

**A. G. (Kayseri-RP)** - The government knows very well that the draft bill of this law is against the Constitution because, in order to pass a decree having force of law in accordance with the Empowering Law, there must be a very urgent and emergency situation and what is going to be done should clearly be stated. According to the draft

bill, the authority will be delegated for 1 year to make some provinces. Which one of the 907 sub-provinces are you going to make provinces? In fact, you had asked for authority until the end of October 1996. We warned you in the Planning and Budget Committee and you decreased it to one year. That is, you were thinking of making use of this during the election period. You think, “A general election will be held this year. If not this year, it will be held in due time. Then can I use this?” We have draft bills given by all of us. Let us consolidate them and make Kilis, Bandırma, Düzce, Gebze and Karabük provinces. In addition, let us not spend a word while these sub-provinces are being made provinces; Let the experts prepare reports and say that these sub-provinces deserve to be made provinces and we pass the law in five minutes.

You have spoilt the law that arranges the administrative structure of Turkey and in fact, does not allow any political attitude. This is an investment made before the elections.

***İ. K. (Erzurum-DYP)*** - Turkey has needs of great importance. We need to pass new laws to be changed or to be newly passed with regard to the Customs Union. Because all these need to be discussed in the commissions and the parliament, we need time.

Now, the government wants to save time by giving the parliament the authority to evaluate the sub-provinces that applied to be made provinces and the discussion of the criteria will be made here again after the authority is delegated.

Making Yalova, Kilis and Karabük will be realized in the alphabetical order. Their order will be written in the decree that will be passed by the Council of Ministers. We say we are not making only Kilis a province, besides; we are making many sub-provinces provinces. Other sub-provinces, Kilis being the first, will be made provinces.

***N. M. (Aydın-Minister of Interior)*** - The criteria to make a province has been determined by our ministry as their population, improvement position, economic and social structure, existing circumstances, the number of the units to be connected, transportation condition, administrative relation and the necessary evaluation to comply with these has been carried out. There were 128 applications to be made provinces but 45 of these have been eliminated.

**İ. K. (Tokat)** - According to the draft bill, duration of time was requested until October 1996. The parliament will delegate the government with this authority and the government will bribe the citizens for either general elections or the local elections and will say, *'Vote for me and become a sub-province or become a borough'*. ANAP made 111 districts sub-provinces before the 1987 general elections, and 135 districts were made sub-provinces and 317 villages were made districts before 1991 elections.

**R. K. Y. (İçel-ANAP)** - We worry that you will not keep your promise as you did not keep the old promises, so, we do not believe that you will make good use of this delegation of the authority. This is why we are trying to defend the rights of Kilis.

What will happen to the people of Kilis, who are hoping to become a province, when the decree having force of law passes and you say, *'CHP opposed to our proposal of making this sub-province a province; DYP opposed to the sub-provinces CHP wanted to make provinces'*?

Let us give priority to the sub-provinces you have promised to make provinces. Let us take the sub-provinces such as Karabük, Yalova, Alanya, Bandırma, Düzce, Gebze and İskenderun. Since we have consensus on this draft statute, let us agree immediately and have no worries about whether the president of the Republic will agree to this.

The mayor was elected in Kilis in March 27, 1994. The only reason why we did not obstruct was that we had promised, as ANAP, the people of Kilis to make them provinces and we did not want to disappoint them. However, if you keep on saying that your coalition partner does not want to do that and you keep on not doing it, believe me, we can take this subject to the Constitutional Court and make Kilis a province when we start ruling.

If we had been governing in 1991, we would have made the other sub-provinces provinces because we had promised to make them provinces. Besides the places we had promised, we would have made all the other deserved places provinces.

**H. B. E. (Edirne-CHP)** - Municipal services are not adequate because municipalities, boroughs, sub-provinces and provinces get their investment share from İller Bank and

similar places according to the census carried out five years ago (1990 Population Census). That is why, I think, these subjects should also be taken into consideration and keep in mind that these services will be very beneficial for these places.

**C. A. (Sakarya-RP)** - We have discussed Kilis, here, today, more than discussing the general and the first article of the draft statute.

Making sub-provinces and provinces by means of the Empowering Law is delegating the government with the authority to do so; if the authority is given, then, it should not be discussed in the parliament. In the legal grounds why the Constitutional Court cancelled the Empowering Law, it was stated that, in order to be delegated the authority to pass a law with regard to a subject, there should be an emergency and compulsory situation. We should always take this point into consideration.

**İ. G. (Aksaray)** - Why does a sub-province wish to be made a province? Because the people of that sub-province want the services to be taken to them. If we take some services; such as passport, license plate, military, bank branches etc. to them, their wish with regard to be made a province will lessen. Besides, our politicians will refrain from exploiting this matter.

The government proves that they do not trust the parliament by means of the draft bill of Empowering Law. It is declared by the Minister of Interior Affairs that it was found suitable to establish 45 more provinces. Why do not you bring the matter to the parliament and make all of them provinces at one go? Thus, we will prevent the people of these sub-provinces from carrying false hopes.

**S. K. (Kayseri-RP)** - This draft bill was discussed in the Council of Ministers on May 17, 1995 and accepted. That is, it was accepted a fortnight ago. You passed it to the Internal Affairs Committee on 18 May. It was transferred to the Planning and Budget Committee on May 24, 1995, without waiting for 48 hours, after 20.00 hours. It is immediately discussed and was passed to the agenda of the parliament.

With this Empowering Law, the majority of the governing party overweighs the predominance of the parliament; execution overweighs legislation; government overweighs the Council of Ministers and Prime Minister overweighs the government.

**M. K. (Konya-ANAP)** - Today, at this very late hour, we have started the new procedure of making sub-provinces provinces by means of the Empowering Law. There is no sub-province or province declared by means of the Empowering Law in the history of Turkish Republic.

What will happen if the government demands to make certain places provinces just before the elections, just because majority of the people in those places had voted for them; or just the opposite, what if they demand to make certain provinces sub-provinces just because the majority of the people in those places had not voted for them?

If your aim is making Kilis and İnebolu provinces, it is very easy: Just bring in a draft bill and make them provinces. You can just say, ‘Kilis, Alanya, Bafra, Bandırma, Çorlu, Düzce, Fethiye, Gebze, Karabük, Zonguldak-Ereğli, İskenderun, Yalova, Şereflikoçhisar, Nazilli, Siverek, Viranşehir, Suşehri, Şebinkarahisar, Tarsus, Sungurlu, Polatlı, Zile, Beyşehir, Seydişehir, Akşehir, Konya-Ereğli, İnebolu, Lüleburgaz, Yalvaç, Muradiye, Tavşanlı, Gediz, Nizip, Islahiye, Ünye, Fatsa, Osmaniye, Anamur, Dinar, Salihli, Alaşehir, Akhisar, Turgutlu, Ödemiş, Hınıs, Kozan, Erciş, Oltu, Doğubeyazıt, Pınarbaşı, Develi, Sandıklı, Bergama, Silifke, Elbistan, Gelibolu, Bor, Divriği, Bolvadin, Niksar, Manavgat, Bozüyük sub-provinces will be made provinces in 15 days after this law is published and the Council of Ministers will be delegated the authority to connect the required sub-provinces to these new provinces’.

What you will have to do is bring in a certain limitation. You may say that the places the populations of which are over 30.000 will be made provinces. The important thing is, you have to decide on a limitation.

**C. G. (Kırşehir)** - Making sub-provinces and provinces just for the target of getting votes has long been a history. Aksaray, Bartın and Kırıkkale have been made provinces in the ANAP period but in the elections, the people of these places voted for other parties. The people of these places voted for mayors from other parties.

**A. G. (Kayseri)** - The 87<sup>th</sup> and the 91<sup>st</sup> articles of the Constitution defines the Empowering Law very clearly and points to three very important points with regard to this: It is necessary to state its aim, enclosure and duration clearly. In addition, there are decisions made by the Constitutional court with regard to the Empowering Laws. Besides, the 153<sup>rd</sup> clause of the Constitution states clearly that “Laws, decrees having the force of law, or the Rules of Procedure of the Turkish Grand National Assembly or provisions thereof, shall cease to have effect from the date of publication in the Official Gazette of the annulment decision. Where necessary, the Constitutional Court may also decide on the date on which the annulment decision shall come into effect. That date shall not be more than one year from the date of publication of the decision in the Official Gazette.” Therefore, we all are responsible for these decisions.

The Constitutional Court specifies the following in the explanatory grounds: “These decrees can be passed based on short term Empowering Laws only on condition that the matters require urgent action.” After explaining this matter it reads, “Spreading the exercise of decrees having force of law, making them permanent by extending the period of usage and passing decrees having force of law on almost all subjects by not complying with its condition of urgency means transferring the legislative authority.”

When this law proposal was passed to the Planning and Budget Committee, the validity period was asked to be until October 1996. Well, Think now. By-elections will be held every six months; decrees having force of law will be politicized and used before all of these by elections. This period was shortened to one year after the discussions made in the Planning and Budget Committee. Even then, a by election will be held in November. This is going to be exploited in these by elections. What I want to say is this: This will cause a problem for all of us. It will indeed cause a problem for the governing party because they expose themselves to the pressures.

During the discussions in the general assembly, there was a proposal with regard to entire of the draft bill. This proposal claims that the draft bill of Empowering Law carries a Constitutional challenge and for this reason, the entire draft bill should be sent to the Constitution Committee. However, this proposal was withdrawn. Apart from this, there two more proposals submitted during the discussions of the Empowering Law,

which are about the second article of the mentioned law. These proposals detailed the second article with adding 62 sub-province names to form provinces within 15 days, but those proposals were not carried. At the end of the discussion in the general assembly, the draft bill of the Empowering Law was adopted unanimously by open vote (187 affirmative votes out of 187 votes).

After the establishment of Yalova, Karabük and Kilis provinces on the basis of mentioned Empowering Law, this law regarding forming provinces and sub-provinces dated May 31, 1995 and numbered 4109 was cancelled by the Constitutional Court.

The subject of forming three provinces was taken to the Constitutional Court by the members of the parliament of the opposition party with the demand of cancellation of the law and staying of execution on grounds of unconstitutionality of the relevant decree having force of law. The Constitutional Court stopped the execution of the Authority decree and cancelled it. But Karabük, Kilis and Yalova were made provinces previously on June 3, 1995, yet the date of the application regarding demanding of cancellation and staying of execution was on June 23, 1995.

The decision of the Constitutional Court, which was made on July 4, 1995, it is stated that situation of forming new provinces and sub-provinces is not something urgent that requires priority, on the contrary, this subject requires making researches in detail. In the decisions made before, it was specified that the decision to be made on organizations were not urgent subjects that required priority, on the contrary, that subject required making researches in detail, the decisions should be relied on plans and should be applied in compliance with the regulations (<http://www.anayasa.gov.tr/eskisite/KARARLAR/IPTALITIRAZ/K1995/K1995-26.htm>).

In addition, it is stated that there was ambiguity in the Empowering Law numbered 4109, which was demanded to be cancelled with regard to the places to be made provinces and sub-provinces. What criteria would be used in this kind of formation was not mentioned in the decision. Besides, it was stated that the rule of making arrangements for compulsory and urgent situations with this law was not obeyed and emphasized that it carried the meaning that the legislative power was transferred

(<http://www.anayasa.gov.tr/eskisite/KARARLAR/IPTALITIRAZ/K1995/K1995-26.htm>).

Due to the mentioned reasons, the Empowering Law, which was the case in question was found against the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 7<sup>th</sup> articles of the Preamble section of the Constitution (The mentioned articles cover “the separation of powers”, “Turkey is a democratic, secular and social state governed by the rule of law”, “Legislative power cannot be delegated” principles). Also, it was contrary to the article 87 due to the reason that the places to be made provinces were not mentioned and was contrary to the article 91 because its aim, enclosure and principles were not clear (<http://www.anayasa.gov.tr/eskisite/KARARLAR/IPTALITIRAZ/K1995/K1995-26.htm>).

#### **5.1.6. Osmaniye (80)**

In 1996, Osmaniye was made a province in accordance with the law numbered 4200. The law regarding forming one province was passed as the attachment to the decree on October 24, 1996, and was proclaimed in the Official Gazette on October 28, 1996 with numbered 22801.

The justifications for making these sub-provinces provinces were explained as follows in the General Grounds section of the mentioned law:

*Operating the public service in an effective way depended closely on the geographical situation, transport and communication conditions and population densities of the provinces and sub-provinces. If there was no geographical wholeness and if an organization parallel to population density was not carried out, the other services also were delayed.*

*Therefore, it is useful to make changes suitable with the geographical structure and the population density during the provincial administration division.*

*Besides, to lift the effectiveness of the security forces in the area, it will be useful to make Osmaniye a province.” (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi - 23.10.1996, Dönem: 20, Cilt: 12, Yasama Yılı: 2, p.2).*

#### 5.1.6.1. The Discussion Process of the Law in TBMM General Assembly

According to the discussions regarding forming Osmaniye province in the general assembly, it is understood that the real reason of this law proposal came into the agenda is the forthcoming local election on grounds of the death of the mayor of Osmaniye.

The relevant discussions can be summarized as follows (TBMM Tutanak Dergisi- 23-24.10.1996, Dönem: 20, Cilt: 12-13, Yasama Yılı: 2, Birleşim: 11-12, Oturum: 1, pp.342-383, 13-24.):

**N.M. (Hatay-CHP)** - Osmaniye's being accepted as a province is the return of a detained right. Osmaniye was already a province between the years 1924 and 1933.

**V. A. D. (Adana-TTP)** - The decision we will make today will be the decision of reestablishing of the credit of those people. Today, as the True Path Party, we are repeating the same promises we made to the Osmaniye people at the first day we started our political operations in Osmaniye. My General Chairman sent me to Osmaniye as the election coordinator to pass his message to the people of Osmaniye. He said, *'Say Hello to Osmaniye people from me and inform them that we will keep our promise and declare Osmaniye to be a province'*.

The offer brought to you today is the offer made by us.

**U. A. (Adana-ANAP)** - The legislative proposal regarding declaring Osmaniye a province was made jointly by all political parties in 1996. The proposal of the Grand Unity Party was made in July 1996 and the other parties' proposals were made on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1996, only ANAP's proposal was made on September 28th, 1995. If you are looking for a first, we are the first, ANAP the first!

Similarly, one more proposal before anybody else, on September 5, 1996, one more on October 2, 1996. Now, answer my question! Which is bigger? One goal or three goals?

Why do people bribe? People bribe to get something illegal. Osmaniye was already a province years and years ago. It was a big Ottoman Province named "Cebelibereket".

Then, it was split, separated, and made a small borough. So, what are we doing today? We are returning an attained right. So how could this be considered as a bribe?

Why is Osmaniye becoming a province? Let me tell you. According to the survey realized by Eskişehir Anatolian University, '*The trust in the politicians is gradually getting less and less*'. It is almost at the point of vanishing. Since the promises are not kept, Turkish people have lost their trust in the politicians anymore.

Now, tell me. Haven't you, all the party leaders, all of whom are present here at the moment, and also us, all said that we would make Osmaniye a province while we were making speeches to those people from on top of our Party Campaign buses? Now Osmaniye is giving all of us, all the politicians, and an opportunity of saving themselves. This is an opportunity to prove that the promises that were made long ago are being kept.

There is also the geographical side of it. There are two boroughs of Osmaniye called Düziçi and Bahçe. When people from these sub-provinces have to go to the center of the Province, which is Adana, for their business matters, it takes them two hours to Adana and two hours back home. That makes four hours only on the road. These sub-provinces need a closer province center and that is another reason why Osmaniye should become a province.

If we consider the population, Osmaniye has rightfully deserved to become a province. There are many provinces, whose population is under 200.000, and Osmaniye's population is between 250.000 and 300.000 including its subdivisions.

Osmaniye has got between 7500 and 8000 taxpayers. It is the natural right of this big an allocation unit to become a province.

While acquitting us by keeping our promises made for Osmaniye, we cannot help mentioning the other boroughs which are already ready to be made provinces and which ANAP will do its best to make them provinces. These are Siverek, Tarsus, İskenderun, Alanya, Anamur, Nazilli, Bandırma, Düzce, Akşehir, Ereğli, and Çorlu. ANAP will do the best to declare these boroughs, which were promised to be made provinces, and whose populations are crowded enough and which have to be made provinces due to

their geographical positions, just like Osmaniye, as provinces. We are hoping that you will support us, too.

**Y.B. (Adana- RP)** - The matter of making Osmaniye a province was highlighted just before the elections; this is not a political bribe and not an election investment but is restoring Osmaniye's right. The number of the proposals does not count here. What counts here is passing a law to realize the proposal. The politicians were touring around announcing: '*Vote for us! We are the ruling party! We will make one of every four boroughs provinces.*' in the 1987 election. In the 1991 elections, some politicians made some places provinces either by telegram or by mail. This government is ruling now and this government is not producing words, it is producing actions.

**A. S. (Adana-DSP)** - I wonder which political group made a legislative proposal about making Osmaniye a province during the 20<sup>th</sup> legislative period before the mayor passed away. Yalova was about to be declared a province just for the election investment purposes but Osmaniye did not appear in the agenda. God forbids us; we are constructing buildings on corps but not giving its natural right to Osmaniye.

Are we labeling this place with a developing area status and attract investments or are we creating an election province? We have to bring up serious projects regarding this matter.

**R. K. Y. (İçel)** - The province projects were brought up and discussed in this general assembly from time to time and, what a coincidence, all these project were brought up just before elections.

All the political party representatives defended that this matter was not a political bribe and definitely was the joint property of this assembly. Only one political party, just because they will not enter the elections to be held on November 3, made a more objective speech.

We, as ANAP, did not declare provinces just before elections. We asked for making Kilis and Yalova with the same words and the same way, last year. You can find this out by examining the minutes of the assembly.

We also declared Bartın province and it is not an exception. We declared Bartın province just because of the municipal elections. That means we made a mistake, as well.

May be, we should launch an appeal for the mayors from here. We, all together, should ask the mayor of the sub-province, which we would like to make a province, to resign three or for months before a by-election. May be, pressure will start to be exerted to the mayors in lots of sub-provinces, and their resignation will come up.

Tarsus, which has more population than 40 of the present provinces, should be declared a province. If population is not the criteria and the criteria is only the distance to and from the province, Anamur, which 225 kilometers away from its own province and which is 260 kilometers away from the next closest province, should be declared a province. If the criteria are its being province in the Ottoman times, then, Silifke and Alanya should be, declared provinces and we should not forget Siverek, as well.

Come on. Let us come together and settle down true criteria for this so that the generations following the voters, our citizens, and us will not see this Great Assembly as an assembly, which declares sub-provinces as provinces from one election to the other.

Until ANAP started ruling in 1983, nobody could talk about the change in the administrative structure of Turkey. Nobody could mention making sub-provinces provinces and declaring boroughs sub-provinces. However, we could do it by setting down the criteria for this and announced that we would increase the numbers of the provinces to a hundred.

I suggest preventing this subject from being exploited.

I would like to read you the letter sent to me by the Mayor of Tarsus:

*“Dear Member of Parliament,*

*People of Tarsus, who are sick and tired of being forgotten after lots of promises made before each election, outraged because a proposal about making Osmaniye a province was given again just before another election. You cannot*

*declare other sub-provinces as provinces by just disregarding Tarsus, which is bigger than sixty provinces of Turkey and which is 22nd in line according to its population potential. Tarsus has long deserved being province not only with the above-mentioned specification but also its historical, social, economic and social infrastructure. Tarsus should be declared province first. If you can claim that you have this criterion, you shouldn't be a mere instrument in the hands of others and shouldn't participate in any voting if Tarsus is not mentioned in."*

**M. I. (Sivas)** - No five mayors will be elected in Osmaniye, my dear friends! Only one mayor will be elected. Of course, we all kindly mentioned our thought, ideas, and contributions. In addition, the rest is the business of Osmaniye people.

Now what will happen to the sub-provinces apart from Osmaniye? Süleyman Demirel, the leader of the JP went to Suşehri twice and said that if they wanted Suşehri to be a province they should vote for his party in one of the municipal elections.

On the other side, I have a few words to say to my friend who has made this proposal and is the Member of Parliament from this province: Suşehri is situated in the Kelkit Valley where four other sub-provinces are situated. These are Suşehri, Akıncılar, Koyulhisar, and Gölova, which are very close to each other. They have approximately 45.000 votes and they all supported the right wing just because they want Suşehri to be declared a province. Both the Welfare Party and Mr. Yazıcıoğlu, on behalf of ANAP promised that Suşehri would be made province. You have made this promise and I want some friends of mine to keep their promises. When these promises are not kept, people lose their trust in the *eyalet* and our citizens are hurt and offended. Therefore, I, as a Member of Parliament and as a citizen request and ask the government: All the sub-provinces promised to be made provinces up to now should definitely be declared provinces within a set timetable. Otherwise, we will lose our persuasiveness and this will cause us to get minus points.

Moreover, Sivas has almost been chosen as a pilot area in respect of terror. It is the second biggest province of Turkey in size. One governor is not sufficient for Sivas. Just try to remember that only a month ago, a regiment from Sarıkamış, one from Kayseri and one from Merzifon were brought to Sivas related to the operations in Divriği, Zara

and İmranlı sub-provinces. These operations were very important for the security and the comfort of the people who are living in these sub-provinces. A group of these regiments had to go back because they had no place to stay. For this reason, Sivas should definitely be divided into two.

There is a six or seven-hour distance between Divriği and Koyulhisar sub-provinces and as you all know, Kızıladağ is situated in the same area. It is not possible for the security forces, people of the area or the vehicles to go from one place to the other.

**M. H. D. (Adana-Minister of Forestry)** - We, as government, have the decision of declaring all the sub-provinces, which are expecting to be announced as provinces, as provinces, at one go, by taking objective criteria into consideration and without waiting for any elections. However, there are 127 sub-provinces, which were applied to be made provinces and 553 boroughs to be made sub-provinces at present. Mr. Okuyan proposes to make all of them provinces, but we have to consider the economic burden they will cause.

Had the authorization bill not cancelled, the number of the provinces would have been more than a hundred now.

It has been a yearning for Osmaniye to become province since Turkey started the multi-party regime.

**A. D. (Kahramanmaraş)** - When Osmaniye becomes a province; Andırın, sub-province of Kahramanmaraş will be made subordinate to Osmaniye. Andırın is 110 kilometers to Osmaniye and 70 kilometers to Maraş. Moreover, Andırın directly subordinate to Maraş but when it will be related to Osmaniye through Kadirli, which will cause a becoming smaller psychology, which will affect our voters. However, nothing has been mentioned related to this subject in the report prepared by the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

None of us said, “Andırın will be made subordinate to Osmaniye” while asking for their votes for the elections. This is something extra and can wait for some time.

**U. A. (Adana)** – ‘Had the Empowering Law not cancelled, Osmaniye would have been a province by now’ said a friend of mine. We can see today that there is no need for the Empowering Law. We are making Osmaniye a province not through the Empowering Law, but by an independent bill. Had we wanted to announce any place a province, after the cancellation of the Empowering Law, we would have had Yalova and Kilis provinces cancelled. We have not applied for it. We have not had them cancelled. They could announce Kilis and Yalova provinces through the Empowering Law that was cancelled later on. Could not they add Osmaniye underneath it?

**M. B. (Adana-DSP)** - Our subject here, today, is making Osmaniye province and the election of a mayor on November 3 due to the death of the late mayor because of an accident.

If the mayor had been living, would Osmaniye have been made a province? The answer is definitely no! Kozan and Kadirli sub-provinces of Adana have been expecting to become provinces; even Ceyhan can be mentioned among them. Not to mention İskenderun and Tarsus, which are situated around Adana. Are there any attempts of doing anything for them? No. Then this is definitely called as “election bribe”.

So, how far do the Turkish nation and Turkey can go with these primitive populist policies and bribing? Politicians should always be one-step ahead of their people. They should be leaders, and be able to open new horizons for them. I cannot tolerate the situation that the politicians are offering bribes. The fact that the members of Parliament and the political parties are offering bribes and making promises that they cannot keep, shakes people’s confidence in democracy.

If you place fanaticism before science, cunning before honesty and call bribe permissible, you cannot go very far.

We would like to add this, as well: We are not content with the idea that Kadirli will make subordinate to Osmaniye. Kadirli and Kozan have already deserved to be provinces by themselves.

**O. K. (Adana)** - All of our friends, who had visited Osmaniye due to the elections, must have seen the banners and the posters in Osmaniye. These banners and the posters read: *'Make us a province and get the votes. If not, no votes'*. We should admit that this opportunism of the people of Osmaniye has brought us to this point. We should consider the administrative restructuring not with unrealistic promises but with objective criteria. That is, which boroughs should be declared sub-provinces and which sub-provinces should be declared provinces should be decided through objective criteria that must be set carefully.

Why has not Hasanbeyli been made a sub-province although it is as developed as the sub-provinces that are being planned to be related to the sub-provinces, which will be made provinces? Because it was unowned. Because the mayor did not belong to any of the political parties, who had a group in the parliament.

I would like to address to the boroughs, which would love to be provinces via this microphone. I am addressing Suşehri, Tarsus, Kozan, Düzce and Siverek. I am also addressing to any other eminent places. Do not give your votes haphazardly for the false promises when you have rightful claims.

**S. C. (Adana)** - Since Adana is my region, I went there very often due to elections. When we started our addresses in the election meetings, people of Osmaniye were shouting *'province, province, province'* in chorus. The reason why they were shouting like this is only the promises that were made until now, politicians always promised that they would do but nothing was done. I said, *'We will make Osmaniye province. You will see'*. Thanks God, today, we are keeping our promise.

**M. A. B. (Adana-ANAP)** - It is promised twice (in 1991 and 1994) that Osmaniye will be made a province but for various reasons, these promises could not be kept.

We, as ANAP, started our studies regarding making the following sub-provinces provinces in this period. We are expecting support from the whole parliament on this matter. These sub-provinces are Fethiye, Şereflikoçhisar, Şebinkarahisar, Polatlı, Siverek, Akhisar, Tarsus, İskenderun, Silifke, Alanya, Anamur, Nazilli, Bandırma, Düzce, Akşehir, Ereğli, Çorlu, Bucak, Ceyhan and Kozan.

**H. S. T. (Trabzon- DSP)** - The legislative proposals regarding making Osmaniye a province was given by the members of Parliaments belonging to five political parties represented in the Parliament, except DSP. It is understood that these proposals were all given within this month. It is clearly visible that the factor that makes the owners of those proposals move is the local by-election to be held on November 3, 1996 in Osmaniye, which has about 80.000 voters. Thus, Osmaniye, which already deserved to be made a province, is going to be made a province as an election investment and as an election bribe just before the local by-election.

The practices realized in recent years proved that the financial criteria were rather freely designated by the governments and some sub-provinces are made provinces just before general or by-elections as an election bribe.

The improvement that started at the end of 1980s and increased the number of sub-provinces to 79, which was 67 for many years, tempted many sub-provinces to be provinces. This temptation became an indispensable passion. The haphazard promises of some politicians stimulated this passion more and more. Now many sub-provinces are expecting to become provinces. This wish turned out to be a competition or a problem of prestige. It is time we formalized the financial criteria in the article 126 of our Constitution in detail, in order not to lose the rational bases of the subject and to provide the people with the public services actively within the most appropriate administrative structure.

In any case, we definitely have to give up the habit of creating new provinces just before the general or by-elections and consequently, this process should be carried out in compliance with objective criteria, not according to the short-term election plans.

In the meantime, by making some sub-provinces with dividing the present provinces, we not only harm the 126th article of the Constitution but also harm some other principles. For example, if the number of the provinces continues increasing, the newly founded provinces will be too far away from being election areas suitable for the principle of “**justice in representation**” stated as one of the two basic principles of the election system in the 67th article of the Constitution. If the era of dividing the present provinces

and creating new provinces continue, the concept of founding provinces will degenerate in a very short time and 126th article of the Constitution might lose its meaning. This conduct will necessitate reuniting the small provinces with the bigger units in the future. If we have to summarize shortly, the operation of making sub-provinces provinces, should be connected with some objective criteria, which will concretize the 126<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution and should be prevented from being made an election investment, which is not compatible with the political moral, before the elections.

**H. Y. (Hatay)** - The sub-province of İskenderun is situated next to Osmaniye. With its 280.000 population, harbor, airport, highway, airway universities, industrial zone, and the socio-economic position, İskenderun had long deserved to be province as much as Osmaniye, if not more and is waiting in line to be announced.

I would also like to mention about the proposal I made in the Committee of Planning and Budgeting. We have made a proposal regarding the criteria and the templates, which will help, decide on if a sub-province can be made province. As a result of the studies, the conditions of forming provinces should be assessed according to the result of the data derived from the template. I suggest that a sub-province should become a province parallel to the specifications it has. My heartfelt wish is that this is taken into consideration in the relevant commissions.

**İ. Y. (Balıkesir)** - If a place is going to be made a province, objective criteria must be determined and the decision must be carried out according to these criteria. From this point of view, whatever criteria you take into consideration, Bandırma is the only sub-province that deserves to be made a province most. Because no election is going to be held anywhere in the province of Balıkesir, I request you to make especially Balıkesir a province.

After determining the criteria for making the sub-provinces provinces as soon as possible, making the planned sub-provinces provinces in the coming, few months will raise the good feeling of our citizens towards our Parliament more and the present trust for the politicians will increase more.

**M. K. (Konya-ANAP)** - Mr. Minister went up here a few minutes ago and said, '*If ANAP had not have the Empowering Law cancelled; Osmaniye would have been a province*'. First, we should not ever forget this: Since it was cancelled, that means there was something contrary the Constitution there. If the Constitutional Court cancels it, there is something contrary with the Constitution. Mr. Minister says, '*Let us continue with the operation, which is contrary with the Constitution, if you had not followed it...*' During the time when that law was being passed, we said, '*the authority you request, is an authority which should not be attempted to ask in a legal regime and in a normal Constitutional system, before all else*'. The government ruling those days overtook the authority of the parliament. They would go to the provinces and sub-provinces would bargain and go to the result according to those bargains.

My dear friends, until we had that law cancelled, you made Yalova, Kilis and Karabük provinces. If you had wanted it this much, why did you not put Osmaniye underneath this list? If Mr. Minister had written down Osmaniye underneath that list, Osmaniye would have been a province in 1995. Now, you cannot put the blame of the mistake you made on anybody. Osmaniye does not owe anything to any party for the passing of this law.

**A.E. (İçel)** - Meanwhile, in the second clause, my friends and I proposed three sub-provinces of İçel to be made provinces but this was not put on the agenda. Tarsus deserves to be made a province.

Now, I propose Tarsus, Silifke and Anamur to be made provinces and you do not put it in the agenda. Then you say, '*Don't step out of the agenda!*' How can I not defend the rights of my Tarsus, Silifke and Anamur and Kızılcabölük in Denizli?

**B.Ö. (Samsun)** - I bring the following facts to your attention: The government cannot bring a serious study in front of you regarding making Osmaniye a province. As a matter of fact, the matter of Osmaniye's becoming a province has been brought up by the proposal of ministers belonging to various political parties. Actually, when the provincial division and the structuring of the government is under discussion, these kinds of arrangements should be assessed with all dimensions of it and then brought to the presence of Grand National Assembly.

When Osmaniye is made a province, the government will have to spend lots of money. I am warning the government on this subject. As a matter of fact, the source of the arrangement that requires this expenditure should be indicated. The sources of the services to be carried out here should be indicated in this proposal. I am showing the way to the government from here: We saw additional resources in the budget of the Ministry of Finance, in the 1996 Budget, for this kind of unexpected expenses, during the ANAP government period. The government should at least transfer these sources to Osmaniye during the preparations, without losing any time and without pleading and putting forward any excuses.

***İ. E. Y. (Adana-The Head of the committee of Planning and Budgeting)*** - My dear friends, we were worried while we were talking about which sub-province should be made province but, people of Osmaniye were a lot more worried and are expecting Osmaniye to be declared as province right now at this moment. Last night they were all watching the parliament on TV and they are looking forward to hearing the good news in great excitement.

If we go into more technical details like this, and if a set of unwanted things occur, we are anxious that we will be ill serving while trying to do something good. For this reason, we do not want this matter back to the Committee just because of a technical difficulty.

***Y. B. (Adana-RP)*** - Some of our friends have been trying to exploit things for two days, somehow thinking that some things are slipping out of their hands. That is, I hardly understand why they are trying to prevent Osmaniye from becoming a province by trying to make a song of the things.

***A. D. (Kahramanmaraş)*** - The main problem is to determine some healthy criteria on the subject of which sub-provinces should be made provinces and which conditions should be fulfilled. Then, their demands to be provinces will be evaluated and tried to be fulfilled. We will be the supporters and the followers of this idea.

I also demand support for Elbistan's becoming a province. Elbistan had long deserved this because it is 120 kilometers away from the closest province, 160 kilometers away from Kahramanmaraş, which it belongs to, it is situated on the fifth biggest plain of Turkey, and lastly it was the capital city of Dulkadiroğulları once.

**M. A. (Elazığ- Minister of Interior)** - Turkey is in the process of great progress and development. As a result of this great progress and development, it is quite natural that similar laws will be proposed to the Grand Assembly when the administrative divisions necessitate. However, Osmaniye, which has been waiting for sixty-three years and which deserves to be a province with all the objective present conditions, has reached the final happy end today.

#### **5.1.7. Düzce (81)**

In 1999, Düzce was made a province in accordance with the decree having force of law numbered 584. The law regarding forming one province and two sub-provinces was passed as the attachment to the decree on December 12, 1999, and was proclaimed in the Official Gazette on December 1, 1999 with numbered 23901.

In the general grounds section of the mentioned decree having force of law, it is mentioned that healing the wounds of the terrible earthquakes that happened on August 17 and November 12 depends on working of all of the ministries and public institutions in harmony and coordination. It continues as follows:

*Forming the coordination among the public institutions of the provinces in the region where the earthquakes happened; and thus, maintaining efficiency and accordance in carrying out the public services in the mentioned provinces has a vital importance.*

*On this account, it was found essential to make Düzce a province in order to supply the services single handedly and on the spot, also to accelerate the economic and social development. Kaynaşlı and Derince boroughs were made sub-provinces with the belief that they would not get enough service if they stayed as boroughs. (Directorate General of the Decisions and Acts of the Prime Ministry, Archives File, 1999: 1)*

Based on the Empowering Law Regarding Removing the Effects of the Damages Caused by Natural Disasters and the Precautions to be taken against the Natural Disasters dated August 27, 1999, this decree having force of law was issued.

Considering the discussions at TBMM General Assembly for the related laws described above, it is inferred that:

- The insufficiency of the criteria on forming a province in the related legislation has been utilized in an opportunist way to tout for votes with political concerns by the governing parties and the members of the Parliament.
- According to the grounds of the related laws, being a province is seen as a precondition for a sub-province to increase the socio-cultural and socio-economic development levels. Otherwise, a sub-province can by no means develop. Furthermore, it is thought that establishing a province is a way of solving the unemployment problem.
- By the members of the Parliament, it is seen that for a demoted province to be a province again is a natural right. Moreover, being a province has become an ambition for the local people whose right was already infringed.
- Giving a notice of motion to make her/his hometown a province, and/or giving an affirmative vote to establish a new province without detailed consideration are seen as a way of public service by the members of the Parliament who consider themselves obliged.
- The notices of motion, which came into the agenda in TBMM General Assembly, are not thought in detail, their pros and cons are not taken into consideration. For instance, even the issue of the subordination of the sub-provinces and/or districts is not examined painstakingly. There is no clarity for forming a province in the related laws; such as the priorities of the sub-provinces and districts subordinated to and their implications. Besides, to reach the newly established province from its own newly subordinated sub-province, one has to pass through another province.
- During the discussions at TBMM General Assembly for the related draft bills, the members of the Parliament, who have given notices of motion in the same subject, express their views for the reason of not being taken into consideration. The members of the Parliament, speaking either on its behalf or on behalf of their political parties, object to the draft bill at fist; but then they explain their

affirmative votes for the related draft bills on forming provinces. Moreover, some of the members of the Parliament take the advantage of the agenda and propose some other sub-provinces for forming a province. Accordingly, they remind their entities on the decision of establishing a province to the public opinion; and in a sense, they try to tout for votes for the incoming elections.

#### **5.4. The Comparison of the Last 14 Provinces**

As mentioned previously, there is a lack of objective criteria on forming a province stated in the related laws and this issue has not been taken into consideration by the governing parties and/or the members of the Parliament. Moreover, as understood from the former section, the provincial statuses were given with political concerns. Within this context, in this part, the subjectivity of the decisions on forming the last 14 provinces is examined by proving the fact that there is no standard for establishing a province.

##### **5.4.1. The Determination of the Criteria for Comparing the Last 14 Provinces**

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, a comparative study will be made according to the criteria determined by the sub-committee of the Internal Affairs Committee of the Parliament. But at first, some of the generally stated criteria in the report by the mentioned committee, must be made more specific to be able to make a quantitative analysis. Accordingly, the each criterion is detailed for comparison as follows:

- a. Transportation
  - The mode of transportation
  - The number of the traffic lanes of the highways
  - The Road Quality
- b. Educational Services
  - The number of primary schools
  - The number of secondary schools
  - The number of high-schools
  - The number of universities
- c. Health Services
  - The number of health centers
  - The number of health stations
  - The number of tuberculosis and malaria dispensaries

- The number of maternal child health and family planning centers
- The number of public health laboratories
- The number of health centers
- The number of SSK and Public Hospitals
- d. Justice Services
  - The types of courts and their numbers
- e. Safety Services
  - The number of police organization
- f. The development level of the industry
  - The number of establishments in manufacturing
  - The average number of labourers
  - The average number of paid workers
  - Value added
  - Total income
- g. The development level of the tourism
  - The number of the accommodation establishments with tourism operation licence and their number of rooms and beds

After determining the scope, the collected data, which cover the years before the establishment dates of each province, are categorized and formed datasets. Here, a multiple criteria analysis is made by using these datasets. This type of analysis is considered as the process of determining the closest to be a province among the 14 provinces for being a province as well as indicating where a particular province stands with respect to the other ones. Each province is evaluated according to established criteria which represent the different information. Note however that the most of these criteria are in different units. The values of these noncommensurable criteria must be converted into the same units. For this purpose, the ranking method is used to eliminate the units of criterion, so that all the criteria are dimensionless and become comparable with each other in the final. This is a simple scale transformation, transforming all criterion values in a linear (proportional) way. In this context, initially, the number of the value intervals is defined as 10. Secondly, for each value of criterion (dataset), the lowest value is subtracted from the highest value. Then, by dividing the found values named range of scores, into the number of intervals (10), the class interval sizes are found. Next, the class interval sizes are added to the lowest values, then to the found values, and it is

repeated successively till is found the highest value. This process ends by giving points from 1 to 10 in an ascending order to the class intervals of each dataset.

In this way, every dataset of each criterion has a score. These scores of each category, which consist of the relevant criteria, are summed, and then, they are divided into the number of the criteria under the same category. These are the average values of the each category. Finally, a 14 by 6 table including 84 values is produced, and the 14 provinces are compared with each other according to six categories by using this pivot table. In the following part, this process is explained in detail and the findings of the case study are critically discussed.

#### **5.4.2. The Evaluation of the Collected Data**

In this section, the collected data are evaluated for each criterion under the each category by using the ranking method. This statistical method was adopted to compare the 14 provinces with each other according to the established criteria with the equal criteria weights. To compare the provinces the data must be in the same qualifications for each criterion. For this purpose, every item for the provinces belongs to the years when they are sub-provinces. At this point, the data are tried to be collected by considering the years of the establishments of the provinces as close as possible to these years. After collecting the data, the provinces are categorized by the criteria, and their values are ranked from 1 to 10; with 1 being very poor, five being average and 10 being outstanding. The detailed results are given in the following part.

##### **5.4.2.1. Population**

The first category of the criteria is the population. The data of this category, which is gathered from TÜİK, covers the results of the General Population Censuses of 1980, 1985, and 1990. The five-year growth rate of population is in the percentage.

As can be seen from the Table-3, Kırıkkale has the maximum population both in central and in total, whereas Şırnak has the minimum. As for the five-year growth rates of population, Ardahan has the minimum percentage, and Kilis has the maximum.

**Table 3. The Central and Total Populations and the Five-Year Growth Rates of Population of the Provinces**

|    |           | Data Year | Central Population | Total Population | Five-Year Growth Rate of Population |
|----|-----------|-----------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1985      | 81.056             | 230.250          | 50,63 (1985-80)                     |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 1985      | 28.068             | 109.260          | 43,53 (1985-80)                     |
| 70 | Karaman   | 1985      | 64.735             | 130.846          | 46,88 (1985-80)                     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 1985      | 208.018            | 262.349          | 30,71 (1985-80)                     |
| 72 | Batman    | 1985      | 110.036            | 129.472          | 48,89 (1985-80)                     |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 1985      | 12.141             | 37.367           | 19,79 (1985-80)                     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 30.142             | 133.942          | 19,81 (1990-85)                     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1990      | 16.761             | 52.574           | -1,59 (1990-85)                     |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 1990      | 35.858             | 95.732           | 39,31 (1990-85)                     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1990      | 65.823             | 113.417          | 40,13 (1990-85)                     |
| 78 | Karabük   | 1990      | 105.373            | 123.361          | 21,11 (1990-85)                     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 1990      | 82.882             | 121.752          | 65,03 (1990-85)                     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 1990      | 122.307            | 174.875          | 32,77 (1990-85)                     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1990      | 61.878             | 156.326          | 18,51 (1990-85)                     |

*Source: Turkish Statistical Institute, the General Population Censuses of 1980, 1985, and 1990.*

**Table 4. The Ranked Values of the Population**

|    |           | Central Population<br>*At least 100.000 | Total Population<br>*At least 250.000 | Population Growth Rate in the last five years | Total Value | Average Value |
|----|-----------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 0                                       | 0                                     | 7                                             | 7           | 2,3           |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 0                                       | 0                                     | 6                                             | 6           | 2,0           |
| 70 | Karaman   | 0                                       | 0                                     | 7                                             | 7           | 2,3           |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 10                                      | 10                                    | 3                                             | 23          | 7,7           |
| 72 | Batman    | 1                                       | 0                                     | 7                                             | 8           | 2,7           |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 0                                       | 0                                     | 1                                             | 1           | 0,3           |
| 74 | Bartın    | 0                                       | 0                                     | 1                                             | 1           | 0,3           |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 0                                       | 0                                     | 0                                             | 0           | 0             |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 0                                       | 0                                     | 5                                             | 5           | 1,7           |
| 77 | Yalova    | 0                                       | 0                                     | 5                                             | 5           | 1,7           |
| 78 | Karabük   | 1                                       | 0                                     | 1                                             | 2           | 0,7           |
| 79 | Kilis     | 0                                       | 0                                     | 10                                            | 10          | 3,3           |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 3                                       | 0                                     | 4                                             | 7           | 2,3           |
| 81 | Düzce     | 0                                       | 0                                     | 1                                             | 1           | 0,3           |

In relation to this table, the scores of the provinces for each criterion are produced by using the ranking method. According to Table-4 there are only four provinces are ranked for the central population, and only one is ranked for the total population by considering the limit values determined in the report of the sub-committee of the Internal Affairs Committee of the Parliament for these criteria. These limit values are at least 100.000 for

the central population, and at least 250.000 for the total population. By comparison, out of 10 points, Kırıkkale is the most suitable for being a province according to the population criteria, with the average score of 7,7.

#### 5.4.2.2. Geographical Structure

For the geographical structure criteria, there are three sub-criteria determined; namely, area, distance to the provinces to which the province was subordinated previously and transportation. But before ranking the values shown in the Table-5, the transportation sub-criteria must be detailed in order to evaluate accurately; because the information of the mode of transportation is too general. In any case, every province has a highway, and this does not provide proper information for comparing. Thus, as presented in the Table-6, the transportation sub-criterion is detailed by three criteria which are mode of transportation, number of traffic-lanes and the road quality.

**Table 5. The Geographical Structures of the Provinces**

|    |                  | Area<br>(km <sup>2</sup> ) | Distance to<br>its<br>province<br>(km.) | Transportation   |
|----|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------|
| 68 | <b>Aksaray</b>   | 6.232                      | 121                                     | highway          |
| 69 | <b>Bayburt</b>   | 3.652                      | 78                                      | highway          |
| 70 | <b>Karaman</b>   | 4.657                      | 119                                     | highway- railway |
| 71 | <b>Kırıkkale</b> | 1.370                      | 77                                      | highway-railway  |
| 72 | <b>Batman</b>    | 498                        | 87                                      | highway-railway  |
| 73 | <b>Şırnak</b>    | 1.715                      | 97                                      | highway          |
| 74 | <b>Bartın</b>    | 1.151                      | 89                                      | highway          |
| 75 | <b>Ardahan</b>   | 1.241                      | 91                                      | highway          |
| 76 | <b>Iğdır</b>     | 1.692                      | 139                                     | highway          |
| 77 | <b>Yalova</b>    | 492                        | 176                                     | highway          |
| 78 | <b>Karabük</b>   | 741                        | 173                                     | highway-railway  |
| 79 | <b>Kilis</b>     | 1.243                      | 64                                      | highway          |
| 80 | <b>Osmaniye</b>  | 974                        | 86                                      | highway          |
| 81 | <b>Düzce</b>     | 1.014                      | 45                                      | highway          |

*Source: The Ministry of Public Works and Settlement, the General Directorate of Highways*

The data in the Table-6 are collected from the General Directorate of Highways. The information obtained on the number of traffic-lanes are mostly the same; with the exception of four provinces having four traffic-lanes. The quality of the roads which connect the provinces as they were sub-provinces formerly to their provinces, is another descriptive information for the transportation sub-criterion. According to their qualities,

highways are divided into five categories. These are; concrete asphalt roads, surface treatment roads, unpaved roads, eart roads, and footpaths.

In the ranking part for mode of transportation, having a highway is not a distinctive information, because of this having no alternative mode in transportation except highway is ranked as zero. Also, having two alternative mode in transportation is valued as five instead of 10 by considering the other alternative modes. Similarly, having a 1\*2 lane highway is not distinctive information; thus, it is evaluated as zero, while the others as 10. As for the road quality, there are five different kinds of roads, as mentioned before. When they are ranked from 1 to 10, the values are as follows:

- a) Concrete asphalt roads **(10)**
- b) Surface treatment roads **(8)**
- c) Unpaved roads **(6)**
- d) Eart roads **(3)**
- e) Footpath **(1)**

**Table 6. The Qualifications of the Transportation**

|    |                  | Mode of Transportation | Number of Traffic Lane | Road Quality            |
|----|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 68 | <b>Aksaray</b>   | highway                | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 69 | <b>Bayburt</b>   | highway                | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 70 | <b>Karaman</b>   | highway-railway        | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 71 | <b>Kırıkkale</b> | highway-railway        | 2*2                    | Concrete asphalt roads  |
| 72 | <b>Batman</b>    | highway-railway        | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 73 | <b>Şırnak</b>    | highway                | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 74 | <b>Bartın</b>    | highway                | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 75 | <b>Ardahan</b>   | highway                | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 76 | <b>Iğdır</b>     | highway                | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 77 | <b>Yalova</b>    | highway                | 2*2                    | Concrete asphalt roads  |
| 78 | <b>Karabük</b>   | highway-railway        | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 79 | <b>Kilis</b>     | highway                | 1*2                    | Surface treatment roads |
| 80 | <b>Osmaniye</b>  | highway                | 2*2                    | Concrete asphalt roads  |
| 81 | <b>Düzce</b>     | highway                | 2*2                    | Concrete asphalt roads  |

*Source: The Ministry of Public Works and Settlement, the General Directorate of Highways*

According to these ranking values stated above, the results are given in the Table-7. As seen from the table, the values are close to each other. But among the 14 provinces, the highest value belongs to Kırıkkale, with the average score 8,3 out of 10.

**Table 7. The Ranked Values of Transportation**

|    |           | Mode of Transportation | Number of Traffic Lane | Road Quality | Total | Average |
|----|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------|---------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 0                      | 0                      | 8            | 8     | 2,7     |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 0                      | 0                      | 8            | 8     | 2,7     |
| 70 | Karaman   | 5                      | 0                      | 8            | 13    | 4,3     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 5                      | 10                     | 10           | 25    | 8,3     |
| 72 | Batman    | 5                      | 0                      | 8            | 13    | 4,3     |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 0                      | 0                      | 8            | 8     | 2,7     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 0                      | 0                      | 8            | 8     | 2,7     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 0                      | 0                      | 8            | 8     | 2,7     |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 0                      | 0                      | 8            | 8     | 2,7     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 0                      | 10                     | 10           | 20    | 6,7     |
| 78 | Karabük   | 5                      | 0                      | 8            | 13    | 4,3     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 0                      | 0                      | 8            | 8     | 2,7     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 0                      | 10                     | 10           | 20    | 6,7     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 0                      | 10                     | 10           | 20    | 6,7     |

Then, the ranking values of the geographical structure criterion are produced by adding the average values of transportation sub-criterion. The geographical structure criterion consists of three sub-criteria mentioned previously. Among these sub-criteria, there is a limit value for the distance of the highways, which connect the sub-province to its province. According to this limit, the distances must be at least 100 kilometers. In the ranking part, this value is taken into consideration and the provinces which are not above this required value are ranked as zero.

**Table 8. The Ranked Values of Geographical Structure**

|    |           | Area | Distance to its province | Transportation | Total Value | Average Value |
|----|-----------|------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 10   | 3                        | 2,7            | 15,7        | 5,2           |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 6    | 0                        | 2,7            | 8,7         | 2,9           |
| 70 | Karaman   | 8    | 3                        | 4,3            | 15,3        | 5,1           |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 2    | 0                        | 8,3            | 10,3        | 3,4           |
| 72 | Batman    | 1    | 0                        | 4,3            | 5,3         | 1,8           |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 3    | 0                        | 2,7            | 5,7         | 1,9           |
| 74 | Bartın    | 2    | 0                        | 2,7            | 4,7         | 1,6           |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 2    | 0                        | 2,7            | 4,7         | 1,6           |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 3    | 6                        | 2,7            | 11,7        | 3,9           |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1    | 10                       | 6,7            | 17,7        | 5,9           |
| 78 | Karabük   | 1    | 10                       | 4,3            | 15,3        | 5,1           |
| 79 | Kilis     | 2    | 0                        | 2,7            | 4,7         | 1,6           |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 1    | 0                        | 6,7            | 7,7         | 2,6           |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1    | 0                        | 6,7            | 7,7         | 2,6           |

As can be seen from the Table-8, there are three provinces having the minimum average score of 1,6. On the other hand, for the geographical structure criterion, Yalova has the maximum value of 5,9 out of 10.

#### **5.4.2.3. Infrastructure**

The infrastructure criterion consists of five sub-criteria: educational, health, justice and safety services and the military organization. However, the required data of the last two sub-criteria could not be obtained from the related institutions. As a result, the infrastructure criterion is confined to use the data of the first three sub-criteria.

##### **5.4.2.3.1. Educational Services**

The data on educational services presented in this section are collected from the Ministry of National Education and the related Provincial Directorates of National Education. The collected information covers the numbers of the educational institutions. In this context, the data of universities, faculties, vocational high schools and higher education institutions are gathered from their official web sites. While the data of the primary and the secondary school educations are collected from the related Ministry and its Provincial Directorates on the basis of the *Information Procurement Act*. But for the data of the primary education, the schools where located in villages of the 14 provinces are ignored because the foundation years of most of these schools could not be reached. Otherwise, the 14 provinces could not be compared accurately considering the educational services sub-criteria.

In the Table-9, the primary education covers the education of children in the age group 6-13. On the basis of the primary education, secondary education covers all general, vocational and technical educational institutions giving at least three years of education. As for the higher education, on the basis of the secondary education, it covers all educational institutions providing at least two years of higher education.

In this context, Aksaray had 64 primary schools when it was a sub-province, while Ardahan had 3 schools. For the secondary education, Şırnak had the minimum number of schools, and Düzce had the maximum. Again Düzce had the maximum number of schools in higher education. But for higher education, 6 out of 14 provinces had no school. Lastly, none of them had a university.

**Table 9. The Number of Schools**

|    |           | Primary Education | Secondary Education | Higher Education | University |
|----|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 64                | 8                   | 1                | 0          |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 13                | 6                   | 0                | 0          |
| 70 | Karaman   | 27                | 8                   | 1                | 0          |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 24                | 9                   | 1                | 0          |
| 72 | Batman    | 20                | 7                   | 1                | 0          |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 5                 | 1                   | 0                | 0          |
| 74 | Bartın    | 13                | 6                   | 0                | 0          |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 3                 | 5                   | 0                | 0          |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 17                | 6                   | 0                | 0          |
| 77 | Yalova    | 10                | 8                   | 1                | 0          |
| 78 | Karabük   | 28                | 10                  | 0                | 0          |
| 79 | Kilis     | 22                | 8                   | 1                | 0          |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 26                | 11                  | 1                | 0          |
| 81 | Düzce     | 23                | 13                  | 4                | 0          |

*Source: The Ministry of National Education, and the Provincial Directorates of National Education*

Based on these numbers, the ranking values are produced as shown in the Table-10. Considering the educational services, it can be seen from the table that Şırnak was in a poor condition when it was a sub-province; while Düzce was in good with the maximum average score.

**Table 10. The Ranked Values of Educational Services**

|    |           | Primary Education | Secondary Education | Higher Education | University | Total | Average |
|----|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------|-------|---------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 10                | 6                   | 1                | 0          | 17    | 4,3     |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 2                 | 5                   | 0                | 0          | 7     | 1,8     |
| 70 | Karaman   | 4                 | 6                   | 1                | 0          | 11    | 2,8     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 4                 | 7                   | 1                | 0          | 12    | 3,0     |
| 72 | Batman    | 3                 | 6                   | 1                | 0          | 10    | 2,5     |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 1                 | 1                   | 0                | 0          | 2     | 0,5     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 2                 | 5                   | 0                | 0          | 7     | 1,8     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1                 | 4                   | 0                | 0          | 5     | 1,3     |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 3                 | 5                   | 0                | 0          | 8     | 2,0     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 2                 | 6                   | 1                | 0          | 9     | 2,3     |
| 78 | Karabük   | 5                 | 8                   | 0                | 0          | 13    | 3,3     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 4                 | 6                   | 1                | 0          | 11    | 2,8     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 4                 | 9                   | 1                | 0          | 14    | 3,5     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 4                 | 10                  | 10               | 0          | 24    | 6,0     |

#### 5.4.2.3.2. Health Services

The data on health services presented in this section are collected from the Ministry of Health and its Provincial Directorates of the related provinces. The gathered information covers the numbers of the health institutions. The data for health institutions that provide

medical and preventive health services are grouped as out-patient institutions and in-patient. Out-patient institutions, shown in Table-11, cover health units, maternal child health and family planning centers and dispensaries. The information of the number of the health houses, which are also out-patient institutions, is obliged to be ignored, because most of the data could not be received exactly neither from the related Ministry nor from its Provincial Directorates. As for the in-patient institutions, they cover the public and the SSK hospitals. Like health houses, the data of the health centers, which are in-patient institutions, are also ignored because of the same reason. Within this context, the Table-11 is produced.

**Table 11. The Number of Out-Patient and In-Patient Institutions**

|    |                  | Out-Patient Institutions |                           |       | In-Patient Institutions |                 |       |
|----|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|    |                  | Health Units             | Other Health Institutions | Total | SSK Hospital            | Public Hospital | Total |
| 68 | <b>Aksaray</b>   | 24                       | 3                         | 27    | 1                       | 2               | 3     |
| 69 | <b>Bayburt</b>   | 14                       | 3                         | 17    | 0                       | 1               | 1     |
| 70 | <b>Karaman</b>   | 7                        | 4                         | 11    | 0                       | 1               | 1     |
| 71 | <b>Kırıkkale</b> | 4                        | 2                         | 6     | 1                       | 1               | 2     |
| 72 | <b>Batman</b>    | 3                        | 4                         | 7     | 1                       | 1               | 2     |
| 73 | <b>Şırnak</b>    | 1                        | 2                         | 3     | 0                       | 0               | 0     |
| 74 | <b>Bartın</b>    | 8                        | 3                         | 11    | 0                       | 2               | 2     |
| 75 | <b>Ardahan</b>   | 3                        | 3                         | 6     | 0                       | 1               | 1     |
| 76 | <b>Iğdır</b>     | 12                       | 2                         | 14    | 0                       | 1               | 1     |
| 77 | <b>Yalova</b>    | 3                        | 3                         | 6     | 0                       | 1               | 1     |
| 78 | <b>Karabük</b>   | 5                        | 5                         | 10    | 1                       | 1               | 2     |
| 79 | <b>Kilis</b>     | 3                        | 3                         | 6     | 1                       | 1               | 2     |
| 80 | <b>Osmaniye</b>  | 10                       | 3                         | 13    | 0                       | 1               | 1     |
| 81 | <b>Düzce</b>     | 12                       | 3                         | 15    | 0                       | 1               | 1     |

*Source: The Ministry of Health, and its Provincial Directorates*

As can be seen from the table below, before being provinces, Şırnak has the minimum value for the health services; whereas, Aksaray has the maximum. On the other hand, there is a huge difference between the highest score and the others. The second highest score is 4,5; namely the difference between them is 5,5 points. In this situation, compared provinces with each other, the number of the health institutions in each province except Aksaray, are not enough.

**Table 12. The Ranked Values of the Health Services**

|    |           | Value of<br>out-patient<br>institutions | Value of<br>in-patient<br>institutions | Average<br>Value |
|----|-----------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 10                                      | 10                                     | 10,0             |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 6                                       | 1                                      | 3,5              |
| 70 | Karaman   | 4                                       | 1                                      | 2,5              |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 2                                       | 5                                      | 3,5              |
| 72 | Batman    | 2                                       | 5                                      | 3,5              |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 1                                       | 0                                      | 0,5              |
| 74 | Bartın    | 4                                       | 5                                      | 4,5              |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 2                                       | 1                                      | 1,5              |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 5                                       | 1                                      | 3,0              |
| 77 | Yalova    | 2                                       | 1                                      | 1,5              |
| 78 | Karabük   | 3                                       | 5                                      | 4,0              |
| 79 | Kilis     | 2                                       | 5                                      | 3,5              |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 5                                       | 1                                      | 3,0              |
| 81 | Düzce     | 6                                       | 1                                      | 3,5              |

**5.4.2.3.3. Justice Services**

The data on justice services presented in this section that are available are collected from the Ministry of Justice. The data covers the types of courts in each province. There is no necessity to use ranking method. Because the maximum value of the total score is already 10.

**Table 13. The Types of Courts**

|    |           | Criminal Courts           |                                           |                               | Civil Courts                           |                               | Cadastral<br>Court | Labour<br>Court | Total<br>Value |
|----|-----------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
|    |           | High<br>Criminal<br>Court | Criminal<br>Court of<br>First<br>Instance | Criminal<br>Court of<br>Peace | Civil<br>Court of<br>First<br>Instance | Civil<br>Court<br>of<br>Peace |                    |                 |                |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1                         | 1                                         | 1                             | 2                                      | 1                             | 1                  | -               | 7              |
| 69 | Bayburt   | -                         | 1                                         | -                             | 1                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 3              |
| 70 | Karaman   | 1                         | 1                                         | -                             | 2                                      | 1                             | 1                  | -               | 6              |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | -                         | 2                                         | 2                             | 2                                      | 2                             | 1                  | 1               | 10             |
| 72 | Batman    | 1                         | 2                                         | 1                             | 2                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 7              |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 1                         | 1                                         | -                             | 1                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 4              |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1                         | 1                                         | 1                             | 2                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 6              |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1                         | 1                                         | -                             | 1                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 4              |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 1                         | 1                                         | -                             | 1                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 4              |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1                         | 1                                         | -                             | 1                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 4              |
| 78 | Karabük   | 1                         | 1                                         | 1                             | 2                                      | 1                             | 1                  | 1               | 8              |
| 79 | Kilis     | 1                         | 1                                         | 1                             | 1                                      | 1                             | 1                  | -               | 6              |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 1                         | 2                                         | -                             | 1                                      | -                             | 1                  | -               | 5              |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1                         | 2                                         | 2                             | 2                                      | 1                             | 1                  | -               | 9              |

*Source: The Ministry of Justice*

After the evaluation of the ranking values for the each sub-criterion separately, the provinces can be compared with each other according to the infrastructure criterion. By using the average values of the three sub-criteria, the average scores of the mentioned criteria are found. As can be seen from the table above, the highest score belongs to Aksaray; whereas the lowest to Şırnak. In other words, for being a province, the most appropriate sub-province is Aksaray considering only the infrastructure criteria.

**Table 14. The Ranked Values of Infrastructure**

|    |                  | <b>Educational Services</b> | <b>Health Services</b> | <b>Justice Services</b> | <b>Average Value</b> |
|----|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 68 | <b>Aksaray</b>   | 4,3                         | 10,0                   | 7,0                     | 7,1                  |
| 69 | <b>Bayburt</b>   | 1,8                         | 3,5                    | 3,0                     | 2,8                  |
| 70 | <b>Karaman</b>   | 2,8                         | 2,5                    | 6,0                     | 3,8                  |
| 71 | <b>Kırıkkale</b> | 3,0                         | 3,5                    | 10,0                    | 5,5                  |
| 72 | <b>Batman</b>    | 2,5                         | 3,5                    | 7,0                     | 4,3                  |
| 73 | <b>Şırnak</b>    | 0,5                         | 0,5                    | 4,0                     | 1,7                  |
| 74 | <b>Bartın</b>    | 1,8                         | 4,5                    | 6,0                     | 4,1                  |
| 75 | <b>Ardahan</b>   | 1,3                         | 1,5                    | 4,0                     | 2,3                  |
| 76 | <b>Iğdır</b>     | 2,0                         | 3,0                    | 4,0                     | 3,0                  |
| 77 | <b>Yalova</b>    | 2,3                         | 1,5                    | 4,0                     | 2,6                  |
| 78 | <b>Karabük</b>   | 3,3                         | 4,0                    | 8,0                     | 5,1                  |
| 79 | <b>Kilis</b>     | 2,8                         | 3,5                    | 6,0                     | 4,1                  |
| 80 | <b>Osmaniye</b>  | 3,5                         | 3,0                    | 5,0                     | 3,8                  |
| 81 | <b>Düzce</b>     | 6,0                         | 3,5                    | 9,0                     | 6,2                  |

#### 5.4.2.4. Economic Conditions

The economic conditions criterion consists of four sub-criteria: contribution to the gross national product, the amount of collected tax, industry (the development level of the industry), and the development level of the tourism. However, the required data of the two sub-criteria, which are the amount of collected tax and the development level of the tourism, could not be obtained from the related institutions. As a result, the economic conditions criterion is confined to be evaluated using only the data of the two sub-criteria.

Before the evaluation of the sub-criteria separately, the related data must be converted to the current prices for both of the sub-criteria in order to compare the provinces with each other. For this purpose, two methods are tried. The first one is the use of the dollar rate, and the second is the inflation rate.

In the former method, the prices are divided into the average dollar rates of the related years shown in the Table-15, and then multiplied with the current dollar rate of 1,5 YTL. The result value is the current price. In the latter method, the prices are converted to the current prices by using the calculation tool (inflation calculator) presented in the official website<sup>9</sup> of the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey. However, the findings of the two methods are different from each other only in current prices, but not in their ranked values. To minimize the differences, the average of current prices and their ranked values are calculated by using the results obtained from the two methods. The detailed tables are given in the each section of this part.

**Table 15. The Average Dollar Rates of the Related Years**

|    |                  | <b>Data Year</b> | <b>Price (TL)</b> |
|----|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 68 | <b>Aksaray</b>   | 1988             | 1.422,00          |
| 69 | <b>Bayburt</b>   |                  |                   |
| 70 | <b>Karaman</b>   |                  |                   |
| 71 | <b>Kırıkkale</b> |                  |                   |
| 72 | <b>Batman</b>    | 1989             | 2.139,52          |
| 73 | <b>Şırnak</b>    | 1990             | 2.618,98          |
| 74 | <b>Bartın</b>    |                  |                   |
| 75 | <b>Ardahan</b>   | 1991             | 4.199,67          |
| 76 | <b>Iğdır</b>     |                  |                   |
| 77 | <b>Yalova</b>    | 1994             | 29.915,67         |
| 78 | <b>Karabük</b>   |                  |                   |
| 79 | <b>Kilis</b>     |                  |                   |
| 80 | <b>Osmaniye</b>  | 1995             | 46.554,51         |
| 81 | <b>Düzce</b>     | 1998             | 262.384,34        |

*Source:* [http://www.igemekktc.org/istatistik\\_tur/temel2.pdf](http://www.igemekktc.org/istatistik_tur/temel2.pdf)

#### **5.4.2.4.1. Contribute to the Gross National Product**

The data on the Gross National Product (GNP) presented in this section are compiled from the study carried out by State Planning Organization (DPT). The gathered information covers the provincial data. In other words, the prices cover the subordinate units of the each province.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/>

**Table 16. The GNP Prices of Agriculture and their Ranked Values**

|    |           | Data Year | Price of the Related Year (YTL) | Dollar Exchange |       | Central Bank |       | Average     |       |
|----|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------------|-------|
|    |           |           |                                 | Price (YTL)     | Value | Price (YTL)  | Value | Price (YTL) | Value |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1988      | 94.551                          | 99.737.342      | 5     | 209.897.139  | 5     | 154.817.240 | 5     |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 1988      | 14.075                          | 14.847.046      | 1     | 31.245.595   | 1     | 23.046.321  | 1     |
| 70 | Karaman   | 1988      | 195.522                         | 206.246.835     | 10    | 434.046.265  | 10    | 320.146.550 | 10    |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 1988      | 61.427                          | 64.796.414      | 4     | 136.363.989  | 4     | 100.580.201 | 4     |
| 72 | Batman    | 1989      | 63.913                          | 44.808.882      | 3     | 86.366.981   | 2     | 65.587.932  | 3     |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 1989      | 18.809                          | 13.186.836      | 1     | 25.416.997   | 1     | 19.301.917  | 1     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 33.360                          | 19.106.675      | 1     | 28.102.497   | 1     | 23.604.586  | 1     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1991      | 29.135                          | 10.406.175      | 1     | 14.341.316   | 1     | 12.373.745  | 1     |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 1991      | 38.348                          | 13.696.790      | 1     | 18.876.293   | 1     | 16.286.542  | 1     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1994      | 31.384                          | 1.573.623       | 1     | 2.469.656    | 1     | 2.021.640   | 1     |
| 78 | Karabük   | 1994      | 31.490                          | 1.578.938       | 1     | 2.477.998    | 1     | 2.028.468   | 1     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 1994      | 76.832                          | 3.852.429       | 1     | 6.046.031    | 1     | 4.949.230   | 1     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 1995      | 130.783                         | 4.213.867       | 1     | 5.845.893    | 1     | 5.029.880   | 1     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1998      | 72.975                          | 417.184         | 1     | 537.005      | 1     | 477.094     | 1     |

**Table 17. The GNP Prices of Industry and their Ranked Values**

|    |           | Data Year | Price of the Related Year (YTL) | Dollar Exchange |       | Central Bank |       | Average     |       |
|----|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------------|-------|
|    |           |           |                                 | Price (YTL)     | Value | Price (YTL)  | Value | Price (YTL) | Value |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1988      | 9.635                           | 10.163.502      | 1     | 21.389.080   | 1     | 15.776.291  | 1     |
| 69 | Bayburt   |           | 2.885                           | 3.043.249       | 1     | 6.404.514    | 1     | 4.723.881   | 1     |
| 70 | Karaman   |           | 22.435                          | 23.665.612      | 1     | 49.804.257   | 1     | 36.734.934  | 1     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale |           | 228.294                         | 240.816.456     | 10    | 506.797.997  | 10    | 373.807.226 | 10    |
| 72 | Batman    | 1989      | 81.961                          | 57.462.188      | 3     | 110.755.622  | 3     | 84.108.905  | 3     |
| 73 | Şırnak    |           | 1.755                           | 1.230.416       | 1     | 2.371.568    | 1     | 1.800.992   | 1     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 23.136                          | 13.250.960      | 1     | 19.489.790   | 1     | 16.370.375  | 1     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1991      | 1.037                           | 370.386         | 1     | 510.449      | 1     | 440.418     | 1     |
| 76 | Iğdır     |           | 1.592                           | 568.616         | 1     | 783.641      | 1     | 676.129     | 1     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1994      | 185.922                         | 9.322.305       | 1     | 14.630.495   | 1     | 11.976.400  | 1     |
| 78 | Karabük   |           | 380.483                         | 19.077.778      | 1     | 29.940.806   | 1     | 24.509.292  | 1     |
| 79 | Kilis     |           | 15.513                          | 777.836         | 1     | 1.220.742    | 1     | 999.289     | 1     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 1995      | 67.862                          | 2.186.534       | 1     | 3.033.376    | 1     | 2.609.955   | 1     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1998      | 82.251                          | 470.213         | 1     | 605.264      | 1     | 537.738     | 1     |

**Table 18. The GNP Prices of Services and their Ranked Values**

|    |                  | Data Year | Price of the Related Year (YTL) | Dollar Exchange |           | Central Bank |           | Average     |           |
|----|------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|    |                  |           |                                 | Price (YTL)     | Value     | Price (YTL)  | Value     | Price (YTL) | Value     |
| 68 | <b>Aksaray</b>   | 1988      | <b>77.810</b>                   | 82.078.059      | <b>7</b>  | 172.733.195  | <b>7</b>  | 127.405.627 | <b>7</b>  |
| 69 | <b>Bayburt</b>   |           | <b>18.755</b>                   | 19.783.755      | <b>2</b>  | 41.634.894   | <b>2</b>  | 30.709.325  | <b>2</b>  |
| 70 | <b>Karaman</b>   |           | <b>59.082</b>                   | 62.322.785      | <b>6</b>  | 131.158.240  | <b>6</b>  | 96.740.512  | <b>6</b>  |
| 71 | <b>Kırıkkale</b> |           | <b>113.121</b>                  | 119.325.949     | <b>10</b> | 251.121.344  | <b>10</b> | 185.223.647 | <b>10</b> |
| 72 | <b>Batman</b>    | 1989      | <b>159.923</b>                  | 112.120.709     | <b>10</b> | 216.107.312  | <b>9</b>  | 164.114.011 | <b>10</b> |
| 73 | <b>Şırnak</b>    |           | <b>20.458</b>                   | 14.342.937      | <b>2</b>  | 27.645.326   | <b>2</b>  | 20.994.131  | <b>2</b>  |
| 74 | <b>Bartın</b>    | 1990      | <b>39.201</b>                   | 22.452.061      | <b>2</b>  | 33.022.962   | <b>2</b>  | 27.737.512  | <b>2</b>  |
| 75 | <b>Ardahan</b>   | 1991      | <b>15.749</b>                   | 5.625.085       | <b>1</b>  | 7.752.236    | <b>1</b>  | 6.688.660   | <b>1</b>  |
| 76 | <b>Iğdır</b>     |           | <b>18.874</b>                   | 6.741.244       | <b>1</b>  | 9.290.475    | <b>1</b>  | 8.015.859   | <b>1</b>  |
| 77 | <b>Yalova</b>    | 1994      | <b>204.305</b>                  | 10.244.046      | <b>1</b>  | 16.077.082   | <b>1</b>  | 13.160.564  | <b>1</b>  |
| 78 | <b>Karabük</b>   |           | <b>133.982</b>                  | 6.717.984       | <b>1</b>  | 10.543.254   | <b>1</b>  | 8.630.619   | <b>1</b>  |
| 79 | <b>Kilis</b>     |           | <b>79.392</b>                   | 3.980.790       | <b>1</b>  | 6.247.481    | <b>1</b>  | 5.114.136   | <b>1</b>  |
| 80 | <b>Osmaniye</b>  | 1995      | <b>183.114</b>                  | 5.899.987       | <b>1</b>  | 8.185.045    | <b>1</b>  | 7.042.516   | <b>1</b>  |
| 81 | <b>Düzce</b>     | 1998      | <b>127.420</b>                  | 728.435         | <b>1</b>  | 937.652      | <b>1</b>  | 833.044     | <b>1</b>  |

As for the minimization of the differences between the prices of different years, the current prices are calculated by using the two ways: dollar exchange and inflation calculator tool. Then the finding results and their ranked values are compared with each other. As is shown in the Table-16, 17 and 18, it is understood that there are no differences among the ranked values. Still, it is decided to use the averages of the prices obtained from the two methods, and then the comparison is made by looking to their ranked values obtained from the average prices.

According to the Table-19, Karaman contributes the maximum price (**320.146.550** YTL at current prices) to the Gross National Product in agriculture. For the industry, Kırıkkale contributes the maximum price (**373.807.226** YTL at current prices) to the GNP. Similarly, Kırıkkale contributes the maximum price (**185.223.647** YTL at current prices) to the GNP in the service sector.

**Table 19. Contribute to the Gross National Product of the Provinces by kind of the Economic Activity**

|    |           | Data Year | Agriculture |             | Industry    |             | Services    |             |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|    |           |           | Value (YTL) | Value (YTL) | Value (YTL) | Value (YTL) | Value (YTL) | Value (YTL) |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1988      | 94.551      | 154.817.240 | 9.635       | 15.776.291  | 77.810      | 127.405.627 |
| 69 | Bayburt   |           | 14.075      | 23.046.321  | 2.885       | 4.723.881   | 18.755      | 30.709.325  |
| 70 | Karaman   |           | 195.522     | 320.146.550 | 22.435      | 36.734.934  | 59.082      | 96.740.512  |
| 71 | Kırıkkale |           | 61.427      | 100.580.201 | 228.294     | 373.807.226 | 113.121     | 185.223.647 |
| 72 | Batman    | 1989      | 63.913      | 65.587.932  | 81.961      | 84.108.905  | 159.923     | 164.114.011 |
| 73 | Şırnak    |           | 18.809      | 19.301.917  | 1.755       | 1.800.992   | 20.458      | 20.994.131  |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 33.360      | 23.604.586  | 23.136      | 16.370.375  | 39.201      | 27.737.512  |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1991      | 29.135      | 12.373.745  | 1.037       | 440.418     | 15.749      | 6.688.660   |
| 76 | Iğdır     |           | 38.348      | 16.286.542  | 1.592       | 676.129     | 18.874      | 8.015.859   |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1994      | 31.384      | 2.021.640   | 185.922     | 11.976.400  | 204.305     | 13.160.564  |
| 78 | Karabük   |           | 31.490      | 2.028.468   | 380.483     | 24.509.292  | 133.982     | 8.630.619   |
| 79 | Kilis     |           | 76.832      | 4.949.230   | 15.513      | 999.289     | 79.392      | 5.114.136   |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 1995      | 130.783     | 5.029.880   | 67.862      | 2.609.955   | 183.114     | 7.042.516   |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1998      | 72.975      | 477.094     | 82.251      | 537.738     | 127.420     | 833.044     |

Source: KAYMAK, C.; AKPINAR, R.; KINDAP, A. (2003) "İller ve Bölgeler İtibarıyla GSYH'daki Gelişmeler (1987-2000)", TC. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, Ankara.

**Table 20. The Ranked Values of the Contribute to the Gross National Product**

|    |           | Data Year | Agriculture | Industry | Services | Total | Average |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------|----------|-------|---------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1988      | 5           | 1        | 7        | 13    | 4,3     |
| 69 | Bayburt   |           | 1           | 1        | 2        | 4     | 1,3     |
| 70 | Karaman   |           | 10          | 1        | 6        | 17    | 5,7     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale |           | 4           | 10       | 10       | 24    | 8,0     |
| 72 | Batman    | 1989      | 3           | 3        | 10       | 15    | 5,0     |
| 73 | Şırnak    |           | 1           | 1        | 2        | 4     | 1,3     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 1           | 1        | 2        | 4     | 1,3     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1991      | 1           | 1        | 1        | 3     | 1,0     |
| 76 | Iğdır     |           | 1           | 1        | 1        | 3     | 1,0     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1994      | 1           | 1        | 1        | 3     | 1,0     |
| 78 | Karabük   |           | 1           | 1        | 1        | 3     | 1,0     |
| 79 | Kilis     |           | 1           | 1        | 1        | 3     | 1,0     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 1995      | 1           | 1        | 1        | 3     | 1,0     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1998      | 1           | 1        | 1        | 3     | 1,0     |

As can be seen from the table above, considering the contribution to the GNP, the highest average ranked value belongs to Kırıkkale. On the other hand, the distribution of the values is not homogenous. In fact, there are 10 provinces having 1 point out of 10.

#### 5.4.2.4.2. The Development Level of the Industry

The data on the development level of the industry presented in this section are gathered from TUIK. The collected information covers the statistics of the number of establishments, average number of labourers, average number of paid workers, value added and the total income.

The statistical unit of the manufacturing sector is the establishment of both public and private. In this context, according to the definitions stated by TUIK, the average number of labourers is obtained by adding the number of working owners and partners and unpaid family workers, active in November in the establishment, to the annual average number of the employees for individual proprietorship, simple partnership, general partnership and limited partnership. Otherwise, annual average number of paid workers and annual average number of labourers are equal. As for the average number of paid workers, it is the arithmetic average of the number of employees in February, May, August and November.

**Table 21. The Value Added and their Ranked Values**

|    | Data Year | Price (YTL) | Dollar Exchange |       | Central Bank  |       | Arithmetic Average |       |
|----|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-------|---------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
|    |           |             | Price (YTL)     | Value | Price (YTL)   | Value | Price (YTL)        | Value |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 5.538       | 5.841.772       | 1     | 12.294.004    | 1     | 9.067.888          | 1     |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 70 | Karaman   | 50.408      | 53.172.996      | 1     | 11.902.518    | 1     | 32.537.757         | 1     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 908.807     | 958.657.173     | 10    | 2.017.493.088 | 10    | 1.488.075.130      | 10    |
| 72 | Batman    | 107.832     | 75.600.135      | 1     | 145.715.649   | 1     | 110.657.892        | 1     |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 111.128     | 63.647.680      | 1     | 93.614.338    | 1     | 78.631.009         | 1     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 16.782.761  | 841.503.516     | 9     | 1.320.661.863 | 7     | 1.081.082.690      | 8     |
| 78 | Karabük   | 8.456.374   | 424.010.594     | 5     | 665.445.372   | 4     | 544.727.983        | 4     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 450.395     | 14.511.859      | 1     | 20.132.286    | 1     | 17.322.073         | 1     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 222.145     | 7.157.577       | 1     | 9.929.699     | 1     | 8.543.638          | 1     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 116.273.321 | 664.711.856     | 7     | 506.911.300   | 3     | 585.811.578        | 4     |

**Table 22. The Total Income and their Ranked Values**

|    |           | Data Year | Price (YTL) | Dollar Exchange |       | Central Bank  |       | Arithmetic Average |       |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-------|---------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
|    |           |           |             | Price (YTL)     | Value | Price (YTL)   | Value | Price (YTL)        | Value |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1988      | 25.288      | 26.675.105      | 1     | 56.137.734    | 1     | 41.406.420         | 1     |
| 69 | Bayburt   |           | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 70 | Karaman   |           | 186.604     | 196.839.662     | 1     | 414.248.878   | 1     | 305.544.270        | 1     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale |           | 1.979.564   | 2.088.147.679   | 10    | 4.394.504.760 | 10    | 3.241.326.220      | 10    |
| 72 | Batman    | 1989      | 288.829     | 202.495.653     | 1     | 390.300.700   | 1     | 296.398.177        | 1     |
| 73 | Şırnak    |           | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 210.640     | 120.642.387     | 1     | 177.443.346   | 1     | 149.042.867        | 1     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1991      | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 76 | Iğdır     |           | 0           | 0               | 0     | 0             | 0     | 0                  | 0     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1994      | 34.266.744  | 1.718.166.967   | 9     | 2.696.503.989 | 7     | 2.207.335.478      | 7     |
| 78 | Karabük   |           | 32.590.492  | 1.634.118.106   | 8     | 2.800.671.801 | 7     | 2.217.394.953      | 7     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 1995      | 1.870.405   | 60.264.999      | 1     | 83.605.565    | 1     | 71.935.282         | 1     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  |           | 1.459.618   | 47.029.321      | 1     | 65.243.724    | 1     | 56.136.523         | 1     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1999      | 217.744.558 | 1.244.803.089   | 6     | 949.290.653   | 3     | 1.097.046.871      | 4     |

As for the minimization of differences between the prices of different years, the current prices are calculated by using the two ways: dollar exchange and inflation calculator tool. Then the finding results and their ranked values are compared with each other. As can be seen from the Table-21, and 22, the ranked values of the three provinces are different from the other 11 provinces. Yet, the differences are not great; therefore, it is decided to use the arithmetic averages of the prices obtained from the two methods, and then the comparison is made by evaluating their ranked values obtained from the arithmetic averages.

**Table 23. The Indicators of the Development Level of the Industry**

|    |           | Data Year | Number of Establishment | Average number of labourers | Average number of paid workers | Value added (YTL) (arithmetic average) | Total Income (YTL) (arithmetic average) |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
|    |           |           |                         |                             |                                |                                        |                                         |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1988      | 16                      | 517                         | 506                            | 9.067.888                              | 41.406.420                              |
| 69 | Bayburt   |           | 4                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0                                      | 0                                       |
| 70 | Karaman   |           | 18                      | 5354                        | 5344                           | 32.537.757                             | 305.544.270                             |
| 71 | Kırıkkale |           | 46                      | 21294                       | 21275                          | 1.488.075.130                          | 3.241.326.220                           |
| 72 | Batman    | 1989      | 4                       | 619                         | 619                            | 110.657.892                            | 296.398.177                             |
| 73 | Şırnak    |           | 0                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0                                      | 0                                       |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 26                      | 2596                        | 2592                           | 78.631.009                             | 149.042.867                             |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1991      | 0                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0                                      | 0                                       |
| 76 | Iğdır     |           | 0                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0                                      | 0                                       |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1994      | 22                      | 7392                        | 7391                           | 1.081.082.690                          | 2.207.335.478                           |
| 78 | Karabük   |           | 56                      | 14625                       | 14617                          | 544.727.983                            | 2.217.394.953                           |
| 79 | Kilis     | 1995      | 20                      | 637                         | 636                            | 17.322.073                             | 71.935.282                              |
| 80 | Osmaniye  |           | 18                      | 509                         | 509                            | 8.543.638                              | 56.136.523                              |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1999      | 128                     | 11538                       | 11509                          | 585.811.578                            | 1.097.046.871                           |

Source: Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK)

**Table 24. The Ranked Values of the Development Level of the Industry**

|    |           | Data Year | Number of Establishment | Average number of labourers | Average number of paid workers | Value added | Total Income | Total | Average |
|----|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|---------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 1988      | 1                       | 1                           | 1                              | 1           | 1            | 5     | 1,0     |
| 69 | Bayburt   |           | 1                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0           | 0            | 1     | 0,2     |
| 70 | Karaman   |           | 2                       | 4                           | 3                              | 1           | 1            | 11    | 2,2     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale |           | 4                       | 10                          | 10                             | 10          | 10           | 44    | 8,8     |
| 72 | Batman    | 1989      | 1                       | 1                           | 1                              | 1           | 1            | 5     | 1,0     |
| 73 | Şırnak    |           | 0                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0           | 0            | 0     | 0       |
| 74 | Bartın    | 1990      | 2                       | 2                           | 2                              | 1           | 1            | 8     | 1,6     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 1991      | 0                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0           | 0            | 0     | 0       |
| 76 | Iğdır     |           | 0                       | 0                           | 0                              | 0           | 0            | 0     | 0       |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1994      | 2                       | 4                           | 4                              | 8           | 7            | 25    | 5,0     |
| 78 | Karabük   |           | 5                       | 7                           | 7                              | 4           | 7            | 30    | 6,0     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 1995      | 2                       | 1                           | 1                              | 1           | 1            | 6     | 1,2     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  |           | 2                       | 1                           | 1                              | 1           | 1            | 6     | 1,2     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 1999      | 10                      | 6                           | 6                              | 4           | 4            | 30    | 6,0     |

According to the Table-23 and 24, Kırıkkale is the most developed sub-province; whereas, Şırnak, Ardahan and Iğdır are the least. Considering the development level of the industry, Kırıkkale was the most appropriate for being a province.

**Table 25. The Ranked Values of the Economic Conditions**

|    |           | Contribute to the GNP |         | Development Level of Industry |         | Total | Average |
|----|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|
|    |           | Total                 | Average | Total                         | Average |       |         |
| 68 | Aksaray   | 13                    | 4,3     | 5                             | 1,0     | 18    | 2,7     |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 4                     | 1,3     | 1                             | 0,2     | 5     | 0,8     |
| 70 | Karaman   | 17                    | 5,7     | 11                            | 2,2     | 28    | 3,9     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 24                    | 8,0     | 44                            | 8,8     | 68    | 8,4     |
| 72 | Batman    | 15                    | 5,0     | 5                             | 1,0     | 20    | 3,0     |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 4                     | 1,3     | 0                             | 0       | 4     | 0,7     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 4                     | 1,3     | 8                             | 1,6     | 12    | 1,5     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 3                     | 1,0     | 0                             | 0       | 3     | 0,5     |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 3                     | 1,0     | 0                             | 0       | 3     | 0,5     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 3                     | 1,0     | 25                            | 5,0     | 28    | 3,0     |
| 78 | Karabük   | 3                     | 1,0     | 30                            | 6,0     | 33    | 3,5     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 3                     | 1,0     | 6                             | 1,2     | 9     | 1,1     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 3                     | 1,0     | 6                             | 1,2     | 9     | 1,1     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 3                     | 1,0     | 30                            | 6,0     | 33    | 3,5     |

After the evaluation of the two sub-criteria: the contribution to the GNP and the development level of industry, the provinces can be compared with each other according to the economic conditions criterion. By using the average values of the two sub-criteria, the average scores of the mentioned criteria are found. As can be seen from the table

below, the highest score belongs to Kırıkkale; whereas the lowest to Ardahan and Iğdır. In other words, for being a province, the most appropriate sub-province is Kırıkkale considering only the economic conditions criteria.

#### 5.4.2.5. Lower Level Units

Here, what is meant is administrative units that exist in the province regardless of their field or local administration units characteristics. Thus, they are referred to lower level or subordinate units to express that they are located within the boundaries of province.

The data on subordinate units presented in this section are collected from the Ministry of Interior. The gathered information covers the current numbers of the subordinate units of provinces: sub-provinces, districts, villages and municipalities.

**Table 26. The Number of the Lower Level Units**

|    |           | Sub-provinces | Districts | Villages | Municipalities |
|----|-----------|---------------|-----------|----------|----------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 7             | 5         | 146      | 48             |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 3             | 1         | 169      | 9              |
| 70 | Karaman   | 6             | 6         | 158      | 16             |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 9             | 0         | 172      | 27             |
| 72 | Batman    | 6             | 7         | 261      | 12             |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 7             | 6         | 230      | 20             |
| 74 | Bartın    | 4             | 3         | 266      | 9              |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 6             | 5         | 239      | 9              |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 4             | 2         | 157      | 8              |
| 77 | Yalova    | 6             | 1         | 44       | 15             |
| 78 | Karabük   | 6             | 1         | 274      | 8              |
| 79 | Kilis     | 4             | 0         | 138      | 5              |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 7             | 3         | 157      | 16             |
| 81 | Düzce     | 8             | 1         | 303      | 11             |

Source: <http://www.illeridaresi.gov.tr/images/Turkiye-Mib.pdf>

It can be seen from the Table-27 that Aksaray, Kırıkkale and Düzce have the highest value for the subordinate units; whereas Bayburt and Kilis have the lowest. In other words, Aksaray, Kırıkkale and Düzce are proper for being a province considering the numbers of the subordinate units.

**Table 27. The Ranked Values of the Lower Level Units**

|    |           | Sub-provinces | Districts | Villages | Municipalities | Total | Average |
|----|-----------|---------------|-----------|----------|----------------|-------|---------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 7             | 7         | 4        | 10             | 21    | 7,0     |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 1             | 1         | 5        | 1              | 7     | 2,3     |
| 70 | Karaman   | 6             | 9         | 5        | 3              | 14    | 4,7     |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 10            | 0         | 5        | 6              | 21    | 7,0     |
| 72 | Batman    | 6             | 10        | 9        | 2              | 17    | 5,7     |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 7             | 9         | 8        | 4              | 19    | 6,3     |
| 74 | Bartın    | 2             | 4         | 9        | 1              | 12    | 4,0     |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 6             | 7         | 8        | 1              | 15    | 5,0     |
| 76 | Iğdır     | 2             | 2         | 5        | 1              | 8     | 2,7     |
| 77 | Yalova    | 6             | 1         | 1        | 3              | 10    | 3,3     |
| 78 | Karabük   | 6             | 1         | 9        | 1              | 16    | 5,3     |
| 79 | Kilis     | 2             | 0         | 4        | 1              | 7     | 2,3     |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 7             | 4         | 5        | 3              | 15    | 5,0     |
| 81 | Düzce     | 9             | 1         | 10       | 2              | 21    | 7,0     |

**5.4.2.6. Special Conditions**

The data on special conditions presented in this section are compiled from the Ministry of Interior and the State Planning Organization (DPT). The gathered information covers the classes of the sub-provinces and being a priority area for development.

**Table 28. The Number of the Priority Areas for Development and the Classes of the Sub-Provinces**

|    |           | Date of the Province Establishment | PAD date   | Priority areas for development (PAD) | The classes of the sub-provinces |
|----|-----------|------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 15.06.1989                         | 12.12.1984 | -                                    | 1                                |
| 69 | Bayburt   |                                    |            | +                                    | 3                                |
| 70 | Karaman   |                                    |            | -                                    | 2                                |
| 71 | Kırıkkale |                                    |            | -                                    | 1                                |
| 72 | Batman    | 16.05.1990                         |            | +                                    | 3                                |
| 73 | Şırnak    |                                    |            | +                                    | 6                                |
| 74 | Bartın    | 28.08.1991                         | 08.11.1990 | -                                    | 2                                |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 27.05.1992                         | 16.01.1992 | +                                    | 4                                |
| 76 | Iğdır     |                                    |            | +                                    | 4                                |
| 77 | Yalova    | 03.06.1995                         | 14.10.1995 | -                                    | 1                                |
| 78 | Karabük   |                                    |            | +                                    | 1                                |
| 79 | Kilis     |                                    |            | -                                    | 2                                |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 24.10.1996                         |            | -                                    | 1                                |
| 81 | Düzce     | 09.12.1999                         | 13.10.1998 | -                                    | 1                                |

Source: Ministry of Interior and State Planning Organization (DPT)

**Table 29. The Ranked Values of the Special Conditions**

|    |                  | The<br>classes of<br>the sub-<br>provinces | Priority<br>areas for<br>development | Total | Average     |
|----|------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|-------------|
| 68 | <b>Aksaray</b>   | 10                                         | 10                                   | 20    | <b>10,0</b> |
| 69 | <b>Bayburt</b>   | 6                                          | 0                                    | 6     | <b>3,0</b>  |
| 70 | <b>Karaman</b>   | 8                                          | 10                                   | 18    | <b>9,0</b>  |
| 71 | <b>Kırıkkale</b> | 10                                         | 10                                   | 20    | <b>10,0</b> |
| 72 | <b>Batman</b>    | 6                                          | 0                                    | 6     | <b>3,0</b>  |
| 73 | <b>Şırnak</b>    | 1                                          | 0                                    | 1     | <b>0,5</b>  |
| 74 | <b>Bartın</b>    | 8                                          | 10                                   | 18    | <b>9,0</b>  |
| 75 | <b>Ardahan</b>   | 4                                          | 0                                    | 4     | <b>2,0</b>  |
| 76 | <b>Iğdır</b>     | 4                                          | 0                                    | 4     | <b>2,0</b>  |
| 77 | <b>Yalova</b>    | 10                                         | 10                                   | 20    | <b>10,0</b> |
| 78 | <b>Karabük</b>   | 10                                         | 0                                    | 10    | <b>5,0</b>  |
| 79 | <b>Kilis</b>     | 8                                          | 10                                   | 18    | <b>9,0</b>  |
| 80 | <b>Osmaniye</b>  | 10                                         | 10                                   | 20    | <b>10,0</b> |
| 81 | <b>Düzce</b>     | 10                                         | 10                                   | 20    | <b>10,0</b> |

On the basis of this information, the ranking values are produced shown in the Table-29. Considering the special conditions, it can be seen from the table that Şırnak has the lowest value; whereas, Aksaray, Kırıkkale, Yalova, Osmaniye and Düzce have the highest values.

#### 5.4.3. Conclusion

Based on an overall assessment of the results described above, the comparison of the last 14 provinces according to the six categories are indicated in the Table-30.

By considering the grounds of the related laws for each province, it can be seen that there are few qualitative data (the detailed information is given in Appendix E): populations (for Aksaray, Kırıkkale, Yalova, Karabük, Kilis, Osmaniye), areas (for Aksaray, Yalova, Osmaniye), distances to their former province (Aksaray, Kırıkkale, Yalova, Osmaniye), the number of taxpayers (only for Osmaniye), the number of employees (only for Kırıkkale), the number of industrial foundations (only for Bartın). Apart from this, there are general statements, which are repeated in each law; such as being the center of its surroundings, intersecting with the important highways, being developed socially, economically and culturally, development level of tourism, deficiencies of public services. Among the qualitative data for each category, there is no standard like in the results of the comparative analysis according to established criteria.

The total average values of the provinces are changing from 1,9 to 6,7 out of 10 and the average value is 3,8 (Figure-3). According to the Table-30, the most appropriate sub-province for being a province is Kırıkkale with the total score 6,7 out of 10, but even Kırıkkale, with this highest value, is not the ideal one for being a province in the light of the proposed criteria.

**Table 30. The Pivot Table**

|    |           | Population | Geographical Structure | Infrastructure | Economic Conditions | Lower Level Units | Special Conditions | Total Average Values |
|----|-----------|------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 68 | Aksaray   | 2,3        | 5,2                    | 7,1            | 2,7                 | 7,0               | 10,0               | 5,7                  |
| 69 | Bayburt   | 2,0        | 2,9                    | 2,8            | 0,8                 | 2,0               | 3,0                | 2,2                  |
| 70 | Karaman   | 2,3        | 5,1                    | 3,8            | 3,9                 | 5,8               | 9,0                | 5,0                  |
| 71 | Kırıkkale | 7,7        | 3,4                    | 5,5            | 8,4                 | 5,3               | 10,0               | 6,7                  |
| 72 | Batman    | 2,7        | 1,8                    | 4,3            | 3,0                 | 6,8               | 3,0                | 3,6                  |
| 73 | Şırnak    | 0,3        | 1,9                    | 1,7            | 0,7                 | 7,0               | 0,5                | 2,0                  |
| 74 | Bartın    | 0,3        | 1,6                    | 4,1            | 1,5                 | 4,0               | 9,0                | 3,4                  |
| 75 | Ardahan   | 0,0        | 1,6                    | 2,3            | 0,5                 | 5,5               | 2,0                | 2,0                  |
| 76 | İğdır     | 1,7        | 3,9                    | 3,0            | 1,0                 | 2,5               | 2,0                | 2,3                  |
| 77 | Yalova    | 1,7        | 5,9                    | 2,6            | 8,0                 | 2,8               | 10,0               | 5,2                  |
| 78 | Karabük   | 0,7        | 5,1                    | 5,1            | 3,5                 | 4,3               | 5,0                | 3,9                  |
| 79 | Kilis     | 3,3        | 1,6                    | 4,1            | 1,1                 | 1,8               | 9,0                | 3,5                  |
| 80 | Osmaniye  | 2,3        | 2,6                    | 3,8            | 1,1                 | 4,8               | 10,0               | 4,1                  |
| 81 | Düzce     | 0,3        | 2,6                    | 6,2            | 4,0                 | 5,5               | 10,0               | 4,8                  |




**Figure 2. The Total Average Values of the 14 Provinces**

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **CONCLUSION**

The province divisions of Turkey, being the main field unit of the central administration, have continuously changed since the foundation of the Turkish Republic. Before the founding of the Republic, in the year 1920, there were fifteen provinces whose foundations were laid down by the Province Regulations (1864) by inspiration of the centralized French provincial administration, and fifty-three liva/sancak units transformed into province units. With the 1921 Constitution, these units were transformed into province units by abolishing the liva/sancak units. Accordingly, it can be said that most of the provinces is based on traditions and historical evolution of the country.

In this way, the country was divided into seventy-four provinces after the founding of the Turkish Republic. Until 1935, this number decreased to fifty-seven, but from that year on gradually increased to sixty-seven until 1957. Between the years 1957 and 1989, there were no changes in the number of province. After 1989, this number started to increase again until 1999. In this 10-year-period, fourteen new provinces were established.

On the other hand, there have been pressures from sub-provincial centers to become a province. For instance, there were more than one hundred demands from sub-provinces to become a center of province after 1959. Before the 1960 elections, more and more promises were made by the party leaders. After 1980s, these desires increased with the newly established provinces. It can be easily said that it is encouraged mostly by the central governments and/or the political parties.

The reasons of these pressures can be separated into two groups: economic factors and psychological factors. It is thought that if the status of the Provincial Local Administration was obtained, the people would make more use of the General Budget;

investments and the public services would increase and they would have a more developed level of life. Because, when the government establishes a sub-province and/or province, new service buildings will be constructed, many personnel will be appointed, and more resource will be transferred from the center. This situation will add value to the regions and will bring economic, commercial, industrial and social liveliness.

Similarly, with the improvement of industry, employment possibilities will improve, immigration will be prevented, the infrastructure problems will be minimized, new schools will be opened, and cultural level will increase by the foundation of a university; also the health problems will be minimized by the foundation of the new hospitals. All these will be realized by the appointment of a governor.

The province title is so easily given to the sub-provinces that sub-provinces see this as their automatic right, even react severely if they are made a sub-province of a newly established province. Thus, no objective criteria become meaningful in the eyes of the population of the region. Since there is no agreed upon objective criteria in the establishment of provinces, their reaction somewhat become justifiable, even natural. Besides, deputies are named by the province that they are elected from, not by the sub-provinces that they came from; this is also a great impetus for naming a province.

Moreover, it becomes a matter of prestige to go one level up in the grade of administration for the members of that society. Besides, through the provincial election precincts, people will be able to choose their own members of parliament and through the new municipalities, they will be able to attract the attention of the political system.

The demands to become a provincial center can be categorized as follows:

- The sub-provinces, which had been a provincial center but later they were transformed into a sub-province again, such as; Ergani (*Diyarbakır*), Kozan (*Adana*), Siverek (*Şanlıurfa*), Şebinkarahisar (*Giresun*), Silifke (*İçel*).
- The sub-provinces with a populations close to or greater than its provincial center, such as; Nazilli-105.665 (*Aydın*-133.757, Census of 2000), İskenderun-160.000 (*Hatay*-139.046, Census of 2000).
- Akşehir, Beyşehir, Ereğli as sub-provinces of Konya, feel that their identities are threatened in this such a large province center.

These demands have prevailed on the politicians since 1950s when Turkey had passed to the multiparty system. In practice, there were 162 legislative proposals<sup>10</sup> regarding forming province and/or sub-provinces given to the TBMM Internal Affairs Committee by members of parliament in the 21<sup>st</sup> Parliamentary Session (1999-2002). Out of 162 legislative proposals, 61 of them (more than one-third) were about establishing provinces related to 40 different sub-provinces. These were; *Adana-Kozan*; *Adıyaman-Kahta*; *Afyon-Dinar*; *Ağrı-Doğubayazıt*; *Amasya-Merzifon*; *Ankara-Bey pazarı*, *Şereflikoçhisar*, *Polatlı*; *Antalya-Alanya*, *Manavgat*; *Aydın-Nazilli*; *Balıkesir-Bandırma*, *Edremit*; *Bolu-Düzce*; *Bursa-İnegöl*; *Diyarbakır-Ergani*; *Giresun-Şebinkarahisar*; *Hatay-İskenderun*; *İçel-Anamur*, *Tarsus*; *İzmir-Ödemiş*; *Kahramanmaraş-Elbistan*; *Kırklareli-Lüleburgaz*; *Kocaeli-Gebze*; *Konya-Ereğli*; *Kayseri-Develi*; *Manisa-Akhisar*, *Salihli*; *Mardin-Midyat*; *Muğla-Fethiye*; *Muş-Malazgirt*; *Sivas-Suşehri*; *Şanlıurfa-Siverek*; *Tekirdağ-Çorlu*; *Tokat-Erbaa*, *Niksar*, *Turhal*, *Zile*; *Van-Erciş*; *Zonguldak-Ereğli*.

As for the present Parliamentary Session (22<sup>nd</sup> Parliamentary Session, 2002- ), there have been 39 legislative proposals waiting in the mentioned Committee. Out of these 39 legislative proposals, 15 (again more than one-third) were about establishing new provinces related to 14 different sub-provinces, namely; *Balıkesir-Bandırma*; *Diyarbakır-Ergani*; *Giresun-Şebinkarahisar*; *Hatay-İskenderun*; *İçel-Anamur*, *Tarsus*; *Kahramanmaraş-Elbistan*; *Karaman-Ermenek*; *Kocaeli-Gebze*; *Konya-Akşehir*, *Beyşehir*, *Ereğli*; *Muğla-Fethiye*; *Sivas-Suşehri*.

When examined closely from the table in Appendix F, each Member of Parliament has given a legislative proposal concerning their own electoral precinct for establishing a province and most probably, the sub-provinces stated in the legislative proposals, are the place of birth of the Members of Parliament. It has almost become a matter of faithfulness to make a province their hometown (memleket).

As a matter of fact, there are no difficulties to declare sub-provinces as provinces, only there should be an election whether it is a local or general in nature in making these decisions. Although, the number of legislative proposals regarding forming a province

---

<sup>10</sup> The detailed table can be seen in Appendix E.

has decreased in the last Parliamentary Session in comparison with the previous; it does not mean that this subject will not come to the agenda again. On the contrary, by considering the political circumstances, one can easily be made a province that the increase in the number of provinces will continue in the future, as before.

Because the results of the case study have shown that the establishment of 14 provinces were political in character, with two exceptions: Batman and Şırnak are made for security grounds, Düzce is made to accelerate the restructuring process after the earthquake (the detailed table is given in the Appendix E). The remaining is based on political considerations, especially Kilis and Osmaniye. As understood clearly from the TBMM Minutes, the legislative proposals regarding forming provinces of these two sub-provinces came to the agenda in the general assembly right before the local elections.

This situation is also examined and supported by comparing these 14 provinces with each other based on the objective criteria. According to the criteria that are used for the comparison purposes, the average of the 14 provinces amount is 3,8 out of 10. Among the 14, the range is quite wide from 1,97 to 6,71. The 6,71 is the average score of Kırıkkale being the highest, and with 1,97 Ardahan the lowest. This shows that in deciding to make a sub-province a province, the reasons or justifications fluctuate greatly and as it has been the case in the past, the difficulty in developing objective criteria still exists.

Unfortunately, the status of being a province has been used as a means of elections just because there are no concrete and objective criteria regarding the subject. In other words, the present criteria determined by the Constitution and the Law numbered 5442, are insufficient in number and content. However, there have been no attempts put into practice concerning determining the criteria for forming provincial administrative units.

On the other hand, this subject is not only a subject that has to be taken many technical factors into consideration, but also it is a complex subject in which traditions, habits, some interests and the feelings or the local people are blended. So, it cannot be retreated that transform the province into the sub-province again.

Moreover, establishing new provinces caused great imbalances among themselves, in population, area, and economic conditions. The cost of the newly formed province to the state is approximately 34 million USD Dollars (Sanal, 2000: 240). By considering these conditions, it is imperative that establishing a new province, and also a sub-province, should be based on objective criteria. Otherwise, if the number of provinces/ sub-provinces is continued to increase with the political considerations, instead of determining scientific criteria, as Geray (1993) said the sub-provinces will look like districts, the provinces will appear to be like sub-provinces. Thus, it will become necessary to form a new unit on top of them, and it will go on as a vicious circle.

For these reasons, in the thesis, the ambiguities, confusions and the subjectivity in the founding of province have been emphasized from different perspectives. Even if some objective criteria are to be developed/proposed, still there is the possibility of political manipulations. The authorities can use their initiatives; so, there will be no objectivity on forming a province and as a consequence the problems continue to occur in the administrative structure. To alleviate this deficiency and come up with more objective stable systematic approach in the development of criteria, the following proposal can be formulated:

1. First, some general agreed upon objective criteria will be set,
2. The data from the 81 provinces which reflect three agreed upon criteria will be collected,
3. These collected data will be averaged out to show the average of a calculation of the criteria to justify the establishment of a specific province. In other words, an average total value will be found to determine the establishment of a province, this will constitute Turkey's average for being a province.
4. Each criterion will be reflected in the calculation with *equal weights*,
5. The average value, thus, found will show the minimum value needed to make a sub-province a province.

In other words, a sub-province cannot be made a province, if and when its average calculated value with equal criteria weights is under the Turkey's average. Suppose we have five established criteria, and each criterion is ranked/calculated out of a value of 10. For each criterion, again we suppose, the respective values of five criteria, are 6, 5, 9, 7

and 8. The Turkey's average for this can be calculated as 7. so the value of 7 indicates the minimum total value of 7 indicates the minimum total value of the appropriate objective criteria to be used for the decision making; in making a sub-province a province. That is, no sub-province, whose average value is less than 7, could be made a province.

For example, a sub-province having the values on the five criteria are 7, 5, 4, 8,9, whose average in this case is 6,6. when we look at this average, since it is less than the Turkish average (that is 7), it cannot be declared a province. In all these calculations, each criterion is considered having an equal weight.

There is a possibility that with a political consideration that the equal weight given to the criteria may be manipulated, so that the weight of the highest valued criteria for a sub-province may be increased in order to reach, even pass the Turkey's total average value. If this is done, under these circumstances equal weight distribution in finding the Turkish average must not be used, and Turkish average calculation must be reconsidered to reflect this new differentiated value weight system as applied specifically to the sub-province under consideration.

The proposal, which is quite simple but very efficient in alleviating the political manipulations, depends not on the equal weighted minimum value of Turkey when calculating the average value of a sub-province but determined on the basis of differentiated weights understanding for the Turkish general average. In this way, the demands of both the local people and the politics are considered simultoneuosly. It determines a compromise solution that could be accepted by the decision makers because it provides a maximum group utility for the 'majority', and a minimum of individual regret for the 'opponent'.

## REFERENCES

- ALDAN, M. (1990) "*İller ve İlçeler Kurulurken*", İdarecinin Sesi Dergisi, 4 (1): 45-53.
- AR, F. (1990) *İllerin Kuruluş ve Fonksiyonlarının Yeniden Düzenlenmesi*, KAYA Araştırma Projesi Taşra ve Yurtdışı Kuruluşlar Araştırma Grubu Raporu, Ankara: TODAİE Yayını.
- ARIK, B. (1999) "*Türkiye'de İl Olma, İl Yapılma İstek ve Kararlarının Siyasal, Sosyal ve İdari Boyutu: Düzce Örneği*", Master Theses, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- BEHLÜLGİL, M. (1992) *İmparatorluk ve Cumhuriyet Döneminde İllerimiz*, İstanbul.
- DEMİR, A. (1993) "*Türkiye'de 1983-92 Yılları Arasında Yeni İlçelerin Kurulmasının Gerekçeleri ve Bu Deneyimin Değerlendirilmesi*", Master Theses, Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- DPT (1963), *Birinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*, Ankara: Başbakanlık Devlet Matbaası.
- DPT (1973), *Üçüncü Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*, Yayın No: 1272, Ankara.
- DPT (1979), *Dördüncü Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*, Yayın No: 1664, Ankara.
- DPT (1985), *Beşinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*, Yayın No: 1974, Ankara, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/plan5.pdf>
- DPT (1989), *Altıncı Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*, Yayın No: 2174, Ankara, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/plan6.pdf>

- DPT (1994), *Yedinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı: Kamu Yönetiminin İyileştirilmesi Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu*, Yayın No: 2362, Ankara.
- DPT (1996), *Yedinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*, Ankara, <http://ekutup.dpt.gov.tr/plan/vii/>
- DPT (2000), *Sekizinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı Kamu Yönetiminin İyileştirilmesi ve Yeniden Yapılandırılması Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu*, Ankara.
- Düstur, II. Tertib, 608-625 in SARAÇOĞLU, M. S. () *Sitting Together: Local Councils of the County of Vidin as Domains of Hybridization (1864-1877)*, USA: The Ohio Eyalet University, [http://www.cas.bg/obj/downloads/3\\_7/Mehmet%20Safa%20Saracoglu%20project%20results\\_ed%201.doc](http://www.cas.bg/obj/downloads/3_7/Mehmet%20Safa%20Saracoglu%20project%20results_ed%201.doc)
- GERAY, C. (1993) "KAYA Yazanağı Açısından Yönetimin Taşra Birimlerinin ve Yerel Yönetimlerin Yeniden Düzenlenmesi", *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 2 (1): 9-17.
- GÖZLER, K. (1999) *Türk Anayasaları*, Bursa: Ekin Kitabevi Yayınları.
- GÜNEY, B. (1976) "Toplum Kalkınması, Vali ve Kaymakamlar", *Türk İdare Dergisi*, (323): 83-93.
- İçişleri Bakanlığı (1972), *İl Genel Yönetimi: İç Düzen Genel Rapor*, Ankara: İçişleri Bakanlığı İç Düzen Yayınları, Yayın No:8.
- İçişleri Komisyonu (22.10.1996) *İl, İlçe, Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kurulmasında Uygulanacak Kısıtları Saptama Alt Raporu*, Rapor No:1, Karar No:1, Ankara.
- İNALCIK, H. (1962) "Sened-i İttifak ve Halt-ı Hümayunu", *Belleten*, C.28, No:112, p.603 aktaran: KAYA KILIÇ, S. (1995) "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye'de İl Yönetimi", PhD Thesis, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tarih Anabilim Dalı.
- KALABALIK, H. (1999) "Türkiye'de Alan (Taşra) Yönetimi; İçinde Bulunduğu Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri", *Türk İdare Dergisi*, 425, 61-103.

- KAYMAK, C.; AKPINAR, R.; KINDAP, A. (2003) “İller ve Bölgeler İtibarıyla GSYH’deki Gelişmeler (1987-2000)”, TC. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, Ankara.
- KILAVUZ, R. (1998) “İdari Reform Olgusu ve Türkiye’de İdari Reform Çalışmaları”, Türk İdare Dergisi, (420): 163-184.
- KILIÇ, S. K. (1995) “Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye’de İl Yönetimi”, PhD Theses, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tarih Anabilim Dalı.
- ORTAYLI, İ. (1979) *Türk İdare Tarihi*, Ankara: TODAİE Yayını, No:180.
- ORTAYLI, İ. (2000) *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareleri (1840-1880)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- PAYASLIOĞLU, A. (1996) *Merkezi idarenin Taşra Teşkilatı Üzerinde Bir inceleme*, TODAİE ve DPT Ortak Yayını, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- SANAL, R. (2000) *Türkiye’de İllerin Yeniden Düzenlenmesi*, Ankara: T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı-Araştırma, Planlama ve Koordinasyon Kurulu Başkanlığı.
- TODAİE (1972), İdari Reform Danışma Kurulu Raporu, *İdarenin Yeniden Düzenlenmesi: İlkeler ve Öneriler*, İçişleri Bakanlığı Kütüphanesi Kayıt No: 0.1177, Ankara.
- <http://www.anayasa.gen.tr/1921tek.htm>, 5 December 2005.
- <http://www.anayasa.gov.tr/eskisite/KARARLAR/IPTALITIRAZ/K1995/K1995-26.htm>, 24 March 2006
- <http://www.mgk.gov.tr/Turkce/basimbildiri1990/28mart1990.htm>, 15 August 2006
- <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/hukumetler.htm>, 14 August 2006
- <http://www.todaie.gov.tr/pdf/MEHTAP.PDF>, 3 February 2006
- <http://www.todaie.gov.tr/pdf/KAYA.PDF>, 3 February 2006

- [http://birimweb.icisleri.gov.tr/teftis/mevzuat/01\\_kanun/k-3152-icisleri\\_bakanligi\\_tes\\_gor\\_hk.doc](http://birimweb.icisleri.gov.tr/teftis/mevzuat/01_kanun/k-3152-icisleri_bakanligi_tes_gor_hk.doc), 28 August 2006
- [http://www.igemekktc.org/istatistik\\_tur/temel2.pdf](http://www.igemekktc.org/istatistik_tur/temel2.pdf), 1 December 2006
- <http://www.illeridaresi.gov.tr/images/Turkiye-Mib.pdf>, 1 December 2006
- TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: K.K.Gn.Md. 07/101-2247/01958, 13.03.1989, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 1/549-12/14-2/84, S. Sayısı: 261, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:18, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:29.
- Aksaray Adıyla Bir İl ve Aksaray İlinde 10 İlçe Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Teklifi – 10.02.1988, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 1/549-12/14-2/84, S. Sayısı:261, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:18, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:29
- İçişleri Komisyonu Raporu, Esas No: 1/549-2/14-2/8, Karar No: 31, 21.04.1989, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 1/549-12/14-2/84, S. Sayısı:261, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:18, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:29.
- Kırıkkale İlçesinde Yeşilkırıkkale Adı ile Bir İl Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Teklifi, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 1/549-12/14-2/84, S. Sayısı:261, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:18, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:29, p.8(94)
- TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: K. K. Gn. Md. 07/101-32/02694, 13.04.1990, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 07/101-32/02694, S. Sayısı:420, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:18, Yasama Yılı:3, Cilt:45, p.1(99).
- TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: 07/101-205/05260, 23.08.1991, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 07/101-205/05260, S. Sayısı:582, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:18, Yasama Yılı:3, Cilt:62, p.1(87).
- TC. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Sayı: B.02.0.KKG/101-301/03417, 26.03.1992, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 1/374, 2/139, 2/143, S. Sayısı:102, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:19, Yasama Yılı:1, Cilt:12, p.1(111).

- Bir İl ve Bir İlçe Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Teklifi (2/139) – 14.04.1992, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 1/374, 2/139, 2/143, S. Sayısı:102, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:19, Yasama Yılı:1, Cilt:12, p.3(113).
- T.C. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşiv Dosyası, 1995, 550 sayılı KHK'nin Genel Gerekçe Raporu.
- DYP TBMM Grup Başkanlığı, No: 2/257, Adana Milletvekili Halit Dağlı ve 7 arkadaşının Teklifi (2/446), 01.10.1996, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 2/446, 457, 2/401, 2/439, 2/447; S. Sayısı:108, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:20, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:12, p.1(93).
- Bir İlçe ve Bir İl Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Teklifi (2/447), Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 2/446, 457, 2/401, 2/439, 2/447; S. Sayısı:108, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:20, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:12, p.27(119), genel gerekçe; Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonu Raporu, Esas No: 2/457, 2/446, 2/447, 2/439, 2/401, Karar No: 52, 21.10.1996, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 2/446, 457, 2/401, 2/439, 2/447; S. Sayısı:108, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:20, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:12, p.39(131).
- Adana İli Osmaniye İlçesinin İl Olması Hakkında Kanun Teklifi (2/401), Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 2/446, 457, 2/401, 2/439, 2/447; S. Sayısı:108, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:20, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:12, p.12(104), genel gerekçe.
- Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonu Raporu, Esas No: 2/457, 2/446, 2/447, 2/439, 2/401, Karar No: 52, 21.10.1996, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 2/446, 457, 2/401, 2/439, 2/447; S. Sayısı:108, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:20, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:12, p.39(131).
- Bir İl Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Teklifi (2/439), Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 2/446, 457, 2/401, 2/439, 2/447; S. Sayısı:108, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:20, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:12, p.24(116), genel gerekçe; Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonu Raporu, Esas No: 2/457, 2/446, 2/447, 2/439, 2/401, Karar No: 52, 21.10.1996, Kanun Teklifi ile İçişleri ve Plan ve Bütçe Komisyonları Raporları, 2/446, 457, 2/401, 2/439, 2/447; S. Sayısı:108, TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, Dönem:20, Yasama Yılı:2, Cilt:12, p.39(131).
- T.C. Başbakanlık Kanunlar ve Kararlar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşiv Dosyası, 1999, 584 sayılı KHK'nin Genel Gerekçe Raporu.

## **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A

**Table 31. The Evolution Process of the Field Units of Central Administration throughout the History**

|                                  |             | 1       | 2                    | 3           | 4              | 5           |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| <b>Ottoman Period</b>            | <b>1842</b> | Eyalet  | Sancak               | Kaza        |                |             |
|                                  | <b>1852</b> | Eyalet  | Sancak <sup>11</sup> | Kaza        |                |             |
|                                  | <b>1858</b> | Eyalet  | Liva (Sancak)        | Kaza        | Karye (Köy)    |             |
|                                  | <b>1864</b> | Vilayet | Sancak               | Kaza        | Karye (Köy)    |             |
|                                  | <b>1913</b> | Vilayet | Liva (Sancak)        | Kaza        | Nahiye         | Karye (Köy) |
| <b>Turkish Republican Period</b> | <b>1921</b> | Vilayet |                      | Kaza (İlçe) | Nahiye (Bucak) |             |
|                                  | <b>1924</b> | Vilayet |                      | Kaza (İlçe) | Nahiye (Bucak) | Kasaba-Köy  |
|                                  | <b>1949</b> | İl      |                      | İlçe        | Bucak          | Kasaba-Köy  |
|                                  | <b>1961</b> | İl      |                      |             |                |             |
|                                  | <b>1982</b> | İl      |                      |             |                |             |

<sup>11</sup> By the 1852 Firman, the autonomous sancak units were established.

## APPENDIX B

**Figure 3. The Provincial Division Map of the Ottoman Empire in 1913**



Source: KILIÇ, S. K. (1995) "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye'de İl Yönetimi", PhD Thesis, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tarih Anabilim Dalı.

## APPENDIX C

Figure 4. The Present Provincial Division of Turkey



Source: <http://www.adli-sicil.gov.tr/TH2.htm>

## APPENDIX D

**Table 32. The Process of the Province Divisions of Turkey**

| Year | Number of Province | Law No.   | Process                                                                                                                                      | Number of Sub-province | Number of District | Number of Village |
|------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1920 | 71                 |           | -                                                                                                                                            | -                      | -                  | -                 |
| 1924 | 74                 |           | Artvin , Kars, Ardahan were made provinces.                                                                                                  | -                      | -                  | -                 |
| 1926 | 63                 | 877       | Üsküdar , Beyoğlu, Çatalca, Gelibolu, Ardahan, Muş, Dersim, Genç, Siverek, Ergani ve Kozan were transformed into sub-provinces.              | 317                    | 661                | -                 |
| 1929 | 63                 |           | Bitlis was transformed into sub-province, and Muş was made a province.                                                                       | -                      | -                  | -                 |
| 1933 | 57                 | 2197      | Aksaray, Cebelibereket, Artvin, Şebinkarahisar, Hakkari were made sub-provinces. Mersin and Silifke were united and formed as İçel province. | 351                    | 699                | -                 |
| 1936 | 62                 | 2885      | Artvin , Hakkari, Bitlis, Bingöl, Tunceli were made provinces.                                                                               | 356                    | 809                | 34067             |
| 1939 | 63                 | 3711      | Hatay was made a province with the adherence to Turkey.                                                                                      | 364                    | 817                | -                 |
| 1953 | 63                 | 7001      | Uşak was made a province. Kırşehir was transformed into sub-province.                                                                        | 460                    | 940                | -                 |
| 1954 | 66                 | 6418-6419 | Adıyaman , Sakarya, Nevşehir were made provinces.                                                                                            | 460                    | 940                | -                 |
| 1957 | 67                 |           | Kırşehir was again made a province.                                                                                                          | 570                    | 930                | -                 |
| 1989 | 71                 | 3578      | Aksaray , Bayburt, Karaman, Kırıkkale were made provinces.                                                                                   | 696                    | 793                | 34996             |
| 1990 | 73                 | 3647      | Batman and Şırnak were made provinces.                                                                                                       | -                      | -                  | -                 |
| 1991 | 74                 | 3760      | Bartın was made a province.                                                                                                                  | 828                    | 699                | 35159             |
| 1992 | 76                 | 3806      | Ardahan and Iğdır were made provinces.                                                                                                       | 839                    | 697                | 35129             |
| 1995 | 79                 | KHK.550   | Yalova, Kilis, Karabük were made provinces.                                                                                                  | 847                    | 690                | 35325             |
| 1996 | 80                 | 4200      | Osmaniye was made a province.                                                                                                                | 849                    | 689                | 35426             |
| 1999 | 81                 | KHK.584   | Düzce was made a province.                                                                                                                   | 850                    | 688                | 35145             |

Source: <http://www.illeridaresi.gov.tr/modules.php?name=ybmulkidarebolumleri>

## APPENDIX E

**Table 33. The General and the Article Grounds of Forming the Last 14 Provinces stated in the Laws and Legislative Proposals<sup>12</sup>**

| Law No. and Date   | Name of Province | The criteria for forming a province stated in the Constitution and in the Law numbered 5442                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                    | Population                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Safety                                                                                                                                                        |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                    |                  | GEOGRAPHICAL SITUATION                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | ECONOMIC CONDITIONS                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | PUBLIC SERVICE REQUIREMENTS                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                               |
| 3578<br>15.06.1989 | Aksaray (68)     | Being the center of its surrounding sub-provinces.<br><br>Its area is 6.232 km <sup>2</sup><br><br>Distance to the provincial center is 109 km.<br><br>Intersecting with E-5 and important highways.<br><br>Being close to important port centers. | Being a magnet of the region<br><br>Being the center of the commercial, industrial and agricultural developments.<br><br>Being a first-degree-priority area for tourism<br><br>Being developed socially, economically and culturally    | For supplying more effective and more productive public service                                                                                                    | Showing an increase in population.<br><br>Central Population: 80.000<br>Total Population: 450.000.<br><br>In the year 2000 (DPT);<br>Central Population: 263.738<br>Sub-provincial Population: 1.000.000.<br><br>Being in a certain level in population density | -                                                                                                                                                             |
|                    | Bayburt (69)     | Being the center of its surroundings.                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Being a magnet of the region<br><br>It will achieve the social, economic and commercial development.<br><br>Being developed socially, economically and culturally                                                                       | -                                                                                                                                                                  | Being in a certain level in population density                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | -                                                                                                                                                             |
|                    | Karaman (70)     | Having a larger area of Konya province<br><br>Difficulties cause from its geographical structure<br><br>Being far from the provincial center of Ermenek subprovince                                                                                | Being a magnet of the region<br><br>It has an important history.<br><br>Being developed socially, economically and culturally                                                                                                           | Increasing costs and compensatory damages in supplying public<br><br>For supplying more effective and more productive public service                               | Being in a certain level in population density                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | -                                                                                                                                                             |
|                    | Kırıkkale (71)   | Being located on E-23 Highway<br><br>It will decrease the distance between the province and the sub-provinces, from 130-135km. to 50km.                                                                                                            | Being a magnet of the region<br><br>Being an important center of industry and commerce with having plants employed 10.000 employees, oil refinery, and related industries.<br><br>Being developed socially, economically and culturally | Being constrained of Ankara with its 24 sub-provinces, in supplying the public services                                                                            | 210.000 population<br><br>Central Population: 320.000<br>Sub-provincial Population: 374.000<br><br>Being in a certain level in population density                                                                                                               | -                                                                                                                                                             |
| 3647<br>16.05.1990 | Batman (72)      | Negative impacts of geographical and climate conditions.                                                                                                                                                                                           | Being the center of the region<br><br>Increase of investments in miscellaneous sectors.                                                                                                                                                 | Deficiency of public services<br><br>Insufficiency of the present administrative structure.<br><br>For supplying more effective and more productive public service | Population growth rate is %78,11 (1965-1985).                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | To maintain order.                                                                                                                                            |
|                    | Şırnak (73)      | Negative impacts of geographical and climate conditions.<br><br>Being the center of the region                                                                                                                                                     | Problematic both economically and socially.<br><br>Being an opportunity to develop.<br><br>For developing the region economically.                                                                                                      | Deficiency of public services<br><br>Weak relations between Hakkari province and Uludere and Beytüşşebap sub-provinces                                             | -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Being important for security reasons<br><br>Having problems at Iraq and Syria borders.<br><br>To increase the efficiency of the security forces in the region |

<sup>12</sup> The qualitative data of this subject are compiled from the ‘general ground’ sections and ‘article grounds’ sections of the related laws and legislative proposals regarding forming provinces.

*Table continued*

|                       |              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                      |   |
|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 3760<br>28.08.1991    | Bartın (74)  | Negative impacts of geographical structure and transportation<br><br>Being the center of the region                                                                                                                                                                        | Being a magnet of its surrounding sub-provinces<br><br>Being an important commercial and industrial center with its approximately 40 industrial foundations.<br><br>Developing tourism<br><br>It will develop economically if it is made a province.   | Insufficiency in responding public service for its region.<br><br>For supplying more effective and more productive public service                                                                         | -                                                                                                                                                                    | - |
| 3806<br>27.05.1992    | Ardahan (75) | Having no geographical wholeness<br><br>Negative geographical impacts of Kars province<br><br>Being located on Hopa-Ardahan-Gürcülük-Dilucu transit highway<br><br>Kars province covers a large area.<br><br>Some of the sub-provinces are far from the provincial center. | There are no sources of income except livestock.<br><br>Carrying on a border trade.<br><br>For provide the economic and social development in the region.<br><br>The reasons caused from economic structure.                                           | For supplying more effective and more productive public service.<br><br>Deficiency of public services.<br><br>Having an obligatory requirement for supplying the public services to the citizens directly | Having an immigration to the outside<br><br>Having a dense population in its province                                                                                | - |
|                       | Iğdır (76)   | Having no geographical wholeness<br><br>Being far from its province<br><br>Kars province covers a large area.<br><br>Some of the sub-provinces are far from the provincial center.                                                                                         | Being an economic center of its surrounding with developed agriculture.<br><br>The reasons caused from economic structure.                                                                                                                             | Deficiency of public services.<br><br>For supplying more effective and more productive public service.                                                                                                    | -                                                                                                                                                                    | - |
| KHK.550<br>03.06.1995 | Yalova (77)  | It has no territorial connection with its province.<br><br>The transportation is provided over Kocaeli and its length is 176 km. Yalova, whose area is 498 km <sup>2</sup> , is almost a bridge among Kocaeli-İstanbul-Bursa provinces.                                    | Being a tourism and agricultural center of its region.<br><br>It will develop economically if it is made a province.                                                                                                                                   | Deficiency of public services                                                                                                                                                                             | Central Population: 65.823.<br>Total Population: 113.417.<br>(1990 Population Census)<br><br>Upsurge in population.<br><br>Increase population especially in summer. | - |
|                       | Karabük (78) | Being a central place among Ankara-İstanbul-Middle and Eastern Black Sea regions<br><br>Its geographical location                                                                                                                                                          | If it is made a province, its growth level will increase with the present industrial foundations and new investments.<br><br>It differs from its province, Zonguldak, because of its economic structure.                                               | Deficiency of public services.<br><br>For supplying more effective and more productive public service.                                                                                                    | Central Population: 105.373 Total Population: 123.361.<br><br>Densely populated.                                                                                     | - |
|                       | Kilis (79)   | -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Increase in the number of the industrial foundations<br><br>If it is made a province, the investments will increase and unemployment will decrease.<br><br>It is not administrated any more at a sub-province status because of its economic activity. | Deficiency of public services.<br><br>For supplying more effective and more productive public service.                                                                                                    | Central Population: 82.882<br>Total Population: 121.752<br><br>Dense Central Population.<br><br>Migration to İstanbul.                                               | - |

*Table continued*

|                                             |                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>4200</b><br/><b>24.10.1996</b></p>    | <p><b>Osmaniye (80)</b></p> | <p>A candidate geographically for become a province.</p> <p>Distance between Osmaniye and Adana is 83km., Osmaniye and Antakya is 129km., Osmaniye and Kahramanmaraş is 108km., Osmaniye and Gaziantep is 127km.</p> <p>It cannot be administrated as a sub-province with its large area about 100.322 hectare</p> <p>Entity of Habur border gate.</p> <p>Being as a gate between Southeast and Mediterranean Regions</p> | <p>There are 7.359 taxpayers in Osmaniye.</p> <p>To accelerate the economic and social development</p> <p>Forming Osmaniye province is inevitable by considering the growth rate</p> | <p>For supplying more effective and more productive public service.</p>                                                                                                                | <p>Population is over 200.000.</p> <p>Its population is more than the other provinces, which are newly established.</p> <p>Increased population by migration.</p> | <p>To maintain order and discipline better.</p> <p>To prevent the forest fires</p> <p>To take safety measures for preventing the illegal entries from Syria border.</p> |
| <p><b>KHK.584</b><br/><b>03.12.1999</b></p> | <p><b>Düzce (81)</b></p>    | <p>-</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <p>To accelerate the economic and social development.</p>                                                                                                                            | <p>To supply the services onsite.</p> <p>To healing the wounds of the earthquake disaster, at short notice</p> <p>To accelerate the restructuring operations after the earthquake.</p> | <p>-</p>                                                                                                                                                          | <p>To maintain order and discipline better</p>                                                                                                                          |

## APPENDIX F

**Table 34. Legislative Proposals Regarding Forming Provinces and Sub-Provinces**

21<sup>st</sup> Parliamentary Session

|    | Name and Surname                          | Electoral Precinct | Province Name   | Sub-province Name               | Number and Date |            |
|----|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1  | Turhan ALÇELİK                            | Giresun            | Şebinkarahisar  | -                               | 2/13            | 17.06.1999 |
| 2  | Fikret UZUNHASAN                          | Muğla              | -               | Göktepe                         | 2/16            | 17.06.1999 |
| 3  | Fikret UZUNHASAN                          | Muğla              | Fethiye         | Kemer<br>Eşen<br>Seki<br>Göcek  | 2/17            | 17.06.1999 |
| 4  | M. Ejder ARVAS                            | Van                | Erciş           | Çelebidağ                       | 2/19            | 17.06.1999 |
| 5  | Ahmet Nuri AYDIN                          | Siirt              | -               | Veysel Karani                   | 2/20            | 17.06.1999 |
| 6  | İsmail ÖZGÜN and his four friends         | Balıkesir          | -               | Sarıköy                         | 2/29            | 17.06.1999 |
| 7  | İlyas YILMAZYILDIZ                        | Balıkesir          | Bandırma        | Sarıköy<br>Edincik              | 2/35            | 17.06.1999 |
| 8  | Suat PAMUKÇU and his 15 friends           | Bayburt            | -               | Akşar                           | 2/36            | 17.06.1999 |
| 9  | Avni AKYOL                                | Bolu               | Düzce           | Kaynaşlı                        | 2/46            | 17.06.1999 |
| 10 | Salih KAPUSUZ and Abdullah GÜL            | Kayseri            | -               | Yemliha                         | 2/51            | 17.06.1999 |
| 11 | Salih KAPUSUZ and Abdullah GÜL            | Kayseri            | Develi          | -                               | 2/52            | 17.06.1999 |
| 12 | Mustafa Güven KARAHAN                     | Balıkesir          | -               | Edincik                         | 2/60            | 21.06.1999 |
| 13 | Mustafa Güven KARAHAN                     | Balıkesir          | Edremit         | -                               | 2/61            | 21.06.1999 |
| 14 | Mustafa Güven KARAHAN                     | Balıkesir          | -               | Altınoluk                       | 2/62            | 21.06.1999 |
| 15 | Mustafa Güven KARAHAN                     | Balıkesir          | -               | Altınova                        | 2/63            | 21.06.1999 |
| 16 | Yücel SEÇKİNER                            | Ankara             | Polatlı         | Temelli<br>Yeni Mehmetli        | 2/70            | 21.06.1999 |
| 17 | Yücel SEÇKİNER                            | Ankara             | -               | Afşar                           | 2/71            | 21.06.1999 |
| 18 | Yücel SEÇKİNER                            | Ankara             | Şereflikoçhisar | -                               | 2/74            | 21.06.1999 |
| 19 | Mustafa Güven KARAHAN                     | Balıkesir          | Bandırma        | -                               | 2/77            | 22.06.1999 |
| 20 | Mustafa Güven KARAHAN                     | Balıkesir          | -               | Sarıköy                         | 2/78            | 22.06.1999 |
| 21 | Mehmet Zeki OKUDAN and his eight friends  | Antalya            | -               | Konyaaltı<br>Muratpaşa<br>Kepez | 2/93            | 01.07.1999 |
| 22 | Osman YUMAKOĞULLARI and his eight friends | İstanbul           | -               | Esenyurt                        | 2/96            | 01.07.1999 |
| 23 | Hüseyin ARI and his eight friends         | Konya              | Ereğli          | -                               | 2/97            | 01.07.1999 |
| 24 | Lütfü ESENGÜN and his 15 friends          | Erzurum            | -               | Akşar                           | 2/98            | 01.07.1999 |

*Table continued*

|    | Name and Surname                         | Electoral Precinct | Province Name   | Sub-province Name                                                   | Number and Date |            |
|----|------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 25 | Ali DOĞAN                                | Kahramanmaraş      | -               | Dumlupınar<br>Aslanbey<br>Dulkadiroğlu                              | 2/101           | 01.07.1999 |
| 26 | Saffet Arıkan BEDÜK                      | Ankara             | Polatlı         | -                                                                   | 2/111           | 01.07.1999 |
| 27 | Saffet Arıkan BEDÜK                      | Ankara             | Şereflikoçhisar | -                                                                   | 2/114           | 06.07.1999 |
| 28 | Saffet Arıkan BEDÜK                      | Ankara             | -               | Temelli                                                             | 2/117           | 06.07.1999 |
| 29 | İsmail ÖZGÜN                             | Balıkesir          | -               | Altınova                                                            | 2/125           | 06.07.1999 |
| 30 | Fırat DAYANIKLI                          | Tekirdağ           | Çorlu           | Ulaş                                                                | 2/130           | 08.07.1999 |
| 31 | T. Boray BAYCIK and<br>his three friends | Zonguldak          | Ereğli          | Kandilli<br>Ormanlı                                                 | 2/132           | 08.07.1999 |
| 32 | T. Boray BAYCIK and<br>his three friends | Zonguldak          | -               | Kilimli<br>Kozlu                                                    | 2/133           | 08.07.1999 |
| 33 | Cafer Turan<br>YAZICIOĞLU                | Bartın             | -               | Kozcağız<br>Arıt<br>Kumluca                                         | 2/136           | 08.07.1999 |
| 34 | Abdülkadir AKSU and<br>his four friends  | İstanbul           | Ergani          | -                                                                   | 2/145           | 08.07.1999 |
| 35 | Abdülkadir AKSU and<br>Osman ASLI        | İstanbul           | -               | Karacadağ                                                           | 2/146           | 08.07.1999 |
| 36 | Ali Şevki EREK and<br>his 24 friends     | Tokat              | -               | Çamlıbel<br>Bereketli<br>Yazıcık<br>Bozcalı<br>Karakaya             | 2/147           | 08.07.1999 |
| 37 | Nurhan TEKİNEL                           | Kastamonu          | -               | İlyasbey<br>İğdir                                                   | 2/151           | 09.07.1999 |
| 38 | Kemal ALBAYRAK                           | Kırıkkale          | -               | Çerikli                                                             | 2/153           | 09.07.1999 |
| 39 | Abdüllatif ŞENER and<br>his four friends | Sivas              | -               | Yavru                                                               | 2/166           | 12.07.1999 |
| 40 | Abdüllatif ŞENER and<br>his four friends | Sivas              | -               | Sızır                                                               | 2/168           | 12.07.1999 |
| 41 | Enis SÜLÜN                               | Tekirdağ           | Çorlu           | -                                                                   | 2/169           | 12.07.1999 |
| 42 | Necati YÖNDAR                            | Bingöl             | -               | Selvi                                                               | 2/172           | 13.07.1999 |
| 43 | Mehmet<br>GÖZLÜKAYA                      | Denizli            | -               | Nikfer<br>Kızılcaölük<br>Yeşilyuva<br>Kelekçi<br>Altınova<br>Kaklık | 2/180           | 14.07.1999 |
| 44 | Cengiz ALTINKAYA                         | Aydın              | -               | Bağarası                                                            | 2/182           | 14.07.1999 |
| 45 | Cengiz ALTINKAYA                         | Aydın              | Nazilli         | -                                                                   | 2/183           | 14.07.1999 |
| 46 | Cemil ÇİÇEK                              | Ankara             | -               | Batıkent                                                            | 2/197           | 27.07.1999 |
| 47 | Cemil ÇİÇEK                              | Ankara             | -               | Bahçelievler                                                        | 2/198           | 27.07.1999 |
| 48 | Nizamettin SEVGİLİ                       | Siirt              | -               | Kayabağlar                                                          | 2/200           | 27.07.1999 |
| 49 | Nizamettin SEVGİLİ                       | Siirt              | -               | Güzelbahçeli                                                        | 2/201           | 27.07.1999 |
| 50 | Nizamettin SEVGİLİ                       | Siirt              | -               | Ziyaret                                                             | 2/202           | 27.07.1999 |
| 51 | İsmail KÖSE                              | Erzurum            | -               | Sızır                                                               | 2/206           | 27.07.1999 |
| 52 | İsmail KÖSE                              | Erzurum            | -               | Esenyurt                                                            | 2/207           | 27.07.1999 |
| 53 | İsmail KÖSE                              | Erzurum            | -               | Dumlu                                                               | 2/208           | 27.07.1999 |
| 54 | İsmail KÖSE                              | Erzurum            | -               | Gökçedere                                                           | 2/211           | 27.07.1999 |
| 55 | İsmail KÖSE                              | Erzurum            | -               | Altunkent                                                           | 2/213           | 27.07.1999 |

*Table continued*

|    | Name and Surname                      | Electoral Precinct | Province Name | Sub-province Name                                                                                   | Number and Date |            |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 56 | İsmail KÖSE                           | Erzurum            | -             | Yağan                                                                                               | 2/215           | 27.07.1999 |
| 57 | İsmail KÖSE                           | Erzurum            | -             | Mercan                                                                                              | 2/218           | 27.07.1999 |
| 58 | Hacı FİLİZ                            | Kırıkkale          | -             | Çerikli                                                                                             | 2/239           | 29.07.1999 |
| 59 | Turhan İMAMOĞLU and his two friends   | Kocaeli            | Gebze         | Ağva<br>Darıca<br>Dilovası                                                                          | 2/241           | 30.07.1999 |
| 60 | Turhan İMAMOĞLU and his two friends   | Kocaeli            | -             | Derince                                                                                             | 2/242           | 30.07.1999 |
| 61 | Bülent ARINÇ                          | Manisa             | -             | Kavaklıdere                                                                                         | 2/243           | 30.07.1999 |
| 62 | Zafer GÜLER                           | İstanbul           | -             | Arnavutköy<br>Alibeyköy<br>Erengazi<br>Esenyurt<br>Kemerburgaz<br>Sultanhanı<br>Güneşli<br>Gürpınar | 2/245           | 03.08.1999 |
| 63 | Mehmet GÖZLÜKAYA                      | Denizli            | -             | Karahisar                                                                                           | 2/249           | 03.08.1999 |
| 64 | Dengir Mir Mehmet FIRAT               | Adıyaman           | Kahta         | Akıncılar                                                                                           | 2/267           | 11.08.1999 |
| 65 | Hasan GÜLAY and his two friends       | Manisa             | Akhisar       | -                                                                                                   | 2/281           | 18.08.1999 |
| 66 | Oktay VURAL                           | İzmir              | -             | Karabağlar                                                                                          | 2/296           | 27.08.1999 |
| 67 | Burhan ORHAN                          | Bursa              | İnegöl        | Alanyurt<br>Tahtaköprü<br>Kurşunlu<br>Yenice<br>Cerrah                                              | 2/301*          | 01.10.1999 |
| 68 | Murat BAŞESGİOĞLU                     | Kastamonu          | -             | Kireli<br>İsmil<br>Yeniceoba                                                                        | 2/318           | 19.10.1999 |
| 69 | Osman PEPE                            | Kocaeli            | -             | Uzunçiftlik                                                                                         | 2/326           | 19.10.1999 |
| 70 | Osman PEPE                            | Kocaeli            | -             | Derince                                                                                             | 2/327           | 19.10.1999 |
| 71 | Osman YUMAUKOĞULLARI                  | İstanbul           | -             | Kemerburgaz                                                                                         | 2/331           | 26.10.1999 |
| 72 | Osman PEPE                            | Kocaeli            | -             | Darıca                                                                                              | 2/338           | 01.11.1999 |
| 73 | Hasan ÖZYER                           | Muğla              | Fethiye       | Kemer<br>Eşen<br>Seki<br>Göcek                                                                      | 2/346           | 12.11.1999 |
| 74 | Cemal ÖZBİLEN                         | Kırklareli         | Lüleburgaz    | Ahmetbey                                                                                            | 2/347           | 12.11.1999 |
| 75 | Rıfat SERDAROĞLU                      | İzmir              | -             | Bayraklı                                                                                            | 2/349           | 12.11.1999 |
| 76 | Ahmet SÜNNETÇİOĞLU and his 21 friends | Bursa              | İnegöl        | Alanyurt<br>Cerrah<br>Kurşunlu<br>Tahtaköprü<br>Yenice                                              | 2/357*          | 18.11.1999 |
| 77 | Yıldırım ULUPINAR                     | İzmir              | -             | Karabağlar                                                                                          | 2/363           | 25.11.1999 |
| 78 | Suat PAMUKÇU and his 30 friends       | Bayburt            | -             | Konursu                                                                                             | 2/389           | 13.12.1999 |

*Table continued*

|     | Name and Surname                               | Electoral Precinct | Province Name | Sub-province Name                             | Number and Date |            |
|-----|------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 79  | Mehmet CEYLAN                                  | Sivas              | -             | Sızır                                         | 2/390           | 14.12.1999 |
| 80  | M. Hadi DİLEKÇİ and Mehmet SERDAROĞLU          | Kastamonu          | -             | Germeç                                        | 2/398           | 21.12.1999 |
| 81  | Avni DOĞAN and his 41 friends                  | Kahramanmaraş      | Elbistan      | Tanır Çardak Arıtış                           | 2/428*          | 24.01.2000 |
| 82  | Ahmet KARAVAR                                  | Şanlıurfa          | Siverek       | -                                             | 2/459           | 22.02.2000 |
| 83  | Mustafa GEÇER and his twenty friends           | Hatay              | -             | Payas                                         | 2/461           | 22.02.2000 |
| 84  | M. Ali BİLİCİ, Musa ÖZTÜRK                     | Adana              | -             | İncirlik                                      | 2/475           | 07.03.2000 |
| 85  | Hacı FİLİZ                                     | Kırıkkale          | -             | Esenli                                        | 2/494           | 29.03.2000 |
| 86  | M. Halit DAĞLI, Musa ÖZTÜRK, Ali HALAMAN       | Adana              | Kozan         | -                                             | 2/495*          | 29.03.2000 |
| 87  | Suat PAMUKÇU                                   | Bayburt            | -             | Gökçedere                                     | 2/510           | 14.04.2000 |
| 88  | Cengiz ALTINKAYA                               | Aydın              | -             | Ortaklar                                      | 2/511           | 14.04.2000 |
| 89  | Cemil ÇİÇEK                                    | Ankara             | -             | Pursaklar                                     | 2/532           | 22.05.2000 |
| 90  | M. İstemihan TALAY and his 11 friends          | Mersin             | Tarsus        | Yenice Gülek Huzurkent                        | 2/545*          | 16.06.2000 |
| 91  | Güler ASLAN and six friends                    | İzmir              | -             | Karabağlar                                    | 2/554           | 16.06.2000 |
| 92  | Veysi ŞAHİN and his three friends              | Mardin             | Midyat        | Kayapınar Şenköy                              | 2/560           | 22.06.2000 |
| 93  | Sebğatullah SEYDAOĞLU                          | Diyarbakır         | -             | Yenişehir Bağlar Sur                          | 2/577           | 04.10.2000 |
| 94  | Hidayet KILINÇ and his five friends            | Mersin             | Anamur        | Kazancı Anıtlı                                | 2/578*          | 04.10.2000 |
| 95  | Yaşar ERYILMAZ                                 | Ağrı               | -             | Gürbulak Değensu                              | 2/583           | 04.10.2000 |
| 96  | H. Hüseyin BALAK, Lütfi CEYLAN and Reşat DOĞRU | Tokat              | Zile          | -                                             | 2/594           | 18.10.2000 |
| 97  | H. Hüseyin BALAK, Lütfi CEYLAN and Reşat DOĞRU | Tokat              | Erbaa         | -                                             | 2/595           | 18.10.2000 |
| 98  | H. Hüseyin BALAK, Lütfi CEYLAN and Reşat DOĞRU | Tokat              | Turhal        | -                                             | 2/596           | 18.10.2000 |
| 99  | H. Hüseyin BALAK, Lütfi CEYLAN and Reşat DOĞRU | Tokat              | Niksar        | -                                             | 2/597           | 18.10.2000 |
| 100 | Mehmet KAYA and his 12 friends                 | Kahramanmaraş      | Elbistan      | Tanır Arıtış Çoğulhan Büyükyapalak Büyüktatlı | 2/608*          | 10.11.2000 |
| 101 | Mehmet ÇAKAR                                   | Samsun             | -             | Anbartepe                                     | 2/616           | 22.11.2000 |

*Table continued*

|     | Name and Surname                                          | Electoral Precinct | Province Name   | Sub-province Name                           | Number and Date |            |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 102 | Ataullah HAMİDİ                                           | Batman             | -               | Kayalar                                     | 2/619           | 27.11.2000 |
| 103 | Cengiz AYDOĞAN                                            | Antalya            | Manavgat        | Side Taşağıl                                | 2/654           | 11.01.2001 |
| 104 | M. Zeki ÇELİK                                             | Ankara             | Polatlı         | -                                           | 2/660           | 12.01.2001 |
| 105 | M. Zeki ÇELİK                                             | Ankara             | Şereflikoçhisar | -                                           | 2/662           | 18.01.2001 |
| 106 | Cezmi POLAT                                               | Erzurum            | -               | Dadaşkent Yakutiye Kazımkarabekir Yenişehir | 2/674           | 02.02.2001 |
| 107 | Sabahattin YILDIZ and his 13 friends                      | Muş                | Malazgirt       | Aktuzla                                     | 2/697           | 02.03.2001 |
| 108 | Cengiz AYDOĞAN                                            | Antalya            | Alanya          | Demirtaş Mahmutlar İncekum                  | 2/698           | 02.03.2001 |
| 109 | M. Zeki ÇELİK                                             | Ankara             | Beypazarı       | -                                           | 2/716           | 29.03.2001 |
| 110 | Reşat DOĞRU                                               | Tokat              | -               | Gökal                                       | 2/721           | 02.04.2001 |
| 111 | Aydın TÜMEN                                               | Ankara             | Polatlı         | -                                           | 2/731           | 13.04.2001 |
| 112 | Mehmet ARSLAN                                             | Ankara             | Şereflikoçhisar | -                                           | 2/732           | 13.04.2001 |
| 113 | Mehmet ARSLAN                                             | Ankara             | -               | Batıkent                                    | 2/734           | 16.04.2001 |
| 114 | Mehmet ARSLAN                                             | Ankara             | -               | Pursaklar                                   | 2/736           | 16.04.2001 |
| 115 | Ali Kemal BAŞARAN, Ali Naci TUNCER                        | Trabzon            | -               | Çağlayan                                    | 2/749           | 02.05.2001 |
| 116 | Mehmet GÖZLÜKAYA                                          | Denizli            | -               | Uzunpınar                                   | 2/750           | 02.05.2001 |
| 117 | Mehmet CEYLAN                                             | Sivas              | Suşehri         | -                                           | 2/752           | 07.05.2001 |
| 118 | Bekir ONGUN                                               | Aydın              | -               | Eskigediz                                   | 2/754           | 07.05.2001 |
| 119 | Mehmet Nuri TARHAN, Mehmet ŞANDIR, Süleyman Turan ÇİRKİN  | Hatay              | -               | Payas                                       | 2/762           | 10.05.2001 |
| 120 | Mehmet Nuri TARHAN, Mehmet ŞANDIR, Süleyman Turan ÇİRKİN  | Hatay              | -               | Aktepe                                      | 2/763           | 10.05.2001 |
| 121 | Kürşat ESER                                               | Aksaray            | -               | Sultanhanı                                  | 2/768           | 24.05.2001 |
| 122 | Murat AKIN                                                | Aksaray            | -               | Sultanhanı                                  | 2/781           | 12.06.2001 |
| 123 | Yücel ERDENER                                             | İstanbul           | -               | Sarıgazi                                    | 2/785           | 21.06.2001 |
| 124 | İsmail AYDINLI and his eight friends                      | İstanbul           | Suşehri         | -                                           | 2/786           | 22.06.2001 |
| 125 | M. Ergül DAĞÇIOĞLU and his six friends                    | Tokat              | -               | Baydarlı                                    | 2/797           | 17.09.2001 |
| 126 | Saffet KAYA                                               | Ardahan            | -               | Kurtpala                                    | 2/833           | 15.11.2001 |
| 127 | Hasan Basri ÜSTÜNBAŞ, Sabahattin ÇAKMAKOĞLU, Hamdi BAKTİR | Kayseri            | -               | Gesi                                        | 2/834           | 15.11.2001 |

*Table continued*

|     | Name and Surname                                                | Electoral Precinct | Province Name  | Sub-province Name | Number and Date |            |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 128 | Hasan Basri ÜSTÜNBAŞ,<br>Sabahattin ÇAKMAKOĞLU,<br>Hamdi BAKTIR | Kayseri            | -              | Erkilet           | 2/835           | 15.11.2001 |
| 129 | Hasan Basri ÜSTÜNBAŞ,<br>Sabahattin ÇAKMAKOĞLU,<br>Hamdi BAKTIR | Kayseri            | -              | Dadaloğlu         | 2/836           | 15.11.2001 |
| 130 | Ali GÜNER and his<br>five friends                               | Iğdır              | -              | Halfeli           | 2/837           | 26.11.2001 |
| 131 | Yücel ERDENER                                                   | Ankara             | -              | Kurtköy           | 2/859           | 03.01.2002 |
| 132 | Evliya PARLAK                                                   | Hakkari            | -              | Bağışlı           | 2/862           | 08.01.2002 |
| 133 | Mükremin TAŞKIN                                                 | Nevşehir           | -              | Türkeli           | 2/865           | 16.01.2002 |
| 134 | Nesrin ÜNAL                                                     | Antalya            | -              | Gebiz             | 2/908           | 15.03.2002 |
| 135 | Sevgi ESEN                                                      | Kayseri            | -              | Argıncık          | 2/909           | 15.03.2002 |
| 136 | Sevgi ESEN                                                      | Kayseri            | -              | Belsin            | 2/913           | 15.03.2002 |
| 137 | Müjdat KAYAYERLİ                                                | Afyon              | -              | Tatarlı           | 2/945           | 19.04.2002 |
| 138 | Numan GÜLTEKİN                                                  | Balıkesir          | -              | Altınova          | 2/968           | 09.05.2002 |
| 139 | Numan GÜLTEKİN                                                  | Balıkesir          | -              | Altınoluk         | 2/969           | 09.05.2002 |
| 140 | Faruk DEMİR                                                     | Ardahan            | -              | Hç.Hasköy         | 2/987           | 11.06.2002 |
| 141 | Saffet KAYA                                                     | Ardahan            | -              | Aşışenlik         | 2/991           | 19.06.2002 |
| 142 | Saffet KAYA                                                     | Ardahan            | -              | Köprülü           | 2/993           | 20.06.2002 |
| 143 | Saffet KAYA                                                     | Ardahan            | -              | Ortakent          | 2/994           | 20.06.2002 |
| 144 | Saffet KAYA                                                     | Ardahan            | -              | Hoçuvan Hasköy    | 2/995           | 20.06.2002 |
| 145 | Mustafa YAMAN                                                   | Giresun            | Şebinkarahisar | -                 | 2/1022          | 02.08.2002 |
| 146 | Hasan AKGÜN and his<br>three friends                            | Giresun            | Şebinkarahisar | -                 | 2/1023          | 02.08.2002 |
| 147 | Yener YILDIRIM                                                  | Ordu               |                | Salman            | 2/1026          | 09.08.2002 |
| 148 | Nesrin ÜNAL                                                     | Antalya            | Manavgat       | -                 | 2/1027          | 09.08.2002 |
| 149 | Nesrin ÜNAL                                                     | Antalya            | Alanya         | -                 | 2/1028          | 09.08.2002 |
| 150 | Müjdat KAYAYERLİ                                                | Afyon              | Dinar          | -                 | 2/1029          | 09.08.2002 |
| 151 | Mehmet BATUK                                                    | Kocaeli            | Gebze          | -                 | 2/1030          | 09.08.2002 |
| 152 | Ahmet İYİMAYA and<br>his three friends                          | Amasya             | Merzifon       | -                 | 2/1031          | 09.08.2002 |
| 153 | Mustafa GEÇER and<br>his 12 friends                             | Hatay              | İskenderun     | -                 | 2/1032          | 09.08.2002 |
| 154 | Mehmet ÖZCAN                                                    | İzmir              | Ödemiş         | -                 | 2/1033          | 09.08.2002 |
| 155 | Kemal ALBAYRAK                                                  | Kırıkkale          | -              | Çerikli           | 2/1034          | 09.08.2002 |
| 156 | Erkan KEMALOĞLU                                                 | Muş                | Malazgirt      | -                 | 2/1035          | 13.08.2002 |
| 157 | Cemal ENGİNYURT<br>and his three friends                        | Ordu               | -              | Akpınar           | 2/1036          | 13.08.2002 |
| 158 | Eyüp Cenap GÜLPINAR                                             | Şanlıurfa          | Siverek        | -                 | 2/1037          | 13.08.2002 |
| 159 | Kemal KÖSE                                                      | Kocaeli            | Gebze          | -                 | 2/1038          | 13.08.2002 |
| 160 | Yaşar ERYILMAZ                                                  | Ağrı               | Doğubeyazıt    | -                 | 2/1039          | 13.08.2002 |
| 161 | Ekrem PAKDEMİRLİ                                                | Manisa             | Salihli        | -                 | 2/1040          | 01.10.2002 |
| 162 | Aydın GÖKMEN                                                    | Balıkesir          | Bandırma       | -                 | 2/1042          | 01.10.2002 |

Source: <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/arsiv.htm>

## 22<sup>nd</sup> Parliamentary Session

|    | Number and Date                                                                                                                              | Electoral Precinct | Province Name | Sub-province Name                                                  | Number and Date |            |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1  | Osman ASLAN and his three friends                                                                                                            | Diyarbakır         | Ergani        | -                                                                  | 2/7             | 16.12.2002 |
| 2  | Muhsin KOÇYİĞİT, Mesut DEĞER                                                                                                                 | Diyarbakır         | Ergani        | Çermik<br>Çüngüç<br>Dicle<br>Maden<br>Eğil                         | 2/28            | 13.01.2003 |
| 3  | Ali AYDINOĞLU, İsmail ÖZGÜN                                                                                                                  | Balıkesir          | -             | Altınova                                                           | 2/31            | 13.01.2003 |
| 4  | Ahmet ERSİN                                                                                                                                  | İzmir              | -             | Uzundere                                                           | 2/46            | 17.01.2003 |
| 5  | Ahmet ERSİN                                                                                                                                  | İzmir              | -             | Yeşilyurt                                                          | 2/62            | 03.02.2003 |
| 6  | Ali Kemal DEVECİLER, Orhan SÜR                                                                                                               | Balıkesir          | -             | Altınova                                                           | 2/63            | 03.02.2003 |
| 7  | Ali Kemal DEVECİLER, Orhan SÜR                                                                                                               | Balıkesir          | -             | Altınoluk                                                          | 2/64            | 03.02.2003 |
| 8  | Vezir AKDEMİR                                                                                                                                | İzmir              | -             | Bayraklı                                                           | 2/77            | 19.02.2003 |
| 9  | Salih GÜN, İzzet ÇETİN, Sefa SİRMEN                                                                                                          | Kocaeli            | Gebze         | Ağva<br>Çayırova<br>Darıca<br>Dilovası<br>Mollafenari<br>Tavşancıl | 2/117           | 18.04.2003 |
| 10 | Sedat PEKEL<br>Orhan SÜR, Ali Kemal DEVECİLER, Ali Osman SALİ, Turhan ÇÖMEZ, İsmail ÖZGÜN, A. Edip UĞUR, Ali AYDINOĞLU and their 160 friends | Balıkesir          | Bandırma      | Sarıköy<br>Edincik                                                 | 2/194           | 12.11.2003 |
| 11 | Ensar ÖĞÜT                                                                                                                                   | Ardahan            | -             | Haçivan Hasköy                                                     | 2/198           | 12.11.2003 |
| 12 | Yücel ARTANTAŞ                                                                                                                               | Iğdır              | -             | Gaziler                                                            | 2/218           | 23.12.2003 |
| 13 | Esat CANAN                                                                                                                                   | Hakkari            | -             | Geçitli<br>Bağışlı<br>Dağlıca<br>Esendere<br>Derecik               | 2/220           | 29.12.2003 |
| 14 | Zafer HİDİROĞLU                                                                                                                              | Bursa              | -             | Akpınar                                                            | 2/223           | 29.12.2003 |
| 15 | Ahmet ERSİN                                                                                                                                  | İzmir              | -             | Ahmetbeyli                                                         | 2/226           | 05.01.2004 |
| 16 | Hasan ÖZYER, O. Seyfi TERZİBAŞIOĞLU                                                                                                          | Muğla              | Fethiye       | Kemer<br>Eşen<br>Seki<br>Göcek                                     | 2/246           | 26.01.2004 |
| 17 | Muharrem İNCE                                                                                                                                | Yalova             | Elbistan      | -                                                                  | 2/251           | 23.02.2004 |
| 18 | Muharrem İNCE                                                                                                                                | Yalova             | -             | Taşköprü                                                           | 2/254           | 26.02.2004 |

*Table continued*

|    | Number and Date                                                             | Electoral Precinct | Province Name  | Sub-province Name                  | Number and Date |            |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 19 | Abdulaziz YAZAR and his 53 friends                                          | Hatay              | İskenderun     | Denizciler Gözcüler Karaağaç Payas | 2/257           | 26.02.2004 |
| 20 | Dursun AKDEMİR                                                              | İğdır              | -              | Batıkent                           | 2/266           | 24.03.2004 |
| 21 | Dursun AKDEMİR                                                              | İğdır              | -              | Bahçelievler                       | 2/267           | 24.03.2004 |
| 22 | Harun AKIN, Nadir SARAÇ, (İstanbul) Kemal KILIÇDAROĞLU                      | Zonguldak          | -              | Kozlu Kilimli                      | 2/419           | 04.04.2005 |
| 23 | Ahmet ERSİN                                                                 | İzmir              | -              | Karabağlar                         | 2/491           | 27.05.2005 |
| 24 | Mustafa ÜNALDI, (Karaman) Yüksel ÇAVUŞOĞLU                                  | Konya              | Beyşehir       | -                                  | 2/588           | 20.10.2005 |
| 25 | Yüksel ÇAVUŞOĞLU                                                            | Karaman            | Ermenek        | -                                  | 2/595           | 21.10.2005 |
| 26 | Fikret BAADAZLI, Burhan KILIÇ, Osman AKMAN, Mevlüt ÇAVUŞOĞLU, Mehmet DÜLGER | Antalya            | -              | Kepez Muratpaşa Konyaaltı          | 2/599           | 21.01.2005 |
| 27 | Semiha ÖYÜŞ, Atilla KOÇ, Ahmet Rıza ACAR, Ahmet ERTÜRK                      | Aydın              | -              | Atça Bağarası Ortaklar Umurlu      | 2/651           | 26.12.2005 |
| 28 | Selami UZUN and his eight friends                                           | Sivas              | Suşehri        | -                                  | 2/659           | 03.01.2006 |
| 29 | Ömer İNAN and his 16 friends                                                | Mersin             | Tarsus         | Yenice Gülek Huzurkent             | 2/666           | 03.01.2006 |
| 30 | Harun AKIN and his two friends                                              | Zonguldak          | -              | Beycuma                            | 2/701           | 20.02.2006 |
| 31 | Hakkı AKALIN and his three friends                                          | İzmir              | -              | Çayyolu                            | 2/703           | 20.02.2006 |
| 32 | Hakkı AKALIN and his three friends                                          | İzmir              | -              | Batıkent                           | 2/704           | 20.02.2006 |
| 33 | Yılmaz ATEŞ and his 31 friends                                              | Ankara             | -              | Çayyolu                            | 2/741           | 03.04.2006 |
| 34 | Nurettin CANIKLI, Hasan AYDIN, Ali TEMUR, Adem TATLI                        | Giresun            | Şebinkarahisar | Yeşilbük                           | 2/745           | 03.04.2006 |
| 35 | Orhan ERDEM and his nine friends                                            | Konya              | Akşehir        | -                                  | 2/746           | 03.04.2006 |
| 36 | Abdullah ÇETİNKAYA and his seven friends                                    | Konya              | Ereğli         | -                                  | 2/747           | 03.04.2006 |
| 37 | Cemal Yılmaz DEMİR                                                          | Samsun             | -              | Canik Gazi İlkadım Atakum          | 2/748           | 03.04.2006 |
| 38 | Ali AYDINOĞLU                                                               | Balıkesir          | -              | Altınoluk                          | 2/777           | 10.05.2006 |
| 39 | Ersoy BULUT                                                                 | Mersin             | Anamur         | Kazancı                            | 2/817           | 13.06.2006 |

Source: [http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/komisyonlar\\_sd.calismalar?p\\_kom\\_kod=13&p\\_islem=1](http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/komisyonlar_sd.calismalar?p_kom_kod=13&p_islem=1)

## APPENDIX G

**Table 35. Information Procurement Application Form (for Real Individuals)**

|                                                                                                                                                  |  |                                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Başvuru sahibinin adı ve soyadı:</b>                                                                                                          |  |                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Oturma yeri veya iş adresi:</b>                                                                                                               |  |                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Kimlik No:</b><br>(Elektronik ortamda yapılacak başvurular için doldurulması zorunludur.)                                 |  | <b>Başvuruya hangi yolla cevap almak istersiniz?</b><br><br>Yazılı <input type="checkbox"/> Elektronik <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Elektronik posta adresi:</b><br>(Elektronik ortamda yapılacak başvurular için doldurulması zorunludur.)                                       |  |                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>İmzası:</b>                                                                                                                                   |  | 4982 sayılı Bilgi Edinme Hakkı Kanunu gereğince istediğim bilgi veya belgeler aşağıda belirtilmiştir.<br>Gereğini arz ederim.   |
| <b>İstenen bilgi veya belgeler:</b><br><br>(Not: Ayrılan bölümdeki boşluk yetmediği takdirde, başvuru için boş sayfa / sayfalar kullanılabilir.) |  |                                                                                                                                 |