

THE TRANSFORMATION OF TURKISH AGRICULTURAL POLICIES
BY THE EFFECTS OF REFORMS DRIVEN BY
INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DYNAMICS AFTER 1980

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

BY

İLKNUR DEDE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

SEPTEMBER 2022

Approval of the thesis:

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF TURKISH AGRICULTURAL POLICIES
BY THE EFFECTS OF REFORMS DRIVEN BY
INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DYNAMICS AFTER 1980**

submitted by **İLKNUR DEDE** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science and Public Administration**, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University by,

Prof. Dr. Sadettin KİRAZCI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. H. Tarık ŞENGÜL
Head of Department
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet OKYAYUZ
Supervisor
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Filiz ZABCI (Head of the Examining Committee)
Ankara University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet OKYAYUZ (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz HOŞGÖR
Middle East Technical University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kemal BAYIRBAĞ
Middle East Technical University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ozan ZENGİN
Ankara University
Department of Political Science and Public Administration



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: İlknur, DEDE

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE TRANSFORMATION OF TURKISH AGRICULTURAL POLICIES BY THE EFFECTS OF REFORMS DRIVEN BY INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DYNAMICS AFTER 1980

DEDE, İlknur

Ph.D., The Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet OKYAYUZ

September 2022, 225 pages

In this thesis building an integrated policy view on the peasant question and the necessities of the structural transformation of development, a multidimensional policy analysis is carried out on Turkish agricultural policies with special emphasis on the period after 1980. The peasant question is classified into two approaches in the literature as; “*disappearance*” and “*persistence*”. The disappearance approach declares that with the industrialization, globalization and commodification particularly by the introduction of the neoliberal policies, “modern capitalist agriculture” or “agribusiness” replaces the peasant mode of production called as “*depeasantization*” and this process is accompanied with “*deagrarianization*”. On the other hand, the persistence approach is defined in a different logic that the peasants are sustaining and reproducing themselves despite all obstacles. Based on these two approaches, the Development Plans are examined using the qualitative content analysis method. Moreover, the discourses used in the minutes of Grand National Assembly of Türkiye since 1960 are analyzed. Turkish agricultural policies have been changed in the direction of three dimensions; Turkish politics in particular the political power and opposition, the public policies and administration reforms and efforts to alignment

with the EU Common Agriculture Policy and structural funds. The reflections of the historical changes and reforms have had influences on policy actors and on peasants. In this context, the peasant question and agrarian transformation are the main questions through which continuities/discontinuities and integrations/bifurcations are tried to be clarified within the context of public policy, polity and politics dimensions.

Keywords: Policy Analysis, Politics, Peasant Question, Agrarian Transformation



ÖZ

TÜRK TARIM POLİTİKALARININ 1980 SONRASINDAKİ İÇ VE DIŞ DİNAMİKLERİN YÖNLENDİRDİĞİ REFORMLARIN ETKİSİYLE DÖNÜŞÜMÜ

DEDE, İlknur

Doktora, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Mehmet OKYAYUZ

Eylül 2022, 225 sayfa

Köylülük sorunsalı ve kalkınmanın gerekliliği olan yapısal dönüşümün kuralları üzerine bütüncül politika bakışı oluşturulan bu tezde, 1980 sonrası döneme özel önem verilerek Türk tarım politikaları üzerine çok boyutlu bir politika analizi yapılmıştır. Yapılan çalışmalarda köylülük sorunsalı “kaybolma” ve “direnme” olmak üzere iki yaklaşımla sınıflandırılmaktadır. Kaybolma yaklaşımı; sanayileşme, küreselleşme ve metalaşma yanında özellikle neoliberal politikaların devreye girmesiyle “modern kapitalist tarım” veya “tarımsal ticaretin” köylü üretim tarzının yerini aldığını ve bu sürecin “köylüsüzleştirme” olarak adlandırıldığını ayrıca “tarımdan uzaklaşmanın” da bu sürece eşlik ettiğini belirtmektedir. Öte yandan, direnme yaklaşımı ise köylülüğün tüm engellere rağmen sürebildiğini ve yeniden üretildiğini savunan farklı bir mantıkla tanımlanmaktadır. Bu yaklaşımlar temelinde, bu tezde, nitel içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılarak Kalkınma Planları incelenmekte ve 1960 yılından itibaren Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi tutanaklarında yer alan tarımla ilgili söylemler analiz edilmektedir. Türk tarım politikaları, üç ana çerçevede değişmiş olup, bunları; Türk siyaseti, özellikle siyasi iktidar ve muhalefet, kamu politikaları ve idari reformlar ve Avrupa Birliği’nin Ortak Tarım Politikası ile yapısal fonlara uyum çalışmaları şeklinde

sınıflandırmak mümkündür. Tarihsel deęişim ve reformların yansımaları, politika aktörleri ve köylüler üzerinde etkili olmuştur. Bu bağlamda, kamu politikası (policy), siyaset (politics) ve devlet/kurumsal çerçeve (polity) bağlamında süreklilikler/kopuşlar ve bütünleşmeler/çatallaşmaların açıklığa kavuşturulmaya çalışıldığı tezin ana sorunsalı köylülük ve tarımsal dönüşüm olarak ele alınmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Politika Analizi, Siyaset, Köylülük, Tarımsal Dönüşüm





To Nihil in my Soul...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to say first; this thesis is the output of my ten years in academic environment of Middle East Technical University (METU). I came back to METU after 20 years from my undergraduate in order to make Master of Science. It was hard for me to be a student after a long time passed.

First, I would like to say my sincere thanks and my deepest appreciation to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz for his undeniable support and huge understanding for me. His motivation and support contributed tremendously to the successful completion of this thesis. I also would like to thank to my thesis monitoring committee members; Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kemal Bayırbağ for their valuable contributions, criticism and constructive feedbacks from the beginning of writing this thesis. I would like to add my sincere thanks to two of persons who have significantly contributed to the finalization of my thesis, Prof. Dr. Filiz Zabcı and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ozan Zengin. This thesis would not have been possible without their exhaustive criticisms, constructive comments and valuable supports.

I should not forget the huge support and interest of my family during this process. I especially would like to thank my husband; Hüseyin, my son; Engin Samet and my brother; Bülent for their great supports. I should not forget my mother and my father. They have done so much for me. I also would like to express my sincere thanks to one who I can always rely on, my best friend; Elif Pınar Başarır, for her endless patience and support.

Last but not least, I would like to thank to everyone who helped and motivated me to complete this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MAIN CONCEPTS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	5
2.1. Policy Target-Peasant and Agrarian Approaches.....	6
2.2. The Features of Turkish Agriculture	13
2.3. Public Administration and Changing Role of State	19
2.4. Multidimensional Policy Analysis	24
2.5. Conclusion.....	38
3. RESEARCH METHOD.....	42
3.1. Qualitative Research	43
3.2. Qualitative Content Analysis	47
4. NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS- POLICY AND POLITY	54
4.1. Policy Choices before 1980.....	54
4.2. Swinging Policy Choices	70
4.3. Turning Points for Policy and Polity.....	79
4.4. New Anchors of Policy and Polity	85

5. POLITICS OF AGRICULTURE	91
5.1. Development Plans before 1980	91
5.2. Discourses in the Parliament before 1980.....	102
5.3. Politics and Populism.....	116
5.3.1. Disputes in the Parliament	119
5.4. Repression of Agricultural Politics	130
6. CHANGING POLICY-POLITY AND POLITICS WITH GLOBAL CRISES ..	143
6.1. Crises and Rising Concerns	143
6.2. Changes in the Parliamentary Discourses	152
6.3. Remarks on Triads of Policy Analysis and Future Prospects on Peasant Question	154
7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	164
REFERENCES.....	182
APPENDICES	
A. CURRICULUM VITAE	199
B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET	205
C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU.....	225

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Share of Sectors in GDP (%)	14
Table 2. Agricultural Employment in Total Employment	14
Table 3. Distribution of Agricultural Holdings According to Economic Size.....	15
Table 4. Distribution of Agricultural Holdings and Agricultural Land by Size	16
Table 5. Agricultural Cooperatives (2016)	18
Table 6. Identification of the Analytics for Dimension	41
Table 7. Methodology of Qualitative Content Analysis	48
Table 8. Analysis of Agricultural Policies	156

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Avrupa Birliđi
ACCs	Agricultural Credit Cooperatives
ACs	Agricultural Cooperatives
AK Party	Justice and Development Party- Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi
AKP	Justice and Development Party- Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi
AP	Justice Party-Adalet Partisi
ARIP	Agriculture Reform and Implementation Project
ASCUs	Agricultural Sales Cooperatives Unions
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CHP	Republican People Party- Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DAP	The Eastern Anatolia Project Master Plan
DOKAP	Eastern Black Sea Regional Development Plan
DP	Democratic Party- Demokrat Party
DPT	Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı
DIS	Direct income support
EC	European Communities
EEC	European Economic Community
EFTA	European Free Trade Associations
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GAP	Southeastern Anatolia Regional Development Project
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GNP	Gross National Product
HDP	Peoples' Democratic Party
Ha	Hectare

IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IMF	International Money Fund
IPARD	Instrument of Pre-Accession Assistance for Rural Development
ISI	Import Substitution Industrialization
KÖYDES	Village Based Infrastructure Support
MHP	National Movement Party, Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NPM	New Public Management
NUTS	Official Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics
NRDS	National Rural Development Strategy
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
R&D	Research and Development
SEEs	State Economic Enterprises
SPO	State Planning Organization
TBMM	Grand National Assembly of Türkiye
TMMOB	Union of Chambers of Architects and Engineers of Türkiye
TMO	Turkish Grain Board
TNCs	Transnational Corporations
TURKSTAT	Turkish Statistical Institute
QCA	Qualitative Content Analysis
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a multi-dimensional policy analysis on Turkish agriculture building an integrated approach on the peasant question and comparative politics of the countries, giving particular importance on the planned period starting after 1960 by choosing text based research methods; content analysis of Turkish Development Plans and analysis of discourses used in the minutes of Grand National Assembly of Türkiye.

For the purpose to establish the basis for the analysis of Turkish agricultural policies, an empirical reality constructing comparative politics for classification of countries as developed and underdeveloped is remarkable. In this context, two important and related features of the agricultural sector are profound in an underdeveloped country. First, in all underdeveloped economies, agriculture's share in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is remarkably high, which corresponds to some 40 to 60% in the national income and secondly it provides employment by taking also high shares corresponding to about 50 to 80% of the total labor force. Moreover, engagement with agriculture is higher than these figures in remote and rural areas with small-sized land or landless agriculture, unwaged labor and very low levels of productivity (Johnston and Mellor, 1961, pp.566-572; Byerlee et.al., 2009, pp.16; Marume et.al., 2016). Within this scope, the classical literature advocates a scientific argument which is an empirical regularity for the developed countries in the World that the structural transformation in agriculture may occur when the shares of agriculture in employment and economy declines and this liquidating mass transforms in a way to feed the industry causing increase in per capita income and welfare (Johnston and Mellor, 1961, pp.566-572; Byerlee et.al, 2009, pp.15). When the acting role of agriculture in the structural transformation is thought; the economic development process means the relocation of labor (Byerlee et.al, 2009, pp.16) from the agricultural sector to the industrial sector

or off-farm activities like rural tourism, handicrafts or niche markets. In this structural transformation, the policies should be implemented carefully for the successful transfer of the labor surplus from agriculture to other sectors without causing social obstacles like the change in demographic situation, uncontrolled movements to cities and appearance of social imbalances in suburb and economic recessions.

This thesis also concentrates on peasant and agrarian question for understanding the agricultural structure and reforms. The “*peasant*” term, “*small scale agriculture*” and “*agrarian approach*” have assumed an important role as the principal activity of the rural areas and to provide food supply and feeding of people (Tacoli, 1998, s. 147-149). Although the term “*peasant*” can be defined in various ways, its main identical features are based on their specifications such as very small-sized production mainly concentrated on plant growing or livestock breeding, use of traditional methods in production, no concerns for market of profit and they produce for their livelihoods and self-consuming (Bhavana, 2016). The peasant and agrarian question have been identified in two approaches for response to the developments in the world; one of them points out that peasants will disappear with the globalization, modernization and industrialization as a response to the capitalist development named as “*depeasantization*” (Araghi 1995, p.338-343; Kautsky, 1988).

The other approach defends that, peasants and agrarian structure will persist and adapt to the changing environment by a new type of peasant mode of production (Chayanov, 1966). Within this approach on peasants, their survival has been explained in the way that they have their special characteristics regarding the territory they live in; they reflect the “*sui-generis*” behavior as being rural inhabitants and petty cultivators of land or dealing with small-scale production just for subsistence but not for profit or trade and depending on family members for labor. Since they produce for their livelihood, they have little interaction with the environment for high technology development or industrialization, they use traditional methods and live in line with their territorial cultural, social and environmental characteristics which can make them resilient to the crises in somehow.

The process of regeneration of new type of peasant form of production is named as “*repeasantization*” or “*new peasantry*”. The reproduction of peasantry can be seen recently in the crises of today’s world since peasant mode of production has been regarded as the remedy for dealing with the food insecurity and food shortage problems. The importance of peasants has been recognized and “*peasant and agrarian*” question was put in the agenda again. New peasant discourses bifurcated from a “peasant” perspective defining them as “family farms” or “petty producers” and an economic development approach focusing on “smallholders” with an oscillation between expansion and contraction of peasantries.

In this thesis, it is intended to formalize the transformation of Turkish agricultural policy starting from 1960’s and to create an argument for the new picture to answer the following main questions:

- Which characteristics did Turkish case of the agricultural transformation show after 1980’s? What were the pushing factors and powers? Who were the policy makers? Were there any changes in agricultural politics?
- Is there a structural transformation characteristic that feeds the economic development as defined in the classical literature?
- Are there any changes in line with the terms identified for the Turkish agriculture by various authors “*deagrarianization*”, “*depeasantization*”, “*neoliberal policy agenda*”, “*internationalization and Europeanization of agriculture*”?
- What is the main character of the new situation if created ever? Is there any continuity of discontinuity?

It is also tried to find an answer whether there is still an agrarian approach and its continuity in the intra or inter-governmental food regimes or this agrarian question has been only a manifestation to respond instantly to the recent crisis.

The second chapter includes an analysis of main concepts and theoretical framework regarding the scope of the thesis. In order to understand the policy subjects and priorities, the literature on description of peasant mode of production and two constructing theories named as *depeasantization* and *repeasantization* have been reviewed. Moreover, a brief description of the agriculture picture in Türkiye has been

made by using the main agriculture statistics. Moreover, information and literature review about the main theories/scholars of public administration, the governing/governance concepts and the changes in the state's role within the framework of public administration reforms are included in the second chapter. The third chapter describes how to make the content analysis, coding and categorizing texts for analysis. The fourth and fifth chapters have been devoted to the examination of National Development Plans in order to make an analysis of public acting/policy, polity and politics dimension. In order to strengthen the analysis of politics and to have an idea about how agricultural politics have changed, the discourses in the minutes of National Parliament after 1960's have been also analyzed.



CHAPTER 2

MAIN CONCEPTS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is a literature review to establish the theoretical framework of the agrarian concepts by analyzing the main characteristics of the peasant form of production, the role of peasantries and the role of state and public administration within transformations in the capitalist world-system compromised by industrialization, modernization, globalization and neoliberalism. The transformation from “agrarian” to “agribusiness” and from “peasantry” to “entrepreneur, commodity or capitalist farmer” is analyzed by describing the terms of “agrarian reform”, “peasantization”, “deagrarianization” and “depeasantization” terms. The unique characteristics of the peasants and their “*sui generis*” situation are also analyzed. The peasant question that has been described by various approaches in the literature has been evaluated in order to reach an argument for the policy analysis in Turkish case. Moreover, the main characteristics and features of Turkish agriculture are provided with statistical figures.

This chapter has also concentrated on the “*role of state*” and “*changing role of state*” by making an analysis of the literature on different approaches of public administration. The characteristics of “*neoliberal phase*” and “*the new public management*” which are the main public administration instruments to implement the neoliberal policies have been reviewed.

This chapter aims to contribute to the scope of the study with the theoretical understanding of the policy analysis through making a literature review that describes the methodology for “Multidimensional Policy Analysis”. Since this research is to make the policy analysis of the agriculture sector by looking at the policy context from a multidimensional view, this chapter includes the theoretical background on three dimensions of the policy analysis; policy, polity and politics concepts by first

describing the scope of a policy analysis, then establishing the basis and interconnections between policy, politics and polity dimensions in a policy analysis.

2.1. Policy Target-Peasant and Agrarian Approaches

The scholars concentrating on the variety of concepts regarding the term “*peasant*” term, “*small scale agriculture*” and “*agrarian approach and agriculture*” argue that through the changing of the environment with the industrialization, globalization and the establishment of modern world-system which started after the Second World War, “*a process of development and modernization accompanied by the capitalist development*” has been experienced (Vanhaute, 2010). Within this process, interactions and interconnections between rural and urban in the sense of economic, social and cultural values have an important role. Agriculture has contributed as the principal activity of the rural areas to supply food and the urban populations have relied on rural resources for feeding and nutrition (Tacoli, 1998, p. 147-149).

The term peasant has been defined by various school of thoughts; anthropological approaches (Foster G.M., 1965; Redfield R., 1956; Wolf E.R., 1966; Migdal J.S, 1974), modernizing approaches (Heynig, 1982) and Marxist approaches (Lenin, 1964; Kautsky K., 1988; Hobsbawn E., 1992). In line with these approaches; “peasants” can be defined identically as “*the petty or small scale producers or land cultivators living in rural areas, dealing with agriculture (mainly plant growing or livestock breeding) on their own or rented land using the traditional production techniques*”. The peasants do not operate an agricultural enterprise or commodity farm in the economic sense; they deal with agricultural activity for their household needs but not for business concerns and this is defined as subsistence farming. Peasants cannot be specified as business oriented, entrepreneurs or commodity farmers but they can be defined as a “*small-scale family farm or small producers*” that produce for their self-consuming not for market of profit (Bhavana, 2016). The peasants are family farms that have no hired labor and they pay no wages, they use their own family labor; the absence of wage data gives values to “*unpaid family labor*” for the unique characteristic of the peasants. Recently, there is a tendency of characterizing contemporary small farmers

as “peasants” in line with their economic scales; as the farms possessing land below 5 ha or 2 ha (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009, p. 4; Basaj, 2007; pp.79). For anthropological approaches the peasants have been specified as a social group of the territory they live possessing the identity and tradition of these areas (Edelman, 2013).

The peasant question is identified in the literature as an ongoing process; adaptation or resistance may be observed but the termination can also be seen by the dissolution of main characteristics of the peasants followed by disappearance. In this perspective, the literature on “*peasant question*” are divided into two approaches and theories (Araghi, 1995, p. 338-343). One approach classified as the “*disappearance thesis*” comments that the unavoidable progression of capitalism will result in the extinction of the peasantry (Araghi, 1995, p. 338-343). In this context, the approaches of Marx, Lenin (1964) and Kautsky (1988) have reached the final destiny for peasants that “*their survival is hopeless*” and “*the peasants must dissolve and cease to exist*” with modernization, industrialization and hence with capitalist development (Banaji, 1990). The old peasantry disappeared and a new type of “*a class of commodity producers/capitalist farms big in sizes and highly efficient or a class of agricultural wage-workers*” replaced (Lenin, 1964). Peasant disappearance theory, named as “*depeasantization*” has argued that the development of capitalism put an end to the “*agriculture based production*” and “*the peasants pass through the extinction, come to an end*” (Kautsky, 1988; Akram-Lodhi, 2008; Kautsky, 2017, p.168) and the new era of capitalism is “*the death of the peasantry and the end of agrarian economy*” (Hobsbawm, 1992; Hobsbawm, 1994, p.289-293; Akram-Lodhi, & Kay, 2009; Kay, 2015).

The second approach is “*permanence thesis*” and is based on Chayanov’s (1966) “*peasant mode of production*” which defends that peasant societies have a distinct development logic that supports the survival of the peasantry within capitalism. Soper (2015) argued the peasant persistence theory of Chayanov and insisted on that “*In spite of erudite affirmations of their disappearance, peasants are still a significant segment of the population and playing an important role in shaping the future of their societies and the process of integration into the globalized economy*” (Soper, 2015). In that concept, peasants as “*constantly adjusting to surrounding conditions*” continue to exist maintaining a rural agrarian way of life that could be associated with

traditionalism and focusing on subsistence or semi-substance production (Hilmi & Burbi, 2015; Morell, 2014, p. 90; Lamba, 2017; Brass, 2000; Soper, 2015).

Heynig (1982, p.118) argues that the peasant societies can be considered as “*anachronistic*” and accordingly the process of development and modernization results in the transformation of the classic “*traditional*” peasant societies into new “*modern*” ones. According to Heynig (1982, p.118) this transformation can be achieved by “*creation of economic and other opportunities that will stimulate the peasants to leave up their traditional way of production and adapting to the realities of the modern world*”. During this process of capitalist development, the traditional peasants will transform into “*farmers, or agricultural business men, whose activities become a business for profit*” with the growing participation in the market and modern world era (Heynig, 1982, p. 118).

Araghi (1995) labels the disappearance thesis as teleological and the persistence as essentialist and argues on historical and functionalistic perspectives. According to Araghi “*depeasantization cannot be defined as a linear process or a historically particular form of differentiation in the countryside, it has been changing according to the conditions of each and every nation-state*” (Araghi, 1995, p.359; Vanhaute, 2010)

Depeasantization has not had links only with the class and labor strategies but also with the urbanization and migration strategies (Vanhaute, 2010; Akram-Lodhi, 2008) through the process of rural-urban interactions and connections expressed by Araghi (1995, p.338) as “*deruralization*”. In this context in order to hinder “*deruralization*” the rural development policies which highlights the role of state in the process as well bring the new development opportunities and accompanying activities beyond agriculture for rural households; rural tourism and recreational activities that are called off-farm or diversified farming activities (Chiengthong, 2010).

Although these diversified activities have been explained as the ways “*for commercialization of rural space*” (Bole et al., 2013) they have positively affected the resistance and survival of the peasantry (Köse, 2012; Akram-Lodhi, 2008; Lamba, 2017; Vanhaute, 2010). This sectoral transformation from agriculture to off-farm

activities has been defined as the form of “*deagrarianization*” began with the globalization in 1980’s and continues by a declining proportion of the labor engaged in agriculture relative to other sectors in the economies (Bryceson,1999, 2000a, 2000b, 2004, 2005, 2019; Lamba, 2017). Deagrarianization has also been referred to the decreasing of the share of small-sized agricultural producers or family farmers in total agricultural production. So it means decreasing the share of agriculture in the economy and employment (Hebinck, 2018). Deagrarianization process may help to reduce the “*depeasantization*” and “*deruralization*”. In this process, the newly created diversified activities for peasants like rural tourism, handicrafts, niche markets and catering help to decrease the share of agriculture sector in the economy and employment. The alternative off-farm economic activities develop opportunities for rural inhabitants and increase the share of the service sector in the economy, so rural economy that is developed in favor of off-farm activities in rural areas, prevent migration to urban areas which means reduction of “*deruralization*”.

The mandated “structural adjustment” policies in developing countries prescribed as the neoliberal agenda of Worldbank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) have considerable meaning in terms of “*deagrarianization*” and “*depeasantization*” since their reforming conditions forced the peasant farmers off the land and into urban slums by mass migration from the countryside (Magdoff, & Tokar, 2009; Patel, 2008; Bryceson 2004, Bryceson 2009; Friedmann, 2006, p. 464; Sexsmith, & McMichael, P., 2015; Lamba, 2017, p. 34; Banerjee, 2009, p.49-52; Misra, 2016). Besides, the agricultural and rural development supports implemented under the EU policies directed to the farms with the ability to achieve economic viability for survival and profitability have contributed to “*depeasantization*” in the new members from the central and eastern Europe particularly (Basaj, 2007, s. 79). Obviously, the EU approach for farmers is to convert them to market-oriented and operate according to the principles of a modern-economic enterprise based on know-how and technology because they can adjust much more easily to the new economic conditions than their peasant predecessors (Basaj, 2007, s. 78).

Globalization has been also associated with depeasantization, involving “commercialization”, “modernization”, “transnational corporates of big producers”,

“global commodity and value chains” and “trade liberalization” which have poisoned the “peasant principle”. With development of globalization and modernization, the small-sized peasants should compete in unfair conditions of structural adjustment packages with the large-sized transnational corporates and industrialized agricultural enterprises which are strongly supported (Woods, 2007, Woods 2017; Bryceson et al., 2010).

However, in 2008 when the global warming and the drought brought to the agenda the fear of global food insecurity, this was the turning point for the appreciation of the food producing capacity of peasants and their resistance against the global crises. In this context, World Bank (WB), the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and many other multilateral and bilateral donors turned their policies from supporting the commodity production and agribusiness to small-scale local production; peasant farming (Bryceson et al., 2010; FAO 2008). In the new agrarian approach, the scholars defined the peasants with differentiating discourses like “small-scale producers”, “smallholders”, “small farmers”, “petty producers”, “family farming” or “rural producers” (Bernstein, 2016; Hebinck, 2018; IAASTD, 2009).

The World Development Report of 2008 emphasized the importance of agriculture in the agenda of global development firstly by naming the report as “*Agriculture for Development*” bringing agriculture and expected food crisis on the fore and criticized the past policies and offered the agricultural rehabilitation in development strategies (Akram-Lodhi, 2008; Bryceson et al., 2010). After this report, another global study report (IAASTD, 2009, p.151) highlighted that large scale mechanized industrial farms may be less productive than small scale-peasant agriculture. Since peasants have the capacity to produce greater added value than large scale producers due their social, cultural and ecological situations. The superiority of peasant agriculture over agribusiness and commodity farming (large-scale farms) and its importance in the social, cultural and environmental fields were recognized after a long time passed. The international agriculture and food system gave priority to the peasant agriculture named as “*repeasantization*” and “*reagrarianization*” in the literature (Van der Ploeg, 2018, Hebinck, 2018).

The year 2014 was announced as the “*International Year of Family Farming*” by the General Assembly of the United Nations, recalling the peasant mode of production. Since peasants have been cultivating land by conserving world ecology and biodiversity, the peasant mode of production has low carbon footprints. Furthermore, they create an alternative to agribusiness and commodity farming by being more sustainable and viable for the global food insecurity and food crises. The approach of “*the agricultural production that became less peasant-like and more entrepreneurial*” and the perception that “*peasants are farming outdated, ineffective and less productive than modern larger farms*” have been changed in favor of peasant farming.

The rise of nationalist and conservative policies of states in recent years accompanied by the national security issues due to massive global immigrations has also contributed to the “*repeasantization*” and “*reagrarianisation*” process since peasants act as the guardians and protectors of rural settlements. The Covid-19 crisis is expected to raise the food crisis in the world in more problematic cases and food insecurity problems are expected to reach to peak points. Moreover, the tension between Ukraine and Russia has resulted in peaks on the worries of food crises in the World (OECD, 2022). The importance of peasants will be recognized with the inclusion in the agenda the “*peasant and agrarian*” question in the following years.

The analysis of literature shows that peasants have their special characteristics regarding the territory they live in; they reflect the “*sui-generis*” behavior as being rural inhabitants and petty cultivators of land or dealing with production in small-scale just for subsistence not for profit/trade and depending on the family members for labor. Since they produce for their livelihood, they have little interaction with the environment for high technology development or industrialization, they use traditional methods and live in line with their territorial cultural, social and environmental characteristics.

The capitalist development has considered peasants as an obstacle for modernization and neglect their presence for they have been perceived as inefficient and economically unsustainable, and hence, they were considered to dissolve and disappear. Particularly, with the promotion of neoliberal agenda of the world’s big

donors in developing Countries and the EU economic integration policies; the “*depeasantization*” process has been discussed in most literature in Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia. The modernization and industrialization have brought in the literature the “*deagrarianization*” term as well since “agrarian” approach has been seen as an obstruction for modernization and development as well.

Although the neoliberal globalization and capitalization processes have changed the rural environment regarding the “*agrarian and peasant*” situation, most of the studies show that the peasants; “*the small-scale family farming*” with the new form but similar characteristics continues to persist.

The new “agrarian” question started particularly after 2008 when world food crisis was constructed for understanding and answering the process; the adaptation of peasants and reproduction of the “new peasants” named as “*repeasantization*” and “*reagrarianisation*”. The main question in this era of revisiting the peasant and agrarian terms is that whether the “*repeasantization*” and “*reagrarianisation*” have been the outcome of capitalist interests for construction of new form of capitalist farms or it has been the result of the adaptation and resistance of peasant mode of production or as characterized by Kearney (1996) on postmodern discourse as “*postpeasants*” or “*polybians*” to world crises.

On the other hand, repeasantization process may be caused by the deagrarianization process which highlights the diversification of rural activities of peasants in the way of non-agrarian works. However, the reality is that today’s crises; like climate change, Covid-19 and tension between Ukraine and Russia will rise the worries on food crisis in the world in more problematic cases and food insecurity problems are expected to reach to peak points in 2050’s with a doubled world population. These food insecurity problems and food crisis make obvious the reproduction of new peasantry for solutions in the world.

2.2. The Features of Turkish Agriculture

This part has been devoted to the descriptive information on Turkish agriculture in order to provide a picture about the situation, the main problems, the main stakeholders and the main changes in years provided with statistical data. In line with the context of this thesis, this part first provides the structure of agriculture sector supported by agricultural indicators of the period before 1980 and afterwards. It has been focused on agriculture sector with a scientific and rational view since agriculture sector should be analyzed with respect to its efficiency and productivity capacity.

One of the main indicators for assessment the capacity of the agriculture sector to catch the opportunities or face to the challenges of the farming and food processing is the data on “*structural efficiency*” which shows the productivity of the sector. The most widely used indicator of “*structural efficiency*” of the agriculture is “*labor productivity*” or the “*gross value added per worker*”. The gross value added per person employed in the agricultural sector in Türkiye when compared with the European countries indicates that productivity and so “*structural efficiency*” of Turkish agriculture, is quite lower than the European average (MARA, 2008, IPARD Programme (2007-2013)). This low structural efficiency of Turkish agriculture compared to the most European Countries has always been criticized and has been pointed out as the main handicap of the sector for development and wealth most importantly for raising its competitiveness in the world.

Agriculture was very important within the economy in 1950’s taking a share of 52% in the economy. However, this notable place and high importance of the sector decreased in years as seen in the table below. It has been realized that after 1990’s the economy has experienced an important change in structure, with more urban-based manufacturing (food processing is included) and service sectors which replaced the place of agriculture in the growth of economy (OECD Report 2011, pp. 16). However, agriculture has still considerable importance in the economy when compared with

other countries; Türkiye was identified the world's 7th-largest agricultural producer in 2009, with agricultural GDP at USD 52.5 billion \$ (OECD Report, 2011, pp. 16).

Table 1. The Share of Sectors in GDP (%)

	1950	1961	1980	1990	2000	2004	2006	2018	2019	2020
Agriculture	52	42	26,1	17,5	14,1	11,2	9,2	6,2	6,4	6,7
Industry	16	23	19,3	25,5	23,3	24,9	25,6	26,3	21,8	21,6
Services	32	35	54,6	57,0	62,6	63,9	65,2	67,5	61,9	61,5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Development Plans

The same figure is valid regarding the share of the agriculture sector in total employment. Although the share of agriculture in total employment was about 80% in 1950s, it fell to 16.8 % in 2021. The transformation of the employment situation has gained momentum after the 1990's as can be seen in the table below. The share of agricultural employment in total employment decreased with the years while the employment in non-agricultural activities increased. This has showed that the increase in employment in industry and services was higher than agriculture.

Table 2. Agricultural Employment in Total Employment

Years	Employment (thousand)	Agricultural Employment (thousand)	%	Non Agricultural employment (thousand)	%
1980	16523	8960	54.2	7563	45.8
1990	19323	9233	47.8	10090	52.2
2000	20578	7187	34.9	13391	65.1
2005	19660	4615	23.5	15045	76,5
2013	24877	5051	20.3	19825	79.7
2015	27004	5417	20.1	21586	79.9
2021	30141	5059	16.8	25082	83.2

Source: TURKSTAT, <https://www.tuik.gov.tr/>; Development Plans

This change in agricultural employment implies the policy orientation should be decided carefully since the labor force leaving agriculture should be transferred to non-agricultural sector by right policies, because if these policies fail, the income differences may show growing disparities in urban and rural poverty rates high below the national poverty line (Larson et al., 2016, pp. pp.1199-1200).

There are about 3.1 million agricultural holdings. The agricultural producers can be characterized in their small scales of an average of 6 hectares (ha) in size. The farms have typical characteristics; they are mostly family-owned, small-sized and highly fragmented. More than 90% of agricultural holdings have less than 20 ha of land and approximately 60% of all farms are less than 5 ha having low economic size (Table 3 and Table 4). The agricultural producers can be characterized as small farms, which prove the structure mainly oriented towards the self-sufficiency or low economic capacity having low structural efficiency and incomes lower than average income (OECD Report, 2011, pp. 19). These constraints on productivity and large proportion of small sized farm households bring about the social consequences of rural poverty (IPARD Programme 2007-2013, pp. 17).

Table 3. Distribution of Agricultural Holdings According to Economic Size

Economic size group (TL)	Total holding (%)
	100,0
<6 660	21,7
6 660 - <26 640	36,3
26 640 - <83 250	27,5
83 250 - <333 000	12,7
333 000 - <832 500	1,4
832 500+	0,3

Source: TURKSTAT, 2016

The distribution of agricultural holdings has been in favor of the medium-sized farms (above 5 ha to 50 ha) and large size holdings between the years 1960's and 2000's.

The small/petty farms (below five ha) shows a trend to diffusion from 68.8 percent to 57.5% (See Table 4). There is also a slow tendency towards the increasing share of agricultural holdings having area above 50 ha when compared with the situation in 1960s. This structure may be evaluated as a slight structural change. On the other hand, the decrease in the percentage of total area shared by holdings having less than 5 ha with time particularly after 2001 implies the petty farms (having area less than 2 ha, peasant farmers) that have no sustainability might be discarded from agricultural activities.

Table 4. Distribution of Agricultural Holdings and Agricultural Land by Size

YEA R	1963		2001		2006	
Size (ha)	Number of agricultural holdings (%)	Percentage of total agricultural area (%)	Number of agricultural holdings (%)	Percentage of total agricultural area (%)	Number of agricultural holdings (%)	Percentage of total agricultural area (%)
>2	40.9	6.9	33.4	5.3	24.8	3.2
2-5	27.9	16.9	31.5	16.1	32.7	12.9
< 5 ha	68.8	23.8	64.9	21.4	57.5	16.1
5.1- 10	18.1	23.3	18.5	20.7	21.4	18.1
11-20	9.4	23.2	10.8	23.8	12.7	21.0
21-50	3.2	16.6	5.1	22.8	6.6	23.6
5.1- 50 ha	30.7	63.1	34.4	67.3	40.7	62.8
50+	0.5	13.1	0.7	11.3	1.8	21.1

Source: Derived from Ninth Five-Year Development Plan (2007-2013) Expert Report on Plant Production (p.3) and OECD Report (2011, pp.20).

The figure of distribution of farm holdings and land by size by area of land between the years 1960's and 2000's shows that Boratav's entitled relations of production (Seddon and Margulies,1984) that Turkish agriculture characterized by a mass of small/petty producers with petty commodity production (having land less than 5 ha) still remain typical although their share in total holdings dropped from 68% to 58%, which may recall the process of "repeasantization". However, on the other side there

has been slight structural change for the increase of medium sized farms (21-50 ha) and farms with a land of more than 50 ha, showing move towards commercialization and marketization (Wharton Jr., C.R., 1969, pp. 6-7) of their farming.

The agricultural land is about 21 million hectares, however, with the population increase, the amount of arable land has opened to use for non-agricultural purposes particularly in the years of significant increase in population. While 6,6 million hectares of farmland were being cultivated in 1928, the intensive agriculture with the mechanization resulted in the significant quantities of agricultural land started for use and reached to 14.5 million hectares in 1950 and at the end of 1980s reached approximately 25 million hectares. After 1980's the area of agricultural land has been declining since that date. The "Report of Sustainable Use of Agricultural Land (Tenth Development Plan 2014-2018, pp. 8)" identified the reasons for this fall as the allocation of land for non-agricultural purposes, the dissolution of very small farmers from agriculture leaving their agricultural land and particularly the soil degradation and desertification due to improper use of scientific techniques by intensive farming and the climate change (Adaman F., and Arsel M., 2010, pp.320).

The employment of women in agriculture has considerable share and agriculture is the primary work activity for rural women. Women play an important role in every stage of production in rural areas particularly in petty farms as unpaid family worker. In that perspective, the farms are also characterized as family organizations which are employing family labor particularly based on women labor. The important character of Turkish agriculture is the dominance of subsistence or semi-subsistence farms. They are independent and producing mostly for their auto-consumption. In these farms the productivity is low and they can market small amount of their production (MARA 2008).

Plant production is the main activity of Turkish agriculture while the holdings can be characterized as mixed cropping or mixed livestock farming. The most important share of the plant production is crop production in arable lands as being cereals, grains and legumes as the traditional production and important for the food and feed industry as raw materials. The most important crop in terms of production amounts to 37.5

percent with grains. This is followed by feeding plants with 34.1 percent, tuber plants with 22.3 percent, oilseed plants with 3.5 percent, dry legumes with 1.2 percent, fibrous plants used in textiles with 1.1 percent and perfumery and pharmaceutical plants with 0.2 percent and tobacco with 0.1 percent.

The most widely developed producer organizations in agriculture can be categorized as the agricultural cooperatives (ACs) established by Law No 1163 in 1969. The ACs have been represented by high level of members. There are also producer unions that were established by the Producer Unions' Law No 5200 dated 2004 representing also high number of farmers.

Table 5. Agricultural Cooperatives (2016)

Cooperative area	Number of Cooperatives	Members
Beet cultivators	31	1.448.171
Agricultural credits	1625	1.001.418
Agricultural development	7201	775.563
Agricultural sales	306	323.596
Irrigation	2523	303.586
Aquaculture	553	30.889
Fresh Fruit and vegetables sales	31	3.128
Total ACs	12.269	3.886.321
Total cooperatives in Türkiye	53.259	7.422.994
Percentage share	23%	52%

Source: 11th Development Plan, Rural Development Special Report, pp.88

There are no political parties that defend the farmers' rights in the political environment. Moreover, the civil society organizations such as the agricultural cooperatives and farmer's associations are quite weak and ineffective to have influence upon policies. There have been sporadic actions of rural producers' organizations. The ruling power and political parties are only taken into account the requests of producers, their interests and needs in times when they suit their interests and in time of elections (Aydın Z., 2010, pp.157).

2.3. Public Administration and Changing Role of State

This part includes an analysis of main scholars/approaches and theories to public administration in order to provide a picture on the process of changing role of state through the liberalization process. In this framework, the changes in public administration and their effects on agriculture can be interpreted in the context of polity dimension.

Public administration, which emerged first as an academic discipline focused on the strong principles and authority of the government in official organizations. The firstly appearing rules and procedures in public administration structures were adopting bureaucratic and hierarchical concepts called as Weber's hierarchy. Later, especially after the formalization of liberal rules, governments were defined to play a "*steering*" role rather than "*rowing*" role. In line with this new definition for the role of governments, the move from "governing" to "governance" occurred in public administration (Rhodes, 1997, p. 5; Pierre & Peters, 2000, p.25-26; Pierre, 2009, p.1; Peters, 2011, p. 10; Peters, 2014, p. 301-306).

The approaches for public administration were changed starting after the Second World War and sound reforms resulted in the mid-1980s with the transition to a enterprise based model of public management called New Public Management (Considine & Lewis, 2003; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993, p.19-20) and as forms of governance models; network governance (Considine & Lewis, 2003; Pierre. & Peters, 2000, Rhodes, 1997; Rhodes, 2008; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007, p.42-43). These changes in public administration have been the reaction to the criticism of the welfare states, the inefficiencies of regulating states and the rising state's legitimacy and governing problems due to the neo-liberal policies and international developments in the world.

Weber's ideal-type of bureaucracy representing the earlier system and the basis of public administration is characterized by hierarchical features relying on strict written

rules and procedures, rational and legally binding system of control, high technical qualifications for career advancement and judgments by organization not individuals.

The American view of public administration theory developed by Woodrow Wilson based on the principles of good administration (Wilson, 1887) and Frederick W. Taylor's «scientific management» (Taylor, 1914) enhancing the efficiency in the operation of government compromised with the hierarchical structure of Weber. This structure was later considered as the ideal way of organization in American public administration (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1971, p. 203-204).

After the World War II, this ideal and “one good way” of public administration” was questioned by various series of challenges thus “*heterodoxy replaced orthodoxy*” (Katsamunka, 2012, p.77; Gruening, 2001, p.4) for public administration. As a result, the state-centric governing changed to society-centric governance with rising importance of “networks” and “decentralization” in the literature.

The prominent defender of network governance; Rhodes (1997, p. 3) points out that governance denotes a change in the meaning of government, referring to a new governing process by inclusion governance of society. Furthermore, he highlights that networks of social, economic and environmental actors can provide more effective and responsive governance than governments do. Therefore, networks should take roles in governance from bottom to up and the state should retreat to a rather minimal role (Rhodes, 2008).

Public-choice scholars (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1971: 203-204) assessed the welfare state and concluded highly critical ideals. Public-choice scholars demonstrated that bureaucratic organizations have number of serious deficiencies which have been seen as tendencies for inefficient use of resources and the exploitation of traditional budgeting by representative committees and by the executives (Gruening G., 2001, pp. 6). Public choice theory would be seen as the starting point for the ending of welfare state tradition and for the pass to neo-liberal state.

Friedman (1981) was the scientist to prove the inefficiency of the welfare state's interventionist measures to demonstrate the superiority of the free market system in his book called "Free to Choose". Friedman highlights that the state should not have the responsibility to intervene to market in order to give social aid or to apply redistribution policies. He believes that the previously welfare state implementations made faults and they ended the competitive free market (Friedman, 1981, pp. 127). He makes critiques on the welfare state rules because they have burden of bureaucracy while serving to inhabitants. This high bureaucracy results in the lower capacity of state to serve fast and the inhabitants wait for service from the state. According to him, bureaucracy in the welfare state does not work efficiently; it causes waste of time and resources.

When the economic and fiscal pressures on governments experienced in most developed countries in the 70s and early 80s, rethinking and reshaping the role of government came on the agenda by "*reinventing the government*" approach of Osborne and Gambler (1993). The governments were criticized for the ineffectiveness and inefficiencies of delivering public services through bureaucratic organizational arrangements. Moreover, the spread of global markets, the financial integration of markets, liberalization and the competition policies forced the public sector in most countries to reshape itself to respond to the emerging global economy and modern information technology. This flourishing way of private and voluntary sector assumed that governments shouldn't always took the role of a direct provider of goods and services, instead they should be contracted defined as "*steering rather than rowing*" (Pierre & Peters, 2000, p. 15-18; Bache 2003, p. 301).

In the 80's and 90's, the impacts of "*New Right*" in the UK and USA made the market oriented private sector rules in public sector applicable by ceasing the affairs of the welfare state, which named as the New Public Management (NPM) implementations (Basu, 2004, p.44-48). In fact, UK was the first country that initiated the privatization of public enterprises and public management reform. In Türkiye, the public reform was started in 2003 by the Law No. 5018 named as "*Public Financial Management and Control Law*" by which the rules for performance budgeting, strategic planning and accountability of public bodies were started.

The NPM called in different ways like “reinvention”, “re-engineering”, “market governance” or “enterprise governance” was presented as a formula for improving the government failures and public administration to achieve “*a government that works better and costs less*” and termed as “*the rise of entrepreneurial government*” (Pollitt, 2000, p. 183; Pollitt C.,2001).

The general elements of the NPM were identified as an active and visible management of organizations by professional managers, a switch in the management systems from inputs/processes to outputs/results, a system of more measurement with the introducing of performance indicators and standards, a promotion from “large”, “multi-purpose”, “hierarchical bureaucracies” to “limited”, “flat” and “autonomous organizational forms”, a mechanism of contracted and market-like public services (including privatization, contracting out, the development of internal markets, licenses and competition etc.) and a switch in the values of universalism, equity, security and resilience towards efficiency, quality and individualism (Pollitt ,2001, p. 474; Hood , 1991, p.4).

The dominant characteristics of “Government” as a unified, independent and rational actor for policy design and implementing policies with defined rules and procedures by the top-down approach have changed with the economic, social and political circumstances in the world particularly after 1980’s. The Governance theory is an approach to study government and public administration from a perspective of neoliberal transformation. This pattern of public administration phenomena was defined as the move from “*government to governance*”, where new modes of governance in public policy making and implementation have been introduced (Rhodes, 1997, p. 5; Pierre & Peters , 2000, p. 16; Considine & Lewis, 2003).

Governance can be defined in various ways but mostly as; “*The organizations was no more hierarchical, central and controlled from top-down, they are complex systems horizontally formed, bottom-up and governed in the way consensual and consultative*” (Frederickson, 2004, p. 3-4; Hill & Lynn, 2004; Lynn et al, 2000). The study of Mee Kam (2008, p. 167) highlights the collaborative work of public sector with private and

voluntary actors in governance. Thus, governance gives importance to the involvement of various actors and partners as networks.

Governance has been identified by Bache (2003, p. 301) that government is no sole the policy actor and the role of non-government actors increased in policy-making. The term “governance” means a highly complicated and multi-actor relationship between state and society (Klijn, 2008, p. 302-312). This implies the inclusion of networks rather than hierarchies in the process of making policies. In this context, role of government’s changes; the role of coordination and steering replaces command and control roles.

Governance refers the inclusion of related actors in policy forming and problem solving. Thus the government’s role in policy making switches rowing to steering. Government becomes variable rather than constant and the role of government changes in accordance with the governance models (Pierre & Peters, 2000, p. 15-18).

The changing line of the role of state from government to governance is defined as a transformation of the role of the state which is first based on constitutional power then towards functioning as a facilitator and cooperative partner. Governance also includes strategies of “*decentralization, privatization, and outsourcing*”. Hierarchically organized political institutions are seen in government role. However, governance includes collaboration, partnership, contracting, networking and interaction between public and private actors (Hysing ,2009, p. 649-651; Capano, 2011, p.1625). The term governance is also linked with a change in the state’s nature. Thus, governance means a transformation process of governing which is hierarchical, bureaucratic, etatist in nature to other different modes such as networks or markets (Treib et al. 2007, p. 2-6)

The study of Klijn (2008, p. 311-312) has conceptualized two modes of governance. One of them is the NPM defined as the “market governance” characterized by the contracting, measurement of effectiveness and efficiency of government performance, privatizing and contracting out governmental services, creating markets, competition, identification of performance indicators to specify the desired outputs. The second is

“network governance” which is characterized by inclusion of different organizations and actors as well as citizens.

The use of Governance as “Good Governance” was introduced by the World Bank (1992) which defined the government as more open, responsive, accountable and democratic; regulate the private sector and strengthen the institutions of civil society. The basic features of good governance can be summarized as strengthened private banking and tax system in the economy, forced in government to transparency, accountability, flexibility and partnership (Kersbergen & Waarden, 2004)

2.4. Multidimensional Policy Analysis

Policy analysis is the examination of a particular policy problem in an effort to determine what the government should do or make a specific decision (or take a specific action) about the policy problem. Policy analysis contains an explicit, and usually detailed, examination for government action (or no action), it is an explanation understanding and description of what governments do (or not do), which decisions they take (or not take), how and why they take these decisions. Policy analysis may be also used to improve the quality of public policy process.

So, it can be said that policy analysis is the composition of activities for the purpose of developing knowledge and information relevant to the formulation and implementation of public policy.

Public Policy is a governmental level action that resolves the problems on the agenda, comprising set of decisions (non-decisions) by using the correct and suitable instruments to reach the intended/somehow unintended consequences. Public policy can also be referred to as the laws put into action by public administrators and judicial systems. However, nongovernmental institutions and organizations are also included in the public policy process (Torgerson, 1986; MacRAE, 1993).

Policy analysis is also described as a way to understand the policy making process and to provide the policy makers on reliable and accurate knowledge about policy in order

to decide about solutions for economic, social and cultural problems. In that context the policy analysis has been defined as a “social discipline utilizing various methods of research in order to produce arguments and evidences and to convert policy-relevant information into political settings to solve policy issues (Fischer et.al., 2007: Dye, 1987).

Policy analysis may be carried out by using different methodologies; as policy analysis being a process or a system (Dye, 1987; Pal, 2014; Hampton, 2009; Jenkins-Smith, 1990; Parsons, 2002). The literature favors the systems analysis and a systematic approach within context of policy analysis (Easton, 1976; Patton et.al., 2016; Walker, 2000). The system analysis derived by David Easton (1976) who took the social theory from living organism and biology. The system (political system) has inputs, outputs and surrounding environment. The inputs in the form of demands, needs, supply or problems come to the system (political system) and going to the process in the system to form the policy outputs in the form of decisions and actions for public policies.

However, another concept that has been developed from systems theory is beneficial to mention; any living organism should adapt considering its environment (internal or external environment) to stay alive. In that context the policy analysis has also its external environment (ecology, other systems) and internal environment (sub-systems) to take care and adapt for policy making (Morgan, 2006).

While explaining the policy analysis, Dye (1987a) mentions three characteristics. Firstly, the primary concern of policy analysis includes the explanation and description rather than prescription. The description is best achieved through careful analysis and understanding. Secondly, policy analysis includes a careful search for the causes and consequences of public policies using quantitative and qualitative methods to reach the results. Thirdly, the findings and results of policy analysis are gathered to develop a general thesis or theories about the causes and consequences of public policy.

In conducting a policy analysis, the researcher should recognize that there are different policy analysis frameworks and it is the preference of the researcher to choose the relevant approach. To identify the policy analysis framework, O'Connor and Netting

(2008) suggests three types of policy analysis: process, product, and performance. The process framework concentrates on the dynamics of policy formulation, that includes agenda-setting regarding the technical and methodological variables. The process logic examines the planning, the decision-making and political processes in the formulation, development, and movement toward creating a policy product. The analyst starts the process by focusing on a relevant problem's or issue's background. In this framework, the analyst asked questions about; the political, cultural, financial issues, the factors that lead to the problem or issue, the existing responses, needed resources, the effects of issues on society, the feasibility studies of the actions on the problem or issue, and the strategies that are available.

The product part concentrates on the results of the planning process and policy preferences. The policy and the policy instruments are questioned by product approach by which the policy content is analyzed as the units of analysis. In the product approach the questions are asked about how values of interest groups are considered in the product for a satisfactory policy, how the policy can be made workable and how the costs and benefits of the policy can be determined efficiently.

The third unit of analysis is performance framework which is related to the description and evaluation of the programmed outcomes of the policy. Performance framework is focused on the implementation and impact of the chosen policy. The questions are asked about how well the policy program was implemented and what were the results or impacts. The performance approach asks questions about the delivery of services, activities, experience, program outcomes, or policy impact. However, O'Connor and Netting (2008) highlights that there is no ideal framework of policy analysis, the important thing is to identify the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of the approach selected.

One of the most important features of policy analysis is that it is problem-oriented and focuses on the search for effective intervention opportunities forwarded to the problems. Although the scientific intervention and problem-solving function of policy analysis under the objectivism and rationality (Dryzek,1993, pp.214) is emphasized and understood as “policy sciences” under the realm of the public professionals within

the limits of classical-modernist approach (Hajer, 2003a, p.91), the studies of policy analysis suggest there is no longer such a case and the policy analysis phase is diversified with the inclusion of various actors outside public professionals and various phases of argument, science and participation (Dryzek,1993, p.230; Torgerson, 2007, p.26).

In that context, the nature of the policy and the structures, the definition of problems, the demands and needs for interventions, and the resources available within the system might be understood in the context of a multidimensional approach. Although the early models of policy analysis lack this capability, and they are unidimensional and generally static, the multi-dimensional approach features a dynamic element. This model strengthens by bringing various dimensions and stakeholders into closer relationship and interactive dialogues (Heisler & Peters,1977; Hajer, 2003; 2003a; Berkovich, 2013; Prittwitz, 2012).

The attempt of Torgerson (1986) to understand the policy analysis phenomenon claims that it has no uniform appearance, instead different aspects and faces of policy analysis should be considered while assessing the knowledge and political relationship and the policy reasons in the public affairs. In that context, Torgerson (1986) describe three faces of policy analysis making a sequential order of historical developments; the first face represents the time of rising of positivism, the second face includes the time when the criticism of positivism starts and the third face includes the period of the development of the post-positivist approaches. In line with these three dimensions, the contextual framework of policy analysis is defined. The first face of policy analysis favor the orderly administration of public affairs based upon objective knowledge which highlights the logic of 18th century's enlightenment and 19th century's positivism.

The knowledge and information could be gathered by ordered laws, rationally and scientifically. Thus the scope of knowledge and acquisition of information is narrowed for the conditions of the availability of logical and factual explanations whereas the values are omitted; defined as "*knowledge replace politics*". The second face of policy analysis comes from the critic of the orderly, scientific, objective knowledge and

political neutrality of policy analysis. The second face refuses the suppression of the political dimensions of policy analysis by the objective knowledge; defined as “*politics comes to fore*”. The third face accept the rational knowledge of Enlightenment and positivism with alteration, the commitment to reason and rationality in public affairs stays but the rationality and the politics become interrelated. Thus, the third face admits the potential relationship between knowledge and politics which brings about an end to the knowledge and politics dichotomy.

Emphasizing the complexity of policy analysis and the difficulty of policy choices, Throgmorton (1991) suggested three dimensions of the rhetoric of policy analysis as science, political and advocate. The science dimension represents the segment of society that are convinced by logic, facts, and coherent theory and believing that public policies should be based on the coherent and correct scientific information and knowledge. In that context, the policy analysis as science; refuses the pursuit of “irrational” policies and proclaims that policy process should be rational and positive, favoring the educated and enlightened public. The policy analysis as politics, highlights the importance of the persuasion and compromise on conflicting interests, favors the inclusion of political actors. The policy analysis as advocate; defines the problems in terms of the concrete experiences, values and interests favors the participation of substantial part of the public in decision making.

Prittwitz (2012) highlights the necessity of different logics while situating the consistent and coherent analysis and implies the multidimensional concept in three dimensions as; policy, politics and polity. In the policy side, the policy process is underway to find solutions to public problems; in the politics dimension it is about the interaction between various actors and finally in the polity side logic, institutional system and the rules and legislation is important.

The first tool of the multidimensional analysis is the policy side which searches for the answers and solutions to the public problems. This pattern represents the public policy acting in a policy cycle including the policy determination, formation, formulation, implementation, evaluation and termination. While making policy analysis, the policy

analysts should consider this public policy acting process for each steps (Prittwitz, 2012, pp.4; Fischer et.al, 2007).

The second dimension is the politics part which comprises the political parties, pressure groups, NGOs, media and other political environments that have potential to raise any constraints and problems to the policy agenda (Prittwitz, 2012). These groups have also the capacity for policy mobilization and formulation. The politics part is the environment that policy analysts should consider for making public policy analysis. The third part of the multidimensional policy analysis includes the polity dimension which includes the institutional, legislative and regulations.

These three tools should be in connection and should not be considered separately while making the policy analysis. For example, public policy acting should not be considered as a sole system, the politics and polity are also the systems surrounding the public policy acting. In any case, these tools enhance the policy analysis and evaluation capacities of a Country; by development of a scientifically based investigations in order to reach knowledge and information; by launching a debate and conflicts within and among political parties for reaching a better agreement or idea, and by strengthening the role played by institutions; such as the parliamentary and the supervisory bodies in interaction with both administrative and governmental bodies (Varone et.al., 2005) .

Policy dimension is usually based on rational, objective and systematic approach for making policy choices in the public sector. It represents a process of adoption of policies as a result of the available information and knowledge. Various policy tools and instruments are used to develop information and consequently to come to a decision. However, in the policy domain, the way to reach the knowledge is certain and based on sound and reliable sources that public policy is guided by the notion of “knowledge as power” (Parsons, 2002, p. 46). The sources of knowledge are academics/policy researchers and public institutions’ professionals and practical experiences and knowledge is managed mechanically. The inclusion of values and beliefs in the policy domain may cause uncertainties, thus it is regarded that policy dimension is an ideology/value free era to reach the knowledge.

The policy domain which is described by Walker (2000, p.13-14) acquires an approach of a system model. The system has its boundaries and its structure and has relations with the elements of surrounding environment. The environment comprises external forces acting on the system and affecting the structure of the system. The external forces may include the economic environment, technology developments and the preferences and behavior of people. These external forces enter in the policy domain as demands, supply, interests or problems and affect the structure and performance of the system. Thus, the system decides a set of actions to solve problems or reply the demands. The policy actions refer to national goals which are the outcomes produced by the system (Ostrom & Polski, 1999; Walker, 2000; Patton et al., 2016).

The policy dimension of the analysis is mostly concerned with the compromise between defined objectives and outcomes. This logic seeks the efficiency and effectiveness of the process and how successfully the defined objectives are realized to reach the defined outcomes. The policy dimension uses analytical techniques and the policy recommendations are drawn by rational knowledge and mostly by mathematical methods (Behn, 1981; Jenkins-Smith, 1990).

Treib et al. (2007) refers the policy dimension with the governance and argues that policies can be distinguished according to the utilized instruments. The state can apply different types of instruments in order to accomplish the outcomes in the form of command and control, incentives and supply, information and knowledge such as hierarchical regulations, supports, management systems and voluntary agreements.

The study of Jordan and Lenschow (2010) in which the environmental policies has been reviewed, has suggested two approaches for policy; as a process and as an outcome. The various country studies of environmental actions view the integration of environment as a process that is bounded in a political system (Jordan and Lenschow, 2010; Meijers & Stead, 2004). This system is structured by institutions, politics and polity acting interconnection with the relevant dynamics to function effectively. In the perspective of policy as an outcome, environmental integration consists of a set of measures that aim to change the process of sectoral policy making. The literature has

been reviewed in order to analyze the interactions in the standard policy cycle; agenda setting, problem definition, decision making, policy implementation and instruments.

The modeling of the policy process in terms of stages from the problem definition to termination has been performed by various researchers that the first policy cycle was developed by Lasswell in 1950's who introduced a policy cycle of seven stages comprising; intelligence, promotion, prescription, invocation, application, termination and appraisal. While various differing approaches to policy cycle have been put forward, the main typology which was adopted has almost the same stages including; agenda setting, policy formulation, decision making, implementation and evaluation. This chronology of policy cycle has been accepted widely, however, sometimes stages may be differentiated (Hoppe, 1993, pp.82; Jann & Wegrich, 2007, pp.43-63; Dunn, 2015; Patton et.al., 2016, pp. 43-53).

The policy cycle has been explained by Easton's systems approach and black box model (Easton, 1976). According to this model, the policy system acts as a "black box" in which inputs (demands and support) are received and outputs (laws, programs, actions etc.) are obtained. Dye (1987) states that it is important to understand what is going on in the "black box" called the political system. It is useful to know how the public policy is produced within the political system, how institutions and processes deal with the demands, what are the effects of external environment to the system, how parties, interest groups, voters, administrators, deputies and other political actors behave in the policy making process.

In the process of policy making, the recognition and identification of a policy problem is important. Defining the problems of the society and proposing alternative solutions is one of the most important stages of the policy making process; this stage is called "agenda setting". Situations that are not defined as a problem in a society and for which alternatives are not offered can never become policy issues. Agenda setting is a process where problems and alternative solutions gain and lose importance in the policy system. The identification of the problem requires the necessity of the state intervention which is put on the agenda as the public action. The agenda comprises the issues or problems to which public institutes and bodies make actions to solve.

Agenda-setting is a process of selection between diverse problems and issues to structure a policy issue including the strategies/actions and instruments forwarded for the development of a policy in the following stages of the policy cycle. (Fischer et.al., 2007, pp. 45-46).

Policy formulation is the stage that the identified problems, needs and proposals are produced as the policy before decision making. It involves identifying and/or formulating a set of policy alternatives to reduce the number of possible solutions involved in addressing a problem and preparing the final policy decision. This approach assumes that those involved in the policy process have previously identified a problem and then moved on to the policy agenda stage. Thus, it involves formulating a range of alternatives, identifying various approaches to the problem in question, and then designing the specific policy instruments to decide the policy. Designing legislative and regulatory works, making the cost-benefit analysis, predicting the effects of the decision and calculating the budget requirements are important elements of this process.

The policy formulation stage comprises an uneasily defined relationship between policy and politics. Although the ideal policy making process highlights that policy and political considerations should be separated, the dichotomy between policy analyst and politics is described as an “*exaggeration*” by Behn (1981). However, the formal structures for policy formulation have demonstrated that the compromise of "pure" policy analysis without politics is difficult, regardless of the policy and the institutions (May, 1986, pp. 114). In many instances, creating an issue, dramatizing it, bringing it to the attention, and pressing the government to do something about it are important political tactics. These tactics are used by influential individuals, organized interest groups, policy planning organizations, political candidates and office holders and mass media organizations.

Policy formulation examines how actors prepare alternatives, lays out some tools for use in this process, and explains why some policy alternatives come up or fall off the agenda. In this context, it is related to other activities such as agenda setting, defining problems and implementation stages. Policy formulation combines the empirical and

the normative: it proposes normative criteria for the evaluation of process and tools (Sidney, 2007; Fischer et.al., 2007). Moreover, the scientific research is also the source of information and knowledge in the policy formulation stage.

Policy design stage aims to improve the process of selection of policy alternatives. It is thought that more effective and successful policies will emerge if the processes of researching and producing policy alternatives are improved. In this way, it is also aimed to minimize randomness in policy formulation. It is argued that a conscious effort to systematically design policy alternatives will improve decisions and their consequences. In the policy design process, alternative solutions are produced, the appropriate one is selected and in this way the random factors are minimized.

The policy implementation stage comprises the adaptation of the policy programme in order to produce the desired outputs. This phase is generally characterized a complex part of the policy cycle. The implementation phase has been defined by three different analytical approaches theory: top-down models, bottom-up approach and hybrid theory that combine the top-down and bottom-up approaches (Knoephel et.al., 2007, pp.194-196; Fischer et.al., 2007).

The top-down approach is an evaluation of whether the results of the implementation are in line with the objectives of the policy decisions put forward at the beginning. Supporters of the top-down approach are of the opinion that policy implementation begins with a decision made by the central government. The top-down implementation has adopted a rule-making approach that essentially considers policy as the input and implementation as the output acquiring the system theory. The top-down approach has been described as the “management by public elite’s phenomenon” since emphasis is placed on central policy makers and their decisions. In this model, implementation is an apolitical, administrative process. Power is ultimately in the hands of central decision makers; they define clear policy goals and are in a position to hierarchically guide the process of putting those goals into practice.

The bottom-up approach analysis starts from the below and from the field, identifying the actors involved in the actual policy delivery and the networks they create. The view

that policies are defined at the central level and that practitioners must adhere to these goals as much as possible is rejected. Instead, taking of initiatives starting from the below level of the policy delivery process is seen as a beneficial factor because local bureaucrats are closer to problems than central decision makers. It is very important to recognize the multi-actor and inter-organizational character of the policy. Therefore, the application analysis should start with the identification of the actors from all relevant institutions and the networks they create in practice, and then examine how the problems are solved. Scholars who advocate the bottom-up approach reject the idea of hierarchical guidance. According to them, it is not possible to formulate laws and regulations with clear policy objectives and implement the implementation process with a top-down process; this model argues that there is always a significant use of initiative in practice at bottom level (Fischer et.al., 2007).

The obstacles of the top-down and bottom-up approaches resulted in a consensus to reach on a hybrid approach process between central guidance and local autonomy. The hybrid approach takes into account both the centrally defined policy goals and hierarchical control efforts and the preferences of local actors and the negotiations taking place within the implementation networks in equal ways (Dunn, 2015).

The evaluation stage of the policy cycle aims to make the analysis of outcomes of policies decided. The intended objectives and impacts of the policy are appraised in normative and rationale way. The evaluation stage, although it is considered as the final phase in the policy cycle that ends with the termination of the policy, actually this stage also represents a step for the starting of the policy by redesigning the problem and setting the agenda. Moreover, the evaluation stage also forms a separate sub discipline in the policy sciences that focuses on the intended results and unintended consequences of policies. The evaluation of the policy process has been carried out in different timing of the policy implementation; ex-ante evaluation before implementation start, mid-term evaluation during implementation and ex-post when the implementation is terminated.

The evaluation stage of the policy cycle can also be considered the policy analysis for the logical consistency, efficiency and ethical character. The policy evaluation is made

logically, technically and ethically. The logical analysis of a policy includes the search for the coherence between goals, ends (outputs and outcomes) and means which is an ex-ante evaluation (Feasibility analysis). The technical analysis considers the impacts of the policy and give improvements for the quality of the policy which is ex-post evaluation (Legitimacy). The ethical analysis of the policy looks at the policy's ethical position. A policy that is designed to be implemented in the equality and efficiency principles may not consider the social equity. Ethical evaluation evaluates the policies with respect to the values of the community (Pal, 1992, pp.19-42).

The theory and practice of policy analysis faced diversified challenges particularly after the mid of 1980s. The widespread policy analysis model envisages that the true and casual knowledge is objectively collected by following scientific methods, rational and analytical ways (Considine, 2012, pp.706). However, this approach argues that the positive policy models and methods may not always provide us with a neutral and objective understanding of policy issues and knowledge is not always "*theory laden*" and the reality may be "*socially constructed*" through beliefs and values. Thus, policy analysis includes a plurality of values and arguments while thinking about any specific policy problem. In that context, policy analysis must comprise a process in which the differing views and arguments are taken into account and interacted in the analysis (White, 1994). This logic of interaction and plurality bring about in the policy analysis process the inclusion of politics which are defined as the motives of interests, values, ideas represented by the political, economic, social, organizational, cultural and environmental actors, military power or network-structures, having symmetric or asymmetric interactions, one-dimensional and multi-dimensional communication and disagreements. The politics are concerned on the interests and on how the public policies affect the individuals and groups having competing interests and how the resolution of conflicts can be achieved to a consensus between these conflicting interests. So politics underline the negotiation, bargaining and compromise in policy analysis (Dye, 1987; Prittwitz, 1989; 2012; Behn, 1981, p.200; Graham 1988).

The better policy analysis can result from better understanding of the potential sources of disagreements and different values. Robert and Zeckhauser (2011, pp. 614-620) pointed out that when disagreements are acknowledged in a positive era, an agreement

will be reached even with the opposing parties on further studies for reaching a solution on the problem. If these disagreements can also be positioned within an era of taking into account of the different values, the politics may come to a mutual understanding of the beneficiary compromise even a mutual agreement cannot be reached. On the other hand, if there is a lack of transparency and clearness over the sources of disagreements and differentiating values, the parties cannot come to an agreement and cannot share information. In that context, Robert and Zeckhauser (2011, p. 616) emphasize that politics place an important part in forming the major policies. The policy analysis should consider different values and argumentations, if not, the contribution of policy analysis to the overall policy process may be insufficient. There is always a great interaction between politics and analysis, politics giving the platform for the different values and arguments supports the policy analysis and analysis providing the transparent and clear information in a positive domain supports a well-functioning political process.

The article of Treib et al (2007) relates the politics dimension with the focus on the actors outside the government and sharing of power in the process of policy formulation. Thus, the policy formulation occurs within the networks characterized by the interconnection between public and private actors. In this concept the interests of public and private are intermediated in a constructed public–private relations, persuasion and negotiation are practiced within the engagement of public and private actors in policy formulation.

The politics pattern means that policy-making is about learning and negotiation rather than command and control. The government has been appreciated as a complex adaptive system rather than rigid mechanical device implementing linear process and techniques. The complexity theory (Klijn E.H., 2008) has been adopted so that the complex and adaptive quality organisms' characteristics apply to government to organize itself in chaos or order. The complexity perspective argues that government cannot be the sole power and cannot know best lonely thus, the diversities of environments should be accepted. The policy-making involves bottom-up direction instead top-down and more interaction of state with private actors. The policy making process of “evidence” and “knowledge” is interconnected with the “negotiation” and

“intermediation” thus knowledge and intelligence (Graham 1988) are exchanged between public and private actors rather than gathered and used by the public officials at the center.

In conclusion, politics means less emphasis on knowledge as power and more emphasis on learning and meaning by inclusion of different ideas, values and intelligence. Thus, the system of information/knowledge is replaced by decentralization and self-organization (Parsons, 2002, pp.52).

In the policy analysis system, the third dynamics of the “policy design” or “policy making” has been considered as the emphasis to be given on the form of institutional and constitutional dimension which resulted in laws, regulations, rules or guidelines; can be named as the polity. This three-dimension way is coherent with the understanding of policies in system dynamics in order to design of better policies; by following the scientific approach to reach the true knowledge and rationality, by taking into account the argument and conflicts and by considering the influencing of politics and polity. When these three dimensions are not considered in policy analysis, the system is described as a-political and a-contextual since the interrelations and interaction between organization and society is omitted (Größler, 2010, pp. 385-387; Prittwitz, 2012).

The “polity” level which pointed out by Größler (2010, pp. 387) in the system approach as one of the three dimensions of the process permits to understand the institutional structures and determination of the effectiveness of policies. Moreover, the polity dimension is a way to clarify the policy changes which usually occur in line with the institutional changes. In that context, the polity has been defined by Größler (2010, pp. 387) as the institutional structure; often the state in which the politics takes action and interacts each other to result in public policies.

One of the three elements of the conventional policy analysis in line with the Lasswellian commitments labelled by Hajer (2003, pp.182) is polity which is associated with the nation state and a powered political order for making laws having interrelations with politics, as well as with policy sciences as pertaining to knowledge

and solving policy problems. However, the article of Hajer (2003) argues that the policy analysis context is changing due to the weakening of state and resulted in the delivery of its power to the transnational and polycentric networks of governance. This dispersed role of state in policy making with civil society and networks is criticized since this new concept takes place in an “institutional void” in other words without polity dimension (Leong, 2017). In this perspective, it is argued that there are no clear rules and norms for politics to conduct accordingly, hence the policy measures are agreed upon without polity which is described as governance without government (Rhodes, 1996; Klijn, 2008) and this policy making process can result in poor outcomes and implementation and can cause legitimacy problems (Leong, 2017).

Although the policy analysis system has been defined in double sided face without polity (Hajer, 2003; Rhodes, 1996; Klijn, 2008) policy analysis needs the state in the way less top-down and more consultative, but the state should enter interrelations and interactions with different networks of actors and politics.

The inter-linkage between politics and polity has been identified in two-way relationship, first political era is infused in a polity, second changes within the political arena can vary the “rules of the game”. The inter-linkage between polity and policy has been defined as the relations between the institutional setting and policy formulation and implementation process. This interaction is also interdependent since variations or innovations in the policy can lead to changes in the institutional setting. The inter-linkage between politics and policy represents the involvement and active participation of state and non-state actors in policy making system (Pisano et.al., 2013;2014).

2.5. Conclusion

The policy analysis methodology is a system theory but is also a process guided by the analytic approach. In this context, the appropriate direction in analysis can be carried out on looking the questions: on what to know, which unit of analysis, what framework of analysis answers the policy question, what is the rationale for selecting/using particular action (or no action) and what are the strengths, motivations and limitations of the approach that is selected. The system for policy analysis is composed of different actors apart from the government which are economic, social and environmental actors, political parties, interest and pressure groups, media etc. characterizing a complex and plural structure. The sole involvement of governments in the policy analysis process may fail to understand and comment on their way and reasons for selection of policy choices. The inclusion of two important dimensions the polity and politics by a multidimensional approach has been decided to be useful and successful in order to provide the complete picture for the analysis of agricultural policies.

The literature review shows that the concept of multi-dimensional policy analysis has been developed in three dimensions (content, process and structure; Policy, Politics and Polity accordingly). Within the concept of policy, the dimension forms the content as normative. The policy dimension is an empirical description of the content of a public policy in terms of its problem definition, interventions, goals and instruments (Pal, 1992, pp.28). The contents are interconnected with defined problems and goals through a policy cycle for each policy area such as agriculture policy, foreign policy, education policy, environmental policy, family policy etc.

The concept of politics represents the process dimension and takes place in the political system. This dimension works on conflicts and reconciliations of power policies and goals orientation in order to be carried out via democratic era of political life through political parties, interest and pressure groups and NGOs.

The concept of polity is considered as the institutional dimension characterized by the structure. This dimension covers the existing laws and legal order through the Constitution. The polity domain studies also the power of state in penetration to the policies and the role of formal institutional structure. The representatives of political institutions in the public sphere are the government emerging from the parliament, the

central institutions of the state, the Presidency, the Prime Ministry, ministries, central and provincial organizations. The institutional dimension is interrelated with the politics.

The article of Lange et al. (2013) has questioned the promotion of sustainable development in three ideal-typical modes of governance in a multi-dimensional approach highlighting the “triad of political processes (politics), institutional structures (polity) and policy content (policy)”. The politics dimension is characterized within the context of the “process” side defined as the interaction processes of different actors. Politics particularly focuses on the relationship between state and non-state actors related with the interrelations of power, resources and interests. The polity dimension has been denoted with the structural side of policy analysis including the institutions, norms and procedural settings and the interaction ways of actors to shape the institutional rules of the game. The policy dimension comprises the policy formulation and implementation, objectives and instruments to reach to outputs.

The study on the analysis of Scandinavian case that was carried out by Nedergaard & Wivel (2017) was on the understanding the characteristics of Scandinavian politics and how it changed with time. The policy analysis of this research has been inherited as a model and adapted to this thesis methodology to establish the basis for multidimensional approach. .

Within the scope of the study of Nedergaard & Wivel (2017) Scandinavian politics were analyzed by dividing into three sub-categories; polity, politics and policies. In the polity dimension; the state and its role, in the politics dimension; the party systems, the parliaments, public opinions, the political populism, civil society and the media, in the policy dimension various policies and policy cycle were evaluated.

In line with this multidimensional approach, the agricultural policy subject of Turkish case has also been defined multidimensional way and in triads of politics (different actors and resources), polity (institutions and norms) and policy (policy objectives and instruments). Thus, the key factors and analytical domains of this triangle of dimensions are identified in Table 6 below for agricultural system.

Table 6. Identification of the Analytics for Dimension

Dimensions	Analytical key factors
Policy	Selection of policy mechanisms, policy agenda, problem formulation and policy instruments for agriculture sector
Politics	Identification of actors, parties and the role and influence of non-state actors, along with the degree of their involvement in agricultural political system.
Polity	Institutional setting and state forms (focus have been made on formal institution), regulations and norms and in which level the locus of agriculture lies in.

Source: Derived from Gong et. al. (2020, p. 6408)

In conclusion, the multidimensional approach has been suggested recently in making policy analysis by the incorporation of different domains (Mullally & Dunphy, 2015; Nedergaard & Wivel, 2017; Gong et al., 2020). The multidimensional approach has been based on the recent theory that government has no longer the sole power and the only actor. Thus, there has been focus on politics in relation to networks (Rhodes, 1997), on polity in relation to the institutions and on policy encapsulated by the policy cycle. These three dimensions are defined interdependent and interrelated in order to realize the goals, actions and various actors in a complementary and coherence (Mullally and Dunphy, 2015; Timmer et al., 1983, p.210). The policy analysis cannot be considered complete without giving a specific attention to the political and institutional domains. In this way, the realistic policy options and a clear understanding of the problems can be obtained and the true policy debates can be achieved and so complementarity and compromise among objectives, government initiatives and actors can be settled for a complete policy analysis.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

In order to make implications and interpretations on the research questions of this study a qualitative content analysis method is applied on the National Development Plans which have been prepared since 1963. This chapter of the thesis gives information on the methods of the study and includes information about how to make a content analysis.

Content analysis is used to measure statistically and/or to analyze the presence, meaning, and association of certain words, themes or concepts on a textual basis. The method can be used in both quantitative and qualitative ways and also in conjunction with different techniques to reach findings and results within a context (White and Marsh, 2006, pp.23; Krippendorff, 1989, pp.403).

Content analysis was first tried in 1930's through quantitative analysis by counting the words and in such a way of manifest analysis by strict steps. Quantitative content analysis follows a positivist way of research, deductive in its character and results are described in terms of numbers and percentages. The analysis is applied on texts through an automatically search process of counting the coded words or categories. The analysis is made usually by a computerized search and the results are compared using statistical methods.

With years the qualitative content analysis replaced the quantitative study. Qualitative content analysis, however, follows a humanist and hermeneutics approach and provides an understanding and interpretation of texts or documents through close reading (White & Marsh, 2006, p.23; Forman & Damschroder, 2008, p.40-43). The qualitative content analysis is described as a latent study since the deep structure of

texts is analyses. In that context the qualitative content analysis should be regarded beyond a sole counting process, since the main target is to connect the results to their context and meaning.

3.1. Qualitative Research

Qualitative Analysis is based on the collection and analysis of non-numeric data in very diversified means is described as “*impossible to provide one-size-fit all*” and “*open-ended*” (Kuckartz,2014, p.4). The qualitative research is also a combination of multiple theories and attempts like critical theory, Frankfurt school, grounded theory, hermeneutics, and a variety of individual attempts.

The application of qualitative methods depends on the researcher and each researcher feels free to create a new systematization and interpretation of his/her own approach. The most common characteristic of the qualitative approach is that there is no underlying, unified theoretical and methodological concept (Kuckartz, 2014, p.4).

One of the qualitative research theory; the hermeneutics is textual interpretation, or, in other words, finding meaning in the written word. The hermeneutic phase aims to make an analysis of semantics within the text. The understanding and interpreting the text is a process of interpretation of the text with the logic of the discovery of perceptive ideas of the persons who make analysis of the text (Kuckartz, 2014, p.14).

Hermeneutics is the mixture of methods, in principle of openness, on textual discipline and context based. It is based on the goal of discovery and theory formation with the subjective conception of the researcher, including the reflexivity and hermeneutics (Flick et.al.,2004, pp.8; Flick, 2018, pp.8-9).

The hermeneutics approach has been characterized by three various text explanation based on the perception of the researchers (Reichert, 2004, p.292). All these three variants of the methods are based on interpretation of the data in the text but with different applications. In methodological terms, hermeneutics follow the general

procedure, which includes the analysis of the documents in question sequentially, extensively and in detail. The researcher can also construct related perception by making as many readings as possible that are compatible with the text. In that way, the researcher repeatedly exercises the data and the theoretical realities and assessments, which create a healthy atmosphere for the discovery of text and its meanings.

The term grounded theory was identified by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as “*the discovery of theory from data of systematically obtained and analyzed in social research*”. The grounded theory can be categorized as an inductive methodology, a systematic generation of theory from systematic research. Grounded theory involves the “use of an intensive, open-ended, and iterative process that simultaneously involves data collection, coding (data analysis), and memo-writing (theory building).

Grounded theory was developed as a qualitative method for abstraction from the data to develop a theory by using different coding procedures. The theory development is carried out under a process of data collection and data analysis, which ends with the memo-writing (theory building). After the data is collected, the analysis of the data can be carried out by coding process which are open, axial, and selective coding (Vollstedt & Rezat, 2019, p. 83-85).

Open coding is the first approach of the data analysis. The core part of the open coding is to create concept (one code) and categories (concepts of higher order) for describing the data. This coding stage is the process that the data is investigated, compared, conceptualized and categorized. Codes can be based on single words, complete sentences or passages in the text.

Strauss and Corbin (1990) described the overall goal of open coding is to elaborate high number of codes and to reach an analysis of the data. The development of coding by asking some questions regarding the data belongs to the professional experience of the researcher and the knowledge gained from the literature that was reviewed. The interpretation of data and the development of codes are relied on the researcher’s creative manner and gained estimations regarding the data investigated.

The second coding process; the axial coding was explained by Strauss and Corbin (1990) that a way to investigate the relationships between concepts and categories that have been developed in the open coding process. The data and the codes that were developed based on a coding paradigm would be worked to establish the relations between categories and conditions of their causal and contextual relations and action/interaction strategies, and consequences. This process on the data will provide to determine the linkage between concepts and categories in order to bind them on macro level.

Accordingly, axial coding is actually an important part of the initial coding. Axial coding includes an intensive work around a main category using a paradigm model (in terms of terms, consequences, context and interaction). This coding constitutes cumulative knowledge of the relationship between the main category, other categories and subcategories. This stage is called axial coding because the research revolves around the axis of a category. What is done in axial coding is the specification of a category (Phenomenon). At this point, sub-categories will emerge, which are in relation to the main category.

This step is also called “focus coding” that the concentration of coding has been forwarded to select the most frequently repeated or the most important codes in the previous coding phase in order to weed out the data crowd. Focus coding is to choose the more analytical codes of the previous coding in order to categorize data. The codes that were hidden in the previous stage emerge at this stage so that events that were not clearly understood in the previous stage can be understood in this stage (Charmaz, K. (2006, pp 57-58).

The final phase of coding, the selective coding aims to integrate the different categories that have been developed, elaborated, and mutually related during axial coding into one cohesive theory. To reach this goal, the results from axial coding are further elaborated, integrated, and validated. Thus, selective coding is quite similar to axial coding, but it is carried out on a more abstract level.

Selective coding is the systematic coding that is compatible with the main category. Other codes are associated with the main category under this key code. On the other hand, selective coding narrows down the codes to be related with the main codes. The chosen master code will be the guide for the next theoretical sampling and data collection. The researcher may refer to the terms, results, etc., which are associated with the main category. At this stage, the focus is also given on memo writing.

This last stage of the coding process is called "delimiting the theory" and "theoretical coding". At this stage, there are two kinds of restrictions, namely reducing the theory and categories. As categories and their characteristics are compared with each other, many different categories decrease. Then there are the differences that will explain the logic of the event. Those categories that do not qualify the main category can be discarded.

Theoretical coding shows how the fixed codes relate to each other as hypotheses to be integrated in theory. Theoretical coding is an advanced stage of the coding phase that follows the codes chosen by the researcher during the second coding. According to Charmaz (2006, p.57-68), the theoretical codes are integrative and give direction to the focused codes obtained. These codes allow the researcher to tell a coherent story. Therefore, these codes not only show the researcher how the fixed codes are compatible with each other; at the same time, it enables the researcher to advance his story in the theoretical direction.

Grounded theory is used to create a substantive theory that will describe a phenomenon in a particular context. The main target in grounded theory is theory development. Grounded theory is suitable for the cases that no theory exists. However, it is not applicable for the test of a theory or generation of knowledge from objective reality (Cho & Lee, 2014).

3.2. Qualitative Content Analysis

The first trials of Content Analysis were performed in the years of 1930's through objective and systematic quantitative analysis by counting the words to make manifest analysis of the data by strict steps. However, with years the qualitative content analysis replaced the quantitative study (White & Marsh, 2006, p.23). The qualitative content analysis opposite to the quantitative one is described as a latent study, should be regarded beyond a sole counting process and gives an interpretive means to answer the research questions in a humanistic tradition (Bengtsson, 2016; White & Marsh, 2006, p.34). Qualitative content analysis is defined as a research method that gives a systematic and interpretive means to answer the research questions and to describe a specific phenomenon from verbal, visual, or written data (Bengtsson, 2016).

The qualitative content analysis aims to “*systematically describe the meaning*” (Schreier, 2012, p. 3) and use the model of “coding” which is derived from the qualitative research concept of grounded theory (Stemler, 2015, p.3-5). Although both grounded theory and qualitative content analysis follow coding processes, content analysis does not concentrate on finding relationships among categories or theory building; instead, it aims at extracting categories from the data.

Qualitative Content Analysis is most frequently applied to text based data such as interviews, newspapers, plans, archives, brochures and contracts. The approach can be characterized as a research method for subjective interpretation of the content of a text or data through a process of coding to understand and/or define themes or theories. The main goal of the analysis is to provide knowledge on the research area, to understand the phenomenon and to make interpretations on the findings (Mayring, 2000; Mayring 2004; Hsieh and Shannon, 2005, p. 1278; Schreier, 2012, p. 1; Roller, 2019).

Although the procedures of the qualitative content analysis cannot be defined in a strict way, Roller (2019, p. 2) suggests a methodology of two phases and eight steps. The

first phase, includes the generation of the data (or coding) to be analyzed in phase 2 (See Table below). Phase 1 composes five steps and the main goal is to determine the codes. Phase 2 aims to categorize, interpret the context and make implications. This process comprises three steps, including identification of categories, themes and theories then finally draw interpretations and implications (Roller, 2019, p. 2). In the framework of this methodological framework, the main steps can be defined as; deciding on a research question; selecting your material; building a coding frame; dividing your material into units of coding; evaluating your coding frame in terms of the consistency and revising the preliminary coding; using the revised version of your coding frame, categorizing the codes and transforming the information to the case level; interpreting and concluding findings (Schreier, 2012, p. 5-6).

Table 7. Methodology of Qualitative Content Analysis

PHASE 1: DATA GENERATION (CODING)	PHASE 2 DATA ANALYSIS (CATEGORIZATION/ INTERPRETATION)
Step 1: Define content Step 2: Specify unit of analysis Step 3: Determine unique codes Step 4: Apply preliminary coding Step 5: Identify code content	Step 6: Identification of categories Step 7: Identification of themes Step 8: Make interpretations and implications

Source: Roller (2022, p. 2)

Since qualitative content analysis is a reflective process and dependent on the perception of the analyzer, the determination of units of analysis, the process of coding and categorizing of the theme may be flexible and have not been smoothly described. However, the main steps of the qualitative content analysis can be pointed out as data management, development of a coding scheme, categorization and interpretation (Mayring, 2004; White & Marsh, 2006; Forman & Damschroder, 2008; Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017).

The determination of the units of analysis is an important initial step to decide which data source will be analyzed. The unit of analysis should include the necessary aspect of materials related to the research questions. The data source (units of analysis) for content analysis may be texts, written documents, programs, newspapers and

interviews. The data source will be read in repeated times to familiarize with the main idea, to gain a sense about the whole and to take the impressions. The researcher doing the content analysis may not initially generate the relevant codes reading through the data initially since the aim in this stage is to see the big picture. Through careful and repeated reading of the documents, key phrases, words and text segments that correspond to research questions are defined, the notes that seem important are taken, and the codes and categories generated through this process are compared with other data and re-reading of the same documents. The coding stage in qualitative content analysis often requires careful reading and deep analysis of the text. The formulation of codes helps to reflect the data and describe the condensed and composite meaning units. The text is divided into meaning units and the meanings are condensed to shortened and summarized versions of codes. The data is brought to a higher level, from codes to categories. The categories help to understand and/or design the themes and the sub-themes. Themes may state underlying meaning, i.e., latent content, and can be constructed by grouping two or more categories together (White & Marsh, 2006, p.33; Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017).

The generation of codes can be done either deductive or inductive way. Deductive codes exist a priori and are identified or constructed from theoretical frameworks, research questions and/or available research materials or literature. Inductive codes are generated from the data itself while reading data sources and/or during the “preliminary coding”. For generation of codes in QCA, the deductive and inductive approaches may be applied in combination (Elo & Kyngas, 2008; Cho & Lee, 2014). The formulation of codes must be carefully carried out in order to fit with the data best and meet the goals of the study successfully. Although each study has different approaches depending the analyzer, the development of 20–40 codes is the norm. Codes help to categorize text and represent as much as information contained in the text (Forman & Damschroder, 2008).

The last step of content analysis is the interpretation phase; in which findings and understanding are laid down as a finished product. The interpretation may include re-organization of data, description of findings, displaying key results, and drawing and verifying conclusions. The examination of data sources and the understanding of

research questions may be included in code reports which enable case-by-case analysis or more deeply evaluation of a particular topic. Descriptive and interpretive summaries of the data contained in each code report are grouped together to come to a conclusion. The structure of these code reports is depended to the analyzer preference, however, the main points obtained through the close reading of texts are included. The codes and themes are interpreted by the analyzer to understand and answer the research question (Forman and Damschroder, 2008, pp.56-57).

The QCA is a complex process in which the perception of the material and the analyzer's background come together in order to learn about the topic and the situation to construct a meaning. This process of construction of a meaning requires some degree of interpretation coming from the analyzer's own perception of the data and situation (Schreier, M., 2012, p. 2-3).

In this thesis the deductive and inductive ways are chosen together since it is used to retest existing data in a new context. The testing categories of concepts, models or hypotheses are involved. A categorization matrix and coding have been developed in order to analyze the plans in order to answer the research questions. The deductive content analysis is generally based on earlier work such as theories, models and literature reviews. On the other hand, the basic idea behind inductive approach is that the procedures of reading and summarizing the text are used to develop new categories/themes (Mayring, 2000; 2004; Elo & Kyngas, 2008; Cho & Lee, 2014; Bengtsson, 2016). The inductive approach is also used for the development of solid policy recommendations and the theory of linkage between different sectors (Hüller et al, 2007). The qualitative content analysis method described by Mayring (2004), Schreier, M. (2012) and Kuckartz (2014) is used in this thesis. The units of analysis are the textual forms of national development plans. Moreover, the qualitative content analysis studies of various researchers have been examined in order to use as models in the method of this thesis. Brief summaries of these studies are found below.

The QCA approach of Pignatti et.al (2015) aimed to identify the influential factors and drivers for adoption of information technologies and innovations in agriculture sector in three Countries (Greece, Türkiye and Italy). The study was based on the analysis

of the interviews and surveys convened with the focus groups in these three Countries. Data generation (coding) and analysis (interpretation) have been performed on the transcribed texts of the interviews. After coding and categorization steps, four themes; 1) Organizational and professional tenure, 2) Technology adoption in agriculture, 3) Technological innovations' adoption process and 4) Opportunities and limitations have been identified for the interpretation.

The study of Specht et.al. (2016) investigated the factors contributing to the acceptance or rejection of ZFarming in Berlin. An overview of ZFarming for better understanding has been carried out on collecting the opinions of key stakeholders with different levels of knowledge and coming from different disciplines by performing interviews. The interviews were recorded and transcribed in order to obtain the data source for the qualitative content analysis. The approach of Kuckartz (2014) was applied for coding and categorization. The large number of textual data was classified as codes and smaller categories. The codes were sorted by topics and assessed in line with the importance criterion. The study followed a deductive approach since the collection of factors includes the description and understanding of the results.

The research of Boğuşli and Oğuztimur (2021) evaluated the National Development Plans and the specialized commission reports of the Development Plans from the year of 2000 to the present in Türkiye. The aim of the study was to make the analysis of transport policies in the Plans through the Qualitative Content Analysis. The three Plans have been evaluated regarding the transport policies using the preliminary coding. The analysis represents the deductive character and no theory has been developed.

The study of Türker (2020) aimed to examine the environmental problems that have been prioritized in National Development Plans of Türkiye. The qualitative content analysis has been determined as the research method. The units of analysis are the Development Plans of the Country. The analysis has been carried out in deductive way by the description and understanding of the environmental problems.

In the study of Demir (2014) the promotion and publicity activities of the tourism sector were evaluated through the content analysis of National Development Plans covering the years 1963-2013 and the Tourism Action Plan. Quantitative and qualitative content analyses are used together in order to make objective and systematic examination and interpretation of plans. Data generation was carried out by scanning in the computer the keywords (codes) "tourism" and "promotion" in the content of Development Plans and in the Action Plan. The code reports were generated in terms of promotional activities, number of tourists, types of tourism activities, and tourism revenues and the results were presented in tables. The plans were summarized and the basic contents and information were explained. The study aimed also to reach the new concepts and relationships that can explain the data obtained. In order to obtain new concepts from the data source in-depth processing and interpretation were done on the plans.

The aim of the study of Çiçekdağı (2020) was to make a content analysis of National Development Plans regarding the tourism sector. The deductive and quantitative analysis was carried out by using computerized program. The five research question have been worked on through the generated codes and categories. The frequency of each code in the plans was counted and they were represented in tables.

The study of Altuntaş and Türker (2012) aimed to examine how the sustainable supply chains in the Turkish business environment are conceptualized and implemented in Türkiye. The content analysis was applied on sustainability reports of manufacturing companies both qualitatively and quantitatively. First, the reports were scanned by counting the generated codes “sustainability”, “supply chain” and “development” and the results were presented in tables. Second, the data sources were deeply analyzed to reach some contextual findings about sustainability.

The study of Köseoğlu and Demirci (2017) applied qualitative content analysis on national policy documents and strategic plans to understand the impact of big data and data mining on public services and policies in Türkiye. The plans and the policy documents were undergone on a deeply reading using generated four keywords (codes); “big data”, “open data”, “data warehouse”, “data mining”. In this context,

strategies and activities related to big data and data mining and their associated goals and objectives were revealed.

The study of Özkan et.al. (2016) analyzed the foreign language education policies between the years 2003 and 2013 in Türkiye by qualitative content analysis method. The units of analysis were; National Development Plans, Councils of National Education Decisions, Governments' Programs, Governments Action Plans, Ministry of Education Strategic Plans between the years 2003 and 2013. The data sources were examined deeply for the generation of codes with the keywords “objectives, decisions, strategies, practices of foreign language education” and the themes were identified accordingly.



CHAPTER 4

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS- POLICY AND POLITY

In this chapter, the National Development Plans have been analyzed by using qualitative content analysis in order to understand the evolution of agricultural policies, the motivations and pushing factors in the agriculture sector by means of public acting and polity dimensions. The National Development Plans have been prepared since 1963 covering a period of five years. These plans can be characterized as a holistic policy framework for all sectors in the country. The plans include the economic and social objectives, the priorities and the expected outcomes and the development programs for all sectors.

In line with the qualitative content analysis method described in Chapter 3, the National Development Plans were examined deeply regarding the coding identified; “agriculture”, “farmer”, “peasant”, “rural development”, “rural area”, “village”, “state”, “public administration”.

4.1. Policy Choices before 1980

First Five-Year Development Plan (1963-1967) is the first breakthrough phase of the planning period of Turkish development and a fifteen-year perspective has been chosen for the long-term strategy. In the preparation of the plan, social and economic goals of the Turkish society and the resources that need to be mobilized have been addressed from a perspective of fifteen years until 1978.

The development intervention regarding agriculture has been identified in the plan period as to increasing the living conditions and standards of overwhelming mass of

people engaged with agriculture. The plan brings to the fore that the communities living in agricultural areas lacked many services and infrastructure. Community development has been selected for increasing the productivity in agriculture and expansion of social services. The main target of the plan is to increase job opportunities and social mobility of the masses and accordingly, to reach high living standards.

The plan has placed an important role on the state to realize economic development and ensured peace and stability such as a fair distribution of income and a balanced production structure, which can only be realized through interventions of the state authority. As it was difficult for the private sector to fulfill all conditions of the economic development alone in those days. For the realization of sound economic development, investments had to be accelerated in order to see changes in the structure of agriculture and methods of production. For the transition from an underdeveloped and stagnant economic stage to an advanced and dynamic one, the plan attached importance to the central authority to take systematic and rational measures. State investments and the activities of SEEs had an important place in order to accomplish the transformation from a primitive economic order to a more advanced production system. Thus the plan envisages not to restrict public and private sector activities strictly and the economic development lead to the activities and responsibilities of the state. In order to increase agricultural production, active role has been given to state for fulfillment of basic structural investments such as irrigation, energy, road and communication facilities, creation of credit and marketing opportunities, extension of technical assistance and implementation of land reform.

The reorganization of administration has been identified as one of the objectives of the plan. In order to fulfill the responsibilities of the state, the reorganization of the administration is determined as a necessity. It is an inevitable necessity to bring both the central government (together with the central and provincial organizations) and the local administrations (together with the provincial special administration, municipalities and villages) in a position to meet the needs of a developing economy in a rational and collaborative manner.

The Plan addresses the restructuring of SEEs to provide support for the development of economy in accordance with the development policy by taking decisions in independent and timely manner.

The Plan describes the community development approach by well-designed theoretical and academic words;

In order to improve social structure, it is necessary to apply the method of community development. Community development is an approach that includes the increasing of the provision of the various services and activities to the people, the establishment of common organizations such as cooperatives and the establishment of cooperation and collaboration between the public administration and communities. This is an important development method that will educate the masses, encourage them to work together, and stimulate manpower creatively. This method, which is based on the principles of the voluntary organization of the people and their cooperation with the administration and their voluntary participation in public activities in certain areas, has become a common way of working in democratic countries today. The community development programs will also have a considerable impact on the more efficient functioning of the services delivered to the village.

The agriculture sector development is combined with the community development and village development with a policy of engagement between agriculture and non-agricultural activities. The plan also emphasizes the community development programs for the development of the agriculture sector including agricultural training and extension services and the cooperative movements. The plan aims to strengthen the village communities by the reach of infrastructure and village services via rational service delivery policy. The participation of village people to the voluntary programs is a priority to work in cooperation with the government. The expected improvement in agriculture is connected to the implementation of community development programs. In this framework, the plan provides solutions for public and community partnership in order to meet the basic needs of the peasants in a shorter time and with lower costs. Moreover, the high unemployment rates and hidden employment can be decreased by creating jobs in non-agricultural sectors by implementation of community development programs. By this way the plan targets to employ the peasants dealing with the agricultural activities and to transfer the peasant workers

from agricultural activities to non-agricultural activities by employment in the village infrastructure services.

Regarding the agriculture sector priorities, the plan provides information about the pre-plan period;

The Turkish economy entered a dynamic period with the relief of the post-war problems and the increase in foreign aid in 50's. The rapidly increasing investments, the mechanization and high agricultural production by the foreign aid (Marshall aids) in this period developed agricultural production and increased the national income. However, the reach of arable land to its limits, financial bottlenecks, the high inflation rates, grown external payments deficit brought upon the economy out of balance. After 1953, the decline on the value of money was compensated by legal cuts, price controls and sells of SEEs below their costs. The over-inflation policy was ended with the stabilization decisions in 1958.

Thus the pre-plan period was identified as the years of high agricultural mechanization and high agricultural production accompanied by the opening of new agricultural land and reaching of limits on the use of agricultural land. In line with this reality, the first plan recognizes the agricultural dominance in the economy and employment in 1962 corresponding as 42% and 77% respectively. Furthermore, although the urbanization had just started in those years, over 70 percent of Türkiye's population was still living in villages. The objectives of the agricultural policy had been defined as to increase the agricultural productivity in order to meet food supply for the rising population, to develop agricultural exports, to meet the needs of increasing raw materials, to overcome the unemployment issue by development of opportunities for non-agricultural sectors, to prevent the flow of workers to the cities and to implement community development programs.

In that period, the most important policy target in agriculture was the improvement of the existing irrigation networks and the construction of new irrigation facilities. Considering the vital importance of irrigation in agriculture and especially in order to achieve the identified 7% development goal of the plan, irrigation has been brought to the fore by opening new lands for irrigation and by ensuring efficient agriculture. Increasing the number of tractors and repairing and renewing the existing tractors were determined as another important tool for agricultural development in the plan. In

addition, increasing the use of chemical fertilizers and certified seeds and supply of these inputs have been important policy choices in order to implement intensive agriculture and to increase yield. The first plan's estimated agricultural output of 4 per cent grow annually was based on the mechanization, irrigation and the use of chemical fertilizers and certified seeds for intensive agriculture.

The interventions of Government in agriculture during this period consisted of supports for regulation of product prices and markets. The state was controlling production of agricultural inputs and their distribution. The trade of agricultural commodity was also under the responsibility of state-owned or state-controlled marketing institutions. The state implement input price support and export support schemes. Moreover, the exchange rate, import and export licenses and food prices were under control. Agricultural training and extension services, development of agricultural research have been determined as priority areas in order to achieve the agricultural targets indicated in the plan. Providing agricultural credits to farmers for supporting their investments and for supply of inputs have been emphasized to increase the agricultural productivity. In the plan period, the organization of farmers under the agricultural cooperatives and unions has been identified as an effective tool for agricultural development. In addition, it has been considered to benefit from the farmers' organization to implement community development programs and to achieve the increase in production. Land reform, land distribution and consolidation have been identified as milestones in the field of agrarian reform.

The Plan has ensured the regional planning to the way to prevent imbalances between regions, to overcome the over-urbanization and population problems and to distribute the public services in a correct way. In the plan, it has been pointed that the term of regional planning and development was at the initial level and regions are determined in three aspects as "regions having development potential", "underdeveloped regions" and "big cities-metropolitans". Emphasizing that regional planning is a new subject, emphasis has been placed on the development of the theoretical framework and the development of human resources.

In conclusion, the First Development Plan aimed at economic, social and cultural development of the Country, with particular emphasis on the development of agriculture efficiency. In the plan, agriculture was one of the main sectors that would ensure economic development. Measures have been identified to increase local employment and community development in order to both contribute to the country's economy and development by increasing agricultural production and to prevent the uncontrolled migration from rural to urban areas. As the strategy of the first development plan, a balanced development rate between agriculture and industry was achieved and a balance was tried to be established between population growth and development rate.

Regarding the peasant question; the First Development Plan addressed the community development programs to employ the peasants in the village roads and other infrastructure services. By this way, the hidden employment of peasants in villages would be registered under the off-farm services and the living conditions in villages would be improved. Rural development and rural area terms have not taken its place in the plan yet and instead the community development and village development have been the terms used for achieving the policies targeting the peasants.

The Second Five-Year Development Plan (1968-1972) aimed for rapid economic development foresees the use of resources in the most efficient way by eliminating the structural difficulties of the economy. The second plan envisages the economy to develop at an average rate of 7% per year and in order to achieve and sustain this development, a radical structural change has been mentioned. The complete modernization of economic activities and the use of advanced technology and innovations in the agricultural sector have been chosen as the policy target. The rapid increase of the share of the industrial sector in the GDP has been determined as the main objective of the Plan. The growth rate for agriculture sector has been determined as 4% in the second planning period in order to meet the rising food demand due to the increasing population. The plan also targets to put under control the rising inflation, to hinder the imports agricultural products, and to increase the living standards of those working in the agricultural sector.

The second plan also aims at expanding general employment opportunities, shifting the excess labor force in the agricultural sector towards non-agricultural activities, preventing the dependence of the economy to external resources, eliminating the bottlenecks in the balance of payments, and supporting urbanization on the basis of development policies. The main goal of the plan is to change the general structure of the economy from an agricultural character to a structure dominated by the industrial sector. Although the importance of agriculture in the economic development has been recognized in the plan, it has been also stated that the agriculture sector plays a prominent role for the failure to reach the GDP growth rate of 7% envisaged in the first plan since the heavy weather conditions resulted in reduced rates of agricultural production. The second plan pointed out that the economy was largely dependent on the agricultural sector and economic development was influenced by the agricultural production. Therefore, reducing the degree of dependence of economy on agricultural production has been settled as a priority. It is foreseen a balanced development by decreasing the relative importance of the agricultural sector in national economy and increasing the share of non-agricultural activities. As a long-term goal of the economy, it has been determined to achieve rapid industrialization and to increase agricultural productivity by using modern methods.

The plan addresses the heavy dependence of economy on agricultural production and describes the main obstacles of agriculture:

Economic development is heavily influenced by agricultural production. The agricultural production affects the economy since agricultural productivity is dependent on weather conditions and it is difficult to control the instability in agricultural production and high prices. The most important factor that exacerbates the agricultural price and production instability in Türkiye is the inability of the agricultural organization to function well. The most important factor that limits organization is that the small landowners are less likely to merge into cooperatives. Farmers are sensitive to price changes and the channels between the production and the market are weak since the cooperatives have not been developed in marketing and supply of credits.

Another important obstacle of the agriculture referred in the plan is the fragmentation of the agricultural holdings by inheritance law and the dominance of the small sized farms with very low efficiencies. Moreover, the plan points out that better condition of the cities compared to the villages led to the migration of mass people to the cities.

In the second Plan, the peasant question has been addressed under a separate section since the peasant population were entirely dealing with farming activities. The plan envisages to increase productivity by a strategy:

The land-human relations will be regulated, a stable price policy will be pursued, cheap inputs will be provided to agriculture, an appropriate marketing order will be established, an effective credit policy will be implemented and thus the income of the peasants will be increased. Such a development in the agricultural sector will improve the nutritional conditions of the total population, increase the export capacity of agriculture and help industrialization by meeting the raw material needs of the industry.

The increase in agricultural productivity and the decrease of agriculture importance in the economy have been chosen as policy choices in the Second Development Plan for the development of the economy. In order to reach an increase in agricultural productivity, the main instruments have been selected as; the use of modern inputs, fertilizer and qualified seed, the organization of farmers under the cooperatives, the development of irrigation facilities, the development of village-based joint activities, provision of agricultural credits, vocational training and agricultural extension services.

Since there was no possibility of increasing total production through extensive agriculture the efforts to improve soil productivity would be chosen to be implemented in order to increase total production. Cadastral and land registry works would be accelerated and priority would be given to the areas where irrigation facilities were active. The agrarian reform, the tenancy establishment and the land consolidation would be provided in order to activate land cultivation opportunities for the landless farmers or the renters. The modernization of agricultural production methods would be achieved, the use of artificial fertilizers and high-yielding seeds would be increased, and irrigation opportunities would be provided in order to increase production and productivity. The supply of pesticides would be provided in order to perform combat

with agricultural diseases, agricultural training and extension programs would be implemented to increase the use of advanced technologies, development of cooperatives would be supported especially for small producers to obtain their needs such as machinery, equipment and credits and to market their products in a more convenient way. Training programs would be implemented in villages on the construction of cooperatives and entrepreneurial initiatives of cooperatives. Supports would be provided to farmers through the agricultural credit cooperatives (ACCs) to reach inputs and credits. Village-based activities and community programs would be supported.

The Plan refers to the state in solving the problems related to the agricultural structure, technology, means of production and marketing. The state takes place an active role for the organization small and medium agricultural enterprises in the form of cooperatives to supply their needs and sell their goods. The contribution of villagers to public services would be encouraged and the youths in villages particularly the girls would be educated. The girls would be educated on home-economics and nutrition. In order to reduce the pressure on the village due to seasonal unemployment and hidden unemployment in the agricultural sector, the population working in the agriculture would be directed to non-agricultural sectors such as forest activities. Handicrafts and home crafts activities would be developed for the peasants to improve their economic power. Village based local administrations would be strengthened and the joint activities between the villagers and public institutions would be implemented for the development of the villages and for the provision of services.

The Second Development Plan addresses the implementation of the mixed economy in order to accelerate the economic development by mobilizing all resources and opportunities of the country by creating an environment that will ensure a better distribution of resources. The mixed economy system has been chosen as a means of ensuring a fair and balanced development for the Turkish society to reach a higher level of prosperity. The Second Five-Year Development Plan has defined the rules of the mixed economy clearly and in detail.

According to the Plan, the rules of mixed economy have been defined as the coexistence of the public and private sectors in the market in order to accelerate economic development within the framework of the principle of equal opportunity. Thus, the state has been given the role to reduce the crises by eliminating the uncertainty in the market and the risk factors that may arise due to the competition.

The rules of the mixed economy policy have been described in the plan. According to this definition; static and dynamic efficiency in the economy would be provided mainly through the market mechanism. Equal opportunities would be provided by the state in areas where the public and private sectors operate together in relation to production. The state would ensure the stability of the economic life as a regulator; regulate the inadequacies of the price mechanism with tools such as taxes, credit, money transfer and foreign trade policy. The state would prevent the emergence of monopolistic powers. The state would especially make infrastructure investments that accelerate the overall development and social investments such as education and health, which increase the welfare of the society. The development of the manufacturing sector was left mainly to the private sector in the long run. The public sector would complete the investments that had been already started. The state would enter as an active entrepreneur in industrial areas that were necessary for the rapid development of the economy. In addition, mixed enterprises would be preferred in order to ensure the contribution of private enterprise in industrial areas. The mixed enterprises established with capitals of state or SEEs would not be allowed under the sole authority of the private individuals.

One of the important features of the second plan, is to take into consideration the structure of agriculture sector and classification of the workers. In that context a very low share of the working population in the field of agriculture (approximately 7%) works for wages and these permanent workers were under the public and public partner agricultural organizations. The daily workers especially working in the planting and harvesting seasons named as “seasonal workers” have an important role. However, large part of the working population in agriculture cannot be grouped because they work as unpaid family workers.

So the agricultural situation of that time could be classified as the “peasant” character. In the villages, apart from agriculture, traditional weaving, small agricultural related industry and small handicrafts activities were available. Social security was not provided for those working in the villages.

In conclusion; villages and forest villages are the main policy targets in the second plan. Moreover, the establishment of cooperatives and village-based joint works between public agents and villagers as well as the education programs for the village people (peasants) are the main instruments to implement the policies. Since the limit has been reached in arable lands, the plan necessitates to adopt intensive agriculture.

The state intervention to the economy under the “mixed economy” policy has been the unique feature of the second plan in order to satisfy the need for rapid development and to reach the level of contemporary economies by using all resources in the country in an efficient way. The scarce resources and investment opportunities in these times, made it necessary for the state to intervene directly in economic life, not only as a regulator but also directly acting an active role in making investments for manufacturing, industry and agriculture and food sector. In that context, the state enter the economy by SEEs and investments on large facilities to meet the essential needs of the people.

The plan refers to the change in the economic and social structure of villages, and states that the population working in agriculture should move to non-agricultural sectors. This social mobility aimed at accomplishment of a transformation of the residents of the villages and the peasants from agriculture to other sectors which would be expected to result in a more developed life for the population in villages.

The second plan in fact by implementing pro-agriculture policies envisages a village society that will reach to high level life standards by using the advanced technology and information-based methods supports “agrarianization” and “peasantization”. However, the decrease of agricultural dependence in the economy shows the “deagrarianization” character. Although the plan accepts the high quantity of the

peasant form of production, the quality increase and high efficiency in agricultural production have been emphasized clearly as the policy choices.

Third Five Year Development Plan (1973-1977) was prepared at a time after Military intervention of 1971, when the whole Country policies were renewed with the regeneration of the Turkish political environment. In that context, the plan was comprehensive with 1077 pages including sector by sector policy interventions, econometric assumptions for each sector and macro projections for the long term. In the plan, it has been emphasized that the share of agriculture in economy and employment should be decreased while the share of industry in employment and economy should be increased. The plan raised the importance for the alignment to Customs Union with the EU.

The plan refers to the development efforts of the first two plan periods and concludes that Türkiye has achieved a higher growth rate than the average growth rate of other developed and developing countries in terms of GDP. However, it is emphasized that the sole increase in the GDP cannot solve the main problems and to close the gap regarding economic, social and cultural development differences between Türkiye and other developed countries. It has been stated that a rapid economic, social and cultural structure transformation, driven by a deep-rooted industrialization, is necessary in order to close the development gap and to solve problems. This transformation cannot be achieved in the short run due to limited resources and the low absorptive capacity of the economy and society. For this reason, the plan stresses a forward-looking and a new perspective for the long-term.

In this framework, the unique feature of the plan is that it envisages a new long term strategy until 1995 when the Customs Union would be completed. This new longterm strategy replaced the strategy adopted in 1962 for fifteen-year perspective, and served for the new era of emerging developments and imperatives for achieving the transition to a Customs Union with the EEC. For this reason, the need to prepare a new strategy targeting the year 1995 has occurred. The new targets have been put for changes in economic and social structure to become an industrialized society. In order to achieve these targets, the long term strategy identified to make reforms in public administration

and to make changes in SEEs to become more effective and dynamic. Besides, reforms were foreseen in agriculture, law, justice, finance and education. The new strategy was based on the acknowledgment that these reforms were compulsory. These reforms would remove the obstacles for the rapid development and enable the rapid creation of an era for the investments and services. Thus, Turkish new development era was based on the economic and state reforms. The new development indicators have been established on the increase of the share of the industry in the GDP and growth of the industry and technology.

In order to reach the targeted income level and economic structure for the end of the perspective period, a “faster and stronger” industrialization than the first two planning periods was envisaged. This necessitates the intensification of resources in this area and the use of these resources in a way that will rapidly create a strong industry. In this context, it was aimed not only to reach a higher income level, but to reach a higher level of economic structure. The rate of increase in GDP was considered as one of the aspects of the development of structural change in the economy. For this reason, the plan pointed out that the rate of increase in GDP was necessary but not sufficient on its own in terms of being an indicator of development. It was deemed necessary to act from a new concept in the evaluation of the development with indicators; (i) GDP growth rate, (ii) The share of industrial income in GDP and its marginal contribution to GDP, (iii) The annual average growth rate of industrial production (mining, manufacturing industry, energy); and composition of industrial production, (iv) Annual average growth rate of investments allocated to industry and its share in total investments.

In third planning period in line with the long-term new strategy, the following policies have been chosen for the agriculture sector;

- (i) Keeping the rate of development in agriculture sector at a level that would not cause bottlenecks and inflation in the economy,
- (ii) Raising the living standard of the farmers,
- (iii) Development of technology and increase of yield,
- (iv) Meeting the domestic demand of the rapidly increasing population,
- (v) Improvement of nutritional balance,

(vi) Using the export potential of the sector particularly for the establishment of Custom Union with the EEC.

To conclude; the third plan emphasized that it had not been possible to solve all the problems and to achieve significant structural changes during the two plan periods. The third plan envisaged a new perspective of 22 years dating back to 1995 when the alignments for Customs Union would be completed. The targets were determined by a different approach. Moreover, this new perspective was the result of the necessity to adapt the rapid changes occurring in the outside world, to acquire the new technological development, to solve the problems faced by the Turkish economy and to establish strong relations with the EEC. In this perspective, different from the perspective of the first two plans, the aims to be achieved in 1995 would be based on (i) increase of income level and (ii) form a production structure using development potentials by eliminating bottlenecks.

The first sentences of the Fourth Five-Year Development Plan (1978-1983) were remarkable to understand the growing economic, social and cultural problems and the situation in the Country:

Although fundamental efforts achieved to maintain the development breakthroughs carried out since the first years of the Republic, Türkiye is under the pressure of major internal and external problems. The society is faced with the necessity of recovery and solving the unavoidable problems.

The milestones to be achieved at the end of plan period have been defined as rapid industrialization, institutional arrangements to provide resources and important breakthroughs in export. At the end of the plan, it is targeted to reach to an era that the Country can meet the needs with its own resources and opportunities and would be in a position to export to other countries. The plan identifies four main targets; to become self-sufficient especially for chemical fertilizers, pesticides and vegetable oils, opening of economy to the outside world, social justice and reaching high income levels. It is envisaged to create a new institutional structure that will easily enable the development process.

A “healthy, balanced and equity based development model” is envisaged for solving inadequacies in infrastructure particularly energy, transportation and communication and the imbalances between rural-urban, intra-regional and interregional created by rapid urbanization. Within the framework of the development model; it is aimed to realize the effective management of SEEs, to establish public entrepreneurship and cooperatives, to prevent unemployment and to increase productivity especially in the agricultural sector.

In the plan, the agricultural sector was evaluated extensively and the agricultural sector was underlined as the main element for development. In particular, it has been stated to seek new markets for agriculture, livestock and aquaculture in order to increase exports and opportunities with the EEC. It was emphasized to issue the regulations for productivity-enhancing and to encourage establishment of cooperatives.

To improve the income distribution among the segments of society; it has been determined as a priority to ensure a healthy transition from agriculture to industrial society with the contribution of the villagers. The plan envisages the establishment of a new production channel through village-towns (köy-kent) for an effective land reform, democratic cooperatives, state regulation and support for peasants. This tool is used to increase the development opportunities, production power and income of the peasants, to accelerate the development in rural areas and to raise the level of living standards in villages. The köy-kent projects would start the industrial investments based on agriculture, animal husbandry and forestry in villages. Moreover, public initiatives and cooperatives would be supported. It has been stated as a priority in the plan to enact the Agricultural Labor Law in order to find jobs for agricultural workers, to protect workers' rights and to ensure their social security.

Within the general context of the fourth plan, instead of the term “development-kalkınma”, it is noticed that the word “gelişme-evolution” has been used in every part. The fourth plan has been characterized for its broad importance to the peasant and agrarian question with the project called “köy-kent”. The “globalization” term cannot be seen in any part of the plan. Although the problems of agriculture were huge at this period, the plan emphasized self-sufficiency in the country.

To conclude; when the planned period started in 1963, the problems of the Country and the goals and targets were evaluated by a 15-year long-term perspective in order to use the socio-economic potential of Türkiye. In order to use this potential in the best way, the direction of policies was decided with medium-term plans. The priorities and strategy of the first two plans have been designed in order to eliminate the bottlenecks and to provide the best use of resources. The strategy adopted in the light of the 1963-1977 perspective targeted to realize an average annual increase of the GDP as 7% per year by achieving a balanced development between the agriculture and industry sectors, solving the employment problem, reaching the balance of payments, diversification of exported goods, ensuring of the sufficient number of qualified scientists and technical personnel. It was emphasized that these targets would be realized in accordance with the principles of social justice. The first and second plans were prepared in the light of this perspective; while the first plan focused on “basic structure” investments, the employment problem and reorganization issues, the second plan adopted the principles of making the industrial sector a driving sector in the economy and benefiting from urbanization.

However, in the third plan period, making reference to new developments and needs particularly coming from the requirements for establishment of Customs Union, a new long-term development strategy was adopted targeting the economic structure, level of development, the modernization of the society and relations with the EEC. The long-term goals would be achieved by the efficient use of the scarce resources, by the necessary reorganizations in the institutional structure and by the effective use of the development tools.

The policy choices in these four plans show the feature of the structural transformation in agriculture which occur by the declining shares of agriculture in employment and economy, as a result the increase per capita income occurs and economy becomes an industrial one. This is an empirical regularity for the development of a country (Johnston B.F., and Mellor J.W., 1961, pp.566-572; Byerlee et.al, 2009, pp.15). This economic development model occurs by the relocation of labor from the agricultural sector to the industrial sector or from on-farm activities to off-farm activities like rural tourism, handicrafts or niche markets (Byerlee et.al, 2009, pp.16). This situation is clearly observed in the development process of all developed countries. The main

target of these four plans were to accomplish this economic development model. In that context, the share of agriculture in national income and employment decreased constantly during these four plan periods. As a matter of fact, the share of agricultural sector in the GDP decreased from 35.7% to 26.2% between 1963 and 1971. The third plan which is welcoming this decrease of agriculture in GDP, however, points out that the value and quality of the agricultural production should be increased by intensive agriculture methods. The fourth plan foresees the continuation of this trend in terms of the speed and forming of industrialization by the "New Strategy" and puts a target of the decrease of agriculture share in GDP to around 12% in 1995. The plan envisages increase in the yield in the long term with the decreasing share of the agriculture sector in the economy but increasing share of industry.

Although these plans favor the low and middle income small producers particularly peasant form of production in the framework of the agricultural supports policy to achieve the targets of agricultural production, the acquisition of structural transformation in order to become a developed country shows “*deagrarianization*”. In the implementation of agricultural support policy, price and intervention purchases as well as agricultural extension and training, agricultural organization and technological development supports are determined essential tools. Moreover, the input supports and low interest rate agricultural credits have been continued in the support schemes. Regarding the peasant question, these plans recognize the peasant mode of production and acquire the policies favoring the peasants like community development programs, köy-kent projects, village development initiatives and development of off-farm activities for peasants.

4.2. Swinging Policy Choices

The Fifth Five-Year Development Plan (1985-1989) has quite differing policy approach from the previous ones which can be characterized as the start of export oriented strategies and liberal economy. Moreover, relations between Türkiye and the EC entered a period of revival, Türkiye applied for full membership to the EC in 1987. The fulfillment of customs union obligations, which had been postponed continuously

since 1977 and due to the coup d'état in 1980, was resumed in 1987 when the EC completely abolished the customs duties applied to Turkish agricultural products.

The main purpose of the plan was to increase the welfare of the society by opening up of the Turkish economy to the outer environment and by implementation of development policies giving priority to exports. The plan envisaged minimizing public interventions, incorporating the private sector into the economy, implementing foreign trade and foreign capital policy, increasing infrastructure and housing investments, and reducing interregional development disparities. Within the framework of these aims, the first steps have been taken for transition from interventionist state to liberal form of state in order to implement free market economy rules. The plan also foresees the reorganization of relations with the EC in line with the policy of opening up of the economy.

The plan referring to the structural and organizational problems of agriculture as low productivity, fragmented small holders and its high dominance in economy and employment envisages to modernize the agricultural sector and production methods. It is foreseen to encourage new production opportunities in order to increase the income of the villagers and farmers, and to provide auxiliary services to the farmers for the evaluation of the goods produced in the villages. The effective use of soil and water resources, the use of qualified seed and fertilizer and increasing the crop and animal production by using the inputs effectively were identified as the strategic priorities. Agricultural reform and technological development practices were chosen as policy objectives targeting to increase the productivity and efficiency.

The plan aims to create a seed industry that allows for the development of high-yielding plant products. Thus, supplying farmers with high yielding and qualified seed varieties is targeted. Encouraging inflows of foreign capital in seed investments is emphasized. The plan gives high priority to the irrigation investments due to the South-Eastern Anatolia Project (GAP) which was being implemented as a big agricultural project of that time. The plan requires improvement of necessary services provided to the villages in order to resolve the development gaps between the villages and the

cities by providing drinking water, electricity, communication, health, education and infrastructure services.

The plan foresees the implementation of “Integrated Rural Development Projects” in order to increase the income of people living in rural areas, to contribute to their social and cultural development and to accelerate the development of villages. In addition, preventing the fragmentation of lands by inheritance, accelerating the practice of consolidation, diversifying farmer incomes, developing services that will support villagers and farmers in reaching the market, and making necessary arrangements for the producer to reach the consumer in a short way have been determined as measures for agricultural development. The plan aims to develop the priority regions, especially Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia Regions, thus to reduce the development gap between these regions and other regions. Allocation of budget and creation of special funds for infrastructure investments in priority regions are planned.

The core objectives and policies of the Sixth Five-Year Development Plan (1990-1994) is to raise the welfare level of the Turkish nation in a free and safe environment in line with the principles of an open society and a competitive economy. The plan aims at improving income distribution in a balanced and stable development process, reducing unemployment and regional development disparities. The plan gave importance to the protection of economic and social stability by ensuring growth and prosperity in an environment of free competition and market rules. The plan emphasizes the efficiency and production increase to be provided through an industry working at optimum capacity and accelerated investments for high production in the short term. This approach implies the policy changes in the way of upraising the use of the dynamism of the private sector. This plan differs from other previous plans since the state role is changed. The state has taken the role of guidance and encouragement in order to raise the economic activities of private sector and create an economic structure for international integration and liberalization. Thus, the macro-economic policies that have been determined for the planning period showed sharp policy orientation from the import substitution policies to the export oriented strategies and from state led economy to free market economy.

The plan gives high importance regarding relations between Türkiye and ECs. The priorities for European integration were determined under a separate chapter. It was foreseen to reduce the trade barriers in accordance with the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), Ankara Agreement and Additional Protocol by taking into account the goal of full membership to the EC. Thus the introduction of new polity goal has been defined as the full membership and integration with the ECs. In line with this goal, the acceleration of the preparatory and harmonization efforts for the fulfillment of the Community's Internal Market conditions have been prioritized. The plan has pointed out that the negotiations between Türkiye and the Community would be initiated and the Internal Market would be realized by the end of the planning period. In this context, the plan prioritized the gradual reduction of customs duties on imports of industrial products from the Community, the fulfillment of tariffs applied on imports from third countries in line with the Community's common customs tariff and the liberalization of imports from the Community. Thus, the policy choice has been to reduce the protection measures for imports in order to increase the competitiveness and foreign trade. The priorities are explained as;

The determination of the exchange rate within the market conditions will be maintained and the necessary environment will be created for the Turkish currency to become convertible. The liberalization of the foreign trade regime will continue. Foreign trade taxes and related funds will be simplified. It will be ensured that the relative price structure in the economy is formed in a way that does not create deviations against exports. International agreements will be taken into account not to disrupt the foreign trade.

The main objective defined for agriculture has been to modernize production methods, to reduce the dependence of production on weather conditions, to meet the food needs of the increasing population and to enhance the exports of agricultural products. In the plan, marketing measures were also foreseen in order to evaluate the goods produced by those living in rural areas and to increase their income. The plan necessitated to modernize information systems, develop joint cooperation and exchange projects to benefit from European funds. Moreover, it was foreseen to ensure the necessary harmonization with the Community's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

Under the title of developments and targets in economic sectors, the priorities for agriculture have been identified as follows; the main policy towards the SEEs is to increase their economic efficiency and privatization. The plan describes the reasons for the privatization of SEEs in the way that more profitable and efficient operation of these institutions would be ensured within a modern management approach. It was foreseen that the privatization policy and increase of their competitiveness in domestic and international markets would increase the quality of the goods and services produced by SEEs. It was also emphasized that this process of privatization would speed the process of becoming a full member of the EC. Thus, the acceleration of the SEEs privatization for increasing of their competitiveness and efficiencies within the framework of modern management approach can be also characterized as one of the important measures in the way of the liberalization.

For the first time in the plan, the main framework of the agricultural support policy was matched with the price and inflation policy, and the support payments in agriculture were blamed for increasing inflation. It was denoted that agricultural support policy had to maintain stability in agricultural income, to construct marketing facilities and to increase productivity. In line with this, the plan has envisaged the determination of the scope of agricultural supports by considering economic and social criteria. Thus, the plan has characterized the new agricultural support mechanism and pointed out the reorganization of price and purchasing supports in the way not to create inflationary pressures in the budget. This new support instruments have been characterized as out of price supports such as credits, agricultural training and extension, agricultural organization and technological development. They have been emphasized in addition to price policy in increasing and promoting agricultural production. Moreover, the plan has pointed out the increase of the efficiencies of the Agricultural Sales Cooperatives Unions (ASCUs) to work rationally and become self-sufficient. The plan also brought forward the development of an agricultural insurance system.

The principles and policies that have been determined for the agriculture sector have been listed in the plan. These policies were;

- Determination of the support prices of agricultural products in order to provide stability in farmer income and orienting production with a general balance between the economy and foreign prices,
- Strengthening of research, training and extension services
- Providing support for small and medium-sized enterprises for usage of high quality inputs, processing and marketing of agricultural products by cooperatives and providing credits to increase the production of products whose demand cannot be met domestically,
- Increasing the quality of agricultural products, improvement studies and activities for standardization,
- Increasing the plant production, aquaculture and animal husbandry,
- Increasing irrigation facilities and forestry activities through the GAP Project,
- Completion of the necessary work for harmonization of the legislation and necessary structural changes within the framework of integration with the EC.

The Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) is included in the plan as an important regional and agricultural development tool, especially under the title of soil and water resources. The importance of the irrigation of agricultural lands and forestry activities within the scope of the GAP is underlined. In order to minimize the effects of climatic conditions and other ecological factors that cause loss of agricultural production, the policies to increase the use of fertilizers, the opening of new irrigation areas, the narrowing of fallow areas and the realization of second and third crop projects came to the fore.

The targets and priorities of "food industry" are discussed under a separate title in the plan. The food industry, in particular, has been designated as a target sector in order to achieve export targets, and the development of the "fruit-vegetable processing industry" has assumed an important role in the plan. The principles and policies determined for the food industry show that the development of the food industry rather than agriculture is the main target of the plan, making agriculture a tool in the food production chain and food industry.

In addition, foreign trade and competition opportunities of the food sector have been highlighted: *“The development of the food industry will be based on maximum using of the existing capacities. Incentives will be given for modernization of the enterprises and use of technological innovations”*. The plan gives importance to the investments in order to increase competitive opportunities of food sector in the foreign market. As it is understood clearly, the food sector with the creation of new capacities, the modernization of existing facilities, the fulfillment of the standards of the EC have been determined as the target sector for the Customs Union to be established with the EC in near future. The food industry and processing of agricultural products have been identified as an instrument to produce goods at high standards and quality that can compete in the domestic and foreign markets. So, the plan envisaged diversification of the food products, encouragement of the new markets and increase of industrial products that have high added value in exports.

The basic principle of the regional development is identified as a balanced development between regions and increased welfare of the people. The main objective is to develop the priority regions, especially the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia Regions, economically, socially and culturally, and thus to reduce the development gap between the regions. Necessary policy and planning tools as well as the public resources have been allocated to ensure economic and social development and integration of these lagging behind regions.

The basic principle of the plan is to facilitate the flow of services and information in accordance with contemporary needs in rural areas. In order to bring dynamism to the rural areas, within the framework of the "rural area planning" approach, the services and agriculture-based industrial investments are chosen as policy tools directed to the central villages.

The Plan highlights the following measures for rural areas;

- Performing necessary arrangements and researches for the rational use of land in order to increase the income of rural areas,
- Eliminating of defects on agricultural structure by projects,

- Encouragement of new rural area economic activities in order to increase employment in rural areas and diversify income and non-agricultural economic activities,
- Diversification and increase of non-formal education programs and projects organized to raise the educational and cultural levels of families living in rural areas,
- Initiation of the integrated projects implementing rapidly developing agricultural technologies in cooperation with the research and education institutions, universities and public institutions.

Clearly saying these two plans were policy means to improve the Turkish economy that entered into a severe crisis in 1970's as a result of the inward industrialization policies based on import substitution and the inability to adapt to rising oil prices. The growth rate first slowed down, then turned negative, inflation rapidly accelerated, and due to the inability to provide sufficient resources for the financing of imports, goods shortages arose in the domestic market, thus caused big crisis in economy, state and rule of law after mid-70s. In that context, the fifth plan includes a stability program in order to overcome the economic results of crisis and bring the economy to a dynamic structure suitable for the international competitive environment. Those decisions targeting to accelerate development and strengthening structural adjustment, reduced the inflation rate, increased exports, efficiency and the domestic saving rates. An industrialization policy led by exports was adopted. In the economy, a liberal system and free market conditions in determining prices were agreed. The economic program was based on industrialization by the private sector and intensifying of infrastructure investments by the public. Within this framework, the economic policy has changed from state-led to market oriented by liberalization of foreign exchange regime and import restrictions.

In these two plans more emphasis is placed on education, health and agriculture sector investments. Although the plans emphasized that the Turkish industry and economy would be made more open to competition and free-market condition and stressed the pursue of policies to increase competitiveness, the "*determination of sensitive sectors*" for which some protective measures could be taken into consideration during the process for fulfillment of the obligations for the membership to the EC. Thus, it is

clear that “agricultural sector” can be classified as the sensitive sector during these two planning periods. This means agriculture sector, though the plan has foreseen liberalization policies, severe economic limitations and strict rules to remedy the economic burden, has been protected somehow, swinging policies between the free market rules and state controlled supports.

To conclude, despite these plans can be characterized as the first plan for the start of the export-oriented policies and the liberalization polity, the big structural burdens of agriculture prevented the implementation of these new policy choices of liberal economy to agriculture. The state continued to its intervening role to agriculture particularly on agricultural subsidies. The foreign investments and private sector initiatives have been welcomed in other sectors but agriculture remained under the state control due to its structural problems. On the other hand, although the strategic importance of agriculture in the economy and employment has been recognized, the diversification of the economic activities to non-agricultural activities in the villages (deagrarianization) have been pointed out in the plan which can be interpreted as the bifurcations in policy between admitting and denying the agrarian question of the country. These two plans have also the similar characteristics from the perspective of peasant form of production, while recognizing the small sized, low capacity agriculture in villages. The plans brought to the agenda the food industry by supporting of agricultural production to provide raw material for processing industry in order to prepare the Country for alignment to Customs Union and compete in the international markets which means on the other side, a policy of depeasantization. These plans have also chosen policies directed to villages for providing rural infrastructure services under the rural development projects instead of village development which can be interpreted as the introduction of new terms and definitions for describing villages as “*rural areas*”. However, this period can be characterized as the transition period showing “*policy swings*” regarding agriculture between protective and liberalized interventions.

4.3. Turning Points for Policy and Polity

The Seventh Five-Year Development Plan (1996-2000) shows distinctive features with respect to other development plans since it can easily be noticed that the plan has been written in an environment that considers the recent developments in the world and the EU. The year 1995 was an important date because the Customs Union between EU and Türkiye was founded. Moreover, the World Trade Organization (WTO), the main institution for determining common rules for global trade was established that year. Within this framework the first part of the plan has been concentrated on these developments in the world and in Türkiye. The main goal and principles of the plan have been identified as;

The Plan will carry Türkiye to the 21st century to get the highest benefits of globalization and to ensure that our country will take its distinguished place among developed world countries. The customs union established between Türkiye and the EC, will bring new opportunities for Türkiye while creating new responsibilities. In order to accomplish this development, the need for reform and innovation is essential. Structural decisions need to be taken and transformations should be applied quickly. During the Plan period, the macroeconomic and structural adjustment policies are to be implemented in an integrated manner to create a stable and sustainable growth.

The plan is addressed with a new strategic approach. The main structural transformation projects have been identified in the plan, one of which has been determined as the “*transformation of the agriculture sector*”. While entering the seventh plan period, the importance of agriculture in the economy is gradually decreasing but a significant part of the population still continues to be dependent on agriculture for their living. According to 1994 data, 66.7% of agricultural production corresponded to plant production, 25.2% to livestock, 2.7 percent to forestry and 5.3 percent aquaculture production. Due to the lack of land use plans, the increase in the uses of agricultural lands for non-agricultural purposes and erosion, agricultural areas were decreasing, and the share of small enterprises was increasing as a result of the deterioration of land ownership. According to the 1980 General Agricultural Census, the number of agricultural holdings, which was 3 million 434 thousand, increased to 4

million 92 thousand in 1991. While the share of enterprises under 5 hectares in total enterprises was 61.1 percent in 1980, this ratio increased to 65.4 percent in 1991. The incomes of those employed in the agricultural sector are lowest compared to other sectors.

In response to the agricultural sector problems specified in the plan, the main target has been determined as *"to ensure a balanced and adequate nutrition of the growing population, to increase production and exports by focusing on products that have a comparative advantage, and to increase and stabilize producer incomes"*.

Considering that agricultural areas have reached marginal limits, it has been underlined that increasing production will only be possible by increasing productivity. For this reason, it has been determined as a priority to increase the irrigation of agricultural areas and to use modern irrigation systems, especially in the Konya Plain and Central Anatolia Region. In addition to increasing the irrigated areas, it has been planned to increase the efficiency and quality of production by increasing the use of fertilizers and high-yielding/good quality seeds, by making the soil analysis, by implementing awareness raising programs, proper training and extension services, by choosing appropriate machinery and equipment and struggling with the agricultural pests.

Policies in agriculture are stated as follows;

- Agricultural policies will be implemented in line with the necessities for alignment to EC CAP and in the context of the agricultural provisions of the WTO,
- Agricultural support policies will be restructured on the basis of the development of production in accordance with market signals under free competition conditions and considering the more rational use of public resources,
- Government interventions in the prices of agricultural products will be reduced and Direct Income Support (DIS) will be given to registered producers, input support will be removed gradually, cultivation areas will be limited by taking into account the excess supply, product quality, types and land conditions,

- Land consolidation and on-farm development services will be activated in the areas opened to irrigation within the framework of the GAP, and their compatibility with irrigation investments will be ensured,
- Product exchanges, markets and related infrastructure will be developed, and producers can get a larger share from the prices formed in the free market and agricultural products can be marketed in a competitive environment,
- The establishment of producer unions and the development of cooperatives will be encouraged to operate for marketing of agricultural products and providing services to producers. In addition, the managements of Agricultural Sales Cooperatives Unions will become autonomous, their production and evaluation units and affiliates will be privatized,
- A system of insurance of agricultural products will be developed in order to stabilize farmer incomes,
- Seed breeding, vaccination, artificial insemination and agricultural struggle will be carried out by the private sector,
- Remote Sensing Method will be used in agricultural sector activities. The collection and dissemination of statistical information will be brought to a certain system,

Legal and institutional arrangements have been determined to achieve these goals;

- In order to solve the structural problems of the agricultural sector and to achieve the determined agricultural policy objectives, a Restructuring Board in Agriculture consisting of the representatives of the relevant public and private sector organizations that determine the policies and direct the activities in this sector will be established,
- In order for the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs to more effectively fulfill its duties, the Ministry will be reorganized with a new law,
- For the Agricultural Sales Cooperative Unions to have an autonomous structure that can provide better service to their members and to perform their cooperative services more effectively, and for the separation of cooperatives and management activities; Law No 3186 and Law No 2834 on Agricultural Sales Cooperatives and Unions will be amended,

- Producer Unions Law will be enacted, and producer unions will be established, to create the necessary infrastructure for the producers in the production and marketing channels.

The seventh plan can be characterized as the start point for the fast liberalization, de-peasantization and *de-agrarianization* of Turkish agriculture. The agrarian question had no meaning in policy choice and the importance of the polity was directed on the accession process to the EC and the main target was full integration to the global world.

The Eight Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005) was prepared in an environment where a new development with regard to integration with EU happened. Türkiye was decided to be as EU candidate country with the Helsinki Summit held on 10-11 December 1999 and a pre-accession strategy to be developed after the Summit would determine the reforms and legislation required for Türkiye's membership. In that context, the EU expressed that Türkiye would benefit from the Community programs and funds in the accession process. In line with this new dynamism, the plan mentions globalization and liberalization as the main drivers for the accomplishment of the economic development. In that context the plan emphasizes the improvement and institutionalization of human rights and democracy, diffusion of education and health services, reduction of poverty and improvement of working conditions.

The plan envisages the preparation of a National Program for Türkiye concerning the adoption of the EU *acquis* and in line with this program the financial assistance would be provided in pre-accession period. It is prioritized the achievement of the accession requirements and the necessary preparations for the start of the accession negotiations since the declaration of Türkiye's candidacy in Helsinki Summit means the direction of a financial assistance similar to those provided to other candidates within the framework of Accession Partnership.

With the decision of Türkiye for the candidate status for the EC, the agricultural policy was directed for alignment to EC Common Agricultural Policy. Moreover, the full membership process brought about the acquisition of the obligations envisaged by the WTO Agriculture Agreement which started the process of the structural changes of

the Turkish agriculture with operating of political instruments to implement the market conditions instead of state interventions and input subsidies. Moreover, formation and supporting of organized and contracted farmers, development of alternative crop schemes and accelerating initiatives for restructuring public institutions and organizations concerning agriculture have been envisaged as the new policy measures in the plan.

The policy change is justified in the plan by making reference to statistical information.

As of the year 1999, the share of the agricultural sector in GDP was 15 %. An important part of the farms is in low productivity. Most of the workers in agriculture are unwaged family workers. This group accounts to 50% in the working group and they are the poorest. The share of agricultural employment in total employment was 45.1 %. The presence of this high amount of unproductive labor force in the agricultural sector limits the efficiency of the labor force market. This high level of agricultural employment in Türkiye while it is no more than 5 percent in developed countries, has negative influences on the labor market and development.

The abundance of unpaid family workers within the labor market has also been pointed out as the most profound problem of the Turkish agriculture (the ratio of unpaid family workers in the agriculture sector represented 57.8 percent, women workers represent a share of 64.2 percent).

The plan addressing this high share of agricultural employment in the total employment and low efficiency of the labor force in the agricultural sector stresses that this situation limits the efficiency of the labor force market and development. As a result, the policies of the plan target to change this agrarian structure to industrial by transferring employment from agriculture to non-agricultural sectors, services and industry. Moreover, in order to achieve the macroeconomic stability and efficient and productive economic structure, the plan highlights the structural reform programs that have been selected as the policy choices on the issues of agricultural subsidy, social security, public fiscal management and transparency, tax policy, control and supervision of banking system.

With regard to agriculture, the plan stressed that the previously implemented agriculture supporting policies have not stabilized the producer income. The agricultural intervention prices which have been over the world prices led to the excessive plantation of supported crops, the production surplus and the state's over purchasing which in turn resulted in excessive purchases by the government with high cost of stocks. This caused to a high inventory cost and economic burden. Thus, the plan again put the blame on the agricultural support policies for the cause of economic burden of that time like sixth and seventh plans. In order to remedy this, the plan envisages a new agricultural support scheme that was called Direct Income Support (DIS) to be implemented after 2001. In fact, the DIS was determined an important instrument to solve the obstacles and structural deficiencies of agriculture.

This period was a new platform for the development of the regional planning and giving new impetus for the development of the agriculture sector in the regions where new regional development programmes were to be implemented. The Eastern Anatolia Project Master Plan (DAP) was prepared covering economic and social sectors mainly the agriculture and animal husbandry, giving importance to the territorial dimension to plan phenomenon. This period was also characterized for the development of new rural development projects in Bingöl, Muş, Yozgat, Ordu, Giresun, Sivas, Erzincan, Gümüşhane, Bayburt and Rize provinces by financial resources taken from International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

This period has sound in the framework of the transformation of agricultural policies through the implementation of Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP) which stated in 2001. The objectives of this reform agenda were to establish an organized, highly competitive and sustainable agricultural sector, which considers the dimensions of economic, social, environmental and international development as a whole, within the framework of the principle of efficient utilization of resources. Under ARIP, the DIS implementations started in order to align to the CAP and fulfil the commitments of the Agricultural Agreement of the WTO. The plan blaming the government interventions on agricultural commodity prices, which had negative impacts on market prices pointed out the new market conditions and new support scheme. Thus, the fundamentals of the agricultural policies were determined within

the framework of commitments envisaged in the Agricultural Agreement of the WTO, and on the path to the membership to EU. Thus, the start of ARIP was a turning point for agricultural policies and polity. Although the liberalization of other sectors started before, strategic importance of agriculture hindered the speed of liberalization and the protective policies on agriculture had continued before the eight plan. In that context, the period after 2001 was remarkable for the start of implementation of liberal and fully competitive policies in agriculture. So the principles of the agricultural policies targeted to complete the alignment to the EU agriculture and rural development policies, to carry out the obligations of the WTO Agriculture Treaty, to follow developments of international trade and to fully integrate with globalization.

4.4. New Anchors of Policy and Polity

The Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013) is unique with regard to all its aspects. First of all, the Plan was the first one which ruined the main characteristic of previous plans which were prepared for five years. Thus, the ninth plan was prepared for seven years in order to be in line with the fiscal period of EU.

The look at the first sentences of the plan (2007-2013) shows clearly the framework of the policy and polity differing from other plans. The plan clarifying the new era of the world in multi-dimensional, rapid, and intense competition inherits the globalization and neoliberalization by “*transformations of Türkiye in economic, social, and cultural areas in an integrated approach*”. This implies that new policy choices have been adopted which were full transformation of the Country in coherence with the international developments in the world, harmonization with the EU and competition with the globalization.

The Plan characterized an approach for the finalization of the accession process to the EU and the completion of the Membership negotiations with the EU composing of 33¹ chapters, which started 3 October 2005. The Plan consist of structural changes for all

¹ It was 35 chapters in the context of Negotiation Framework. Chapter 34-Institutions and Chapter 35-Other Issues are addressed at the very last stage of the negotiations.

sectors targeting for the full membership. In that context the vision of the Plan was identified as; *“Türkiye, a country of information society, growing in stability, sharing more equitably, globally competitive and fully completed her coherence with the European Union”*.

The plan adopts a strategical approach for the realization of the vision within the framework of the five development axes, which are: 1) Increasing Competitiveness, 2) Increasing Employment, 3) Strengthening Human Development and Social Solidarity, 4) Ensuring Regional Development, 5) Increasing Quality and Effectiveness in Public Services. The policies for the agricultural sector were dealt under the first axes; “Increasing Competitiveness” and fourth axes “Ensuring Regional Development” divided in two pillars cloned from the EU Common Agricultural Policy, “Agriculture” and “Rural Development”.

Increasing Competitiveness is the first development axis of the plan, which accounted an approach for increasing competition, developing technology, information and communication in order to specialize in international markets and to raise the competitiveness of all sectors. The “economic development” has been chosen as the main strategy. The production of knowledge intensive, high value-added products and services have become main instruments for the achievement of the strategy.

Making reference to the eight plan’s structural reforms for productivity increases, the ninth plan emphasized that competitiveness in the Country have not been sufficiently improved for the effective competition with the world. The main reasons for this failure were defined as; incompetence of the business era, financing sector, urban areas and transportation infrastructure, the failure in the development of R&D, information and communication technologies. The high level of informality and the structural problems of the agriculture sector and the inability to shift to a high value-added production structure in industry and services were also represented as the main reasons of the insufficient competitiveness.

The main objective of this axis was to enable an economy having a structure of high technological capability and qualified labor force adapting to changing conditions of

the world and being competitive, stable and highly productive in national and international markets.

The policy basis for agriculture was identified in the plan in line with the “The Agriculture Strategy” (adopted in 2004) and within the framework of the Agricultural Law No. 5488 (enacted in 2006). These two policy instruments characterized to be the first attempts for legislation directly forwarded to the planning of the sector.

The plan addressing these two legislations and targeting primarily the EU accession prioritized to ensuring adequate and reliable food supply for food security and safety as well as sustainable use of natural resources to create an agricultural structure that is highly organized and competitive. While achieving this primary goal “*the necessary transformation in the agriculture sector*” to be competitive with the EU after the Membership have been underlined as the priority. Within the context of this basic and main principle of the achievement of the EU accession; the improvement of the infrastructure of agricultural enterprises, dissemination of the use of information and technologies, orientation from agriculture to industry, establishment of an environment for the production of high value products have been chosen as the strategies. The Plan also emphasized the inclusion of young and women farmers and the producer organizations with strengthened structures in the process.

The target of the agricultural policies was identified under the “*Improving Efficiency of the Agricultural Structure*” axis. It was aimed to increase the welfare level of the producers by developing agricultural production in accordance with domestic and foreign demand, to protect and develop natural and biological resources, to increase productivity, to strengthen food security and safety, to develop producer organizations, to strengthen agricultural markets and to develop rural areas.

The plan also gave the print of the policy change in the institutional structures in the future which also target the EU integration. The public services on phytosanitary, animal health and food safety subjects which were carried out by various authorities would be formed under a single authority within an integrated framework and in line with the EU acquis.

The Plan also highlighted another measure for increasing the plant and animal health and food hygiene and for an agricultural production and marketing stages towards providing food safety from “*the farm to the table*” by the promotion of the training and extension services on the use of agricultural inputs like pesticides, fertilizers and quality seeds and irrigation in line with the EU standards and rules.

The plan highlighted “Regional Development Policies” as a priority axis for the national development, competitiveness and employment by increasing productivity of regions to decrease regional and rural-urban handicaps. In this context; the Plan placed emphasis on activities particularly targeting in each region to build an environment based on local dynamics and accelerating rural development.

The inclusion of this axis in the plan is another tool of the EU policy absorption since the regional development policy has been institutionalized and managed separately in the EU structure. The plan highlighted again the developments in the world for regional and spatial framework and the Law on the Establishment, Coordination and Duties of Development Agencies came into force in 2006 aiming to improve collaboration among the public sector, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations in local and regional development have been addressed as the institutional structure in the future. The regional development agencies have been established on the Official Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) 2 level in 26 regions of Türkiye, which was a comparable statistical database harmonized with the EU regional statistics system in 2002.

The inclusion of the regional development priority as an axis to the plan has enabled the acceleration of the implementation of the Southeastern Anatolia Regional Development Project (GAP), the Zonguldak-Bartın-Karabük Regional Development Project, the Eastern Black Sea Regional Development Plan (DOKAP) and the Eastern Anatolia Project Master Plan (DAP) and the Yeşilırmak Basin Development Project which were prepared in the past. These regional development projects including the measures for the agricultural development provided the integration of the regional development and rural development.

The strategy of “*Ensuring Development in the Rural Areas*” priority has been designed to contribute to the EU membership process and to acquire the necessary requirements for the adoption of the EU rural development institutions and implementations. In that context, the first “National Rural Development Strategy” adopted in 2006 was taken as the basis of the policy orientation for the EU membership process and the accelerating transformation in the agricultural structure and creating a framework for rural development projects and activities.

In the plan, the preparation of a rural development plan in line with the National Rural Development Strategy (NRDS) was envisaged. In rural areas; the reorganization of producer organizations within the framework of integration with the EU, the development of agriculture-based industry and other alternative production activities by using e-commerce, and the development of human resources for agriculture and non-agricultural economic activities have been selected as the policy choices. In this period, the framework of the policies related to ensuring rural development was developed within the scope of harmonization with the EU acquis which would be managed by the implementation of the EU financial support under the rural development programme for the years 2007-2013 called IPARD Programme (Instrument for Pre-Accession Rural Development). Within the scope of IPARD Programme, the implementation of participatory projects that strengthen development initiatives with a bottom-up approach, increasing the efficiency of local governments and their unions, especially provincial special administrations, on rural development, and establishing an institutional framework for harmonization with EU rural development policies were brought to the agenda. The plan prioritized to providing of the basic infrastructure needs and planning of the rural settlements by the start of a project called Village Based Infrastructure Support (KÖYDES).

To conclude, the years after 1995 when the Customs Union between Türkiye and EU was established have been characterized for the start of the transformation of polity and policy choices in agriculture. The polity was turned to liberal state and free economy from interventionist state and mixed economy. When the membership negotiations started in 2005, the EU and the WTO became anchors of policy and polity. The ninth plan’s policy choices that were prescribed in line with the fulfillment of EU alignment studies were implemented without any doubts. In the determination

of policies, the application of EU rules was unquestionably preferred with common consensus. In that context, in the ninth plan period, the policy became technical and scientific.

The policies disregarded the peasant form of production and agrarian question, since the alignment to EU CAP required the elimination of small-sized, inefficient and economically nonviable farms from the system. The DIS favored the big producers and small ones could not achieve their sustainability due to the production decoupled supports under DIS.

To conclude, this period, can be characterized the years of denial the Turkish agriculture structure of peasant mode of production with policy choices accelerating “depeasantization” and “deagrarianization”. In line with the “depeasantization” approach, an important policy choice of this period was noteworthy; it was Metropolitan Law. By this law, the villages and towns were changed into neighborhoods in order to decrease rural tendency of the Country, to show it urban with regard to the EU definitions and to transform the rights of peasants in holding the villages’ public common goods like meadows, pastures, grazing areas and winter quarters under the state’s authority. Although this arrangement resulted in decrease of the agricultural population and villages in statistics, it is a good example how new anchors were effective.

CHAPTER 5

POLITICS OF AGRICULTURE

A better and integrated policy analysis can be possible by better understanding of the potential sources of different values, interests and views. Politics should assume an important role in forming the major policies and in making policy analysis.

This chapter of the thesis provides information about how the Turkish politics is addressed in the development plans by using qualitative content analysis method. Since politics is also an important dimension of policy analysis, the plans have been examined by defined codes related to “politics”. The coding words have been determined as; democracy, party, politics, political economy, constitution, political conjuncture, government, stability, political stability, private sector, civil society, union, foundations, NGOs, cooperative, social welfare, mixed economy, international politics, environment, equity, social justice.

This chapter also includes the analysis of the minutes of Grand National Assembly of Türkiye to understand the politics and their discourses regarding agriculture because the qualitative content analysis of National Development Plans gives provides limited information about the politics. This chapter looks for answers for the research question of the thesis on how politics acted in the policy making and in which way the agricultural politics changed during the planning period.

5.1. Development Plans before 1980

The military coup of 27 May 1960, was the downfall of the Democrat Party ruled government and after this date a new era and approach for planning came to the fore

with the establishment of the State Planning Organization (SPO). The military coup reformed the political structure while a new constitution was drawn up just after the coup in order to reestablish the democratic environment. The first election after the military regime was made in 1961 after which the first multi-party coalition government (Republican People Party and Justice Party) with a strong opposition was challenged in the Country meaning a compromise between divergent views for the political structure and the state (Eastham,1964, pp.133).

The First-Five Year Development Plan was prepared by the newly established State's advisory and planning body which was established by a special law. This organization was later endorsed by the new Constitution of July 1961, fostering the democratic system (Katatas, 1966) which was underlined in the first sentences of the Plan as "*Türkiye has entered a period of planned development within the democratic order*" (p.8). The plan recalling the new Constitution highlighted the three final goals of the Turkish society. These were; successful economic development, political stability and social justice. Particularly, the political stability in the Country was stated to be provided by the accomplishment of the expected economic development and economic stability.

In those days although the political activity was under the hands of "*a small professional and business class*" (Eastham,1964, p.133), the voting power belonged to peasant farmers whose major part was illiterate and had poor economic conditions. In line with this issue, the plan raised great concerns for remodeling of the social structure together with the increase in the national income in line with principle of social justice.

The most important context underlined by the plan is the classification of the Country as "underdeveloped" level compared to the Western countries. In line with this outcome, the plan envisages Türkiye's transition from a primitive economic order to a more advanced production system by provision of state investments and incentives to support the activities of SEEs. In this framework, SEEs became "*one of the main instruments of the overall development*" (Snyder, 1969, p.61). Although, the SEEs have been inefficient and no improvements have been realized for increasing productivity, at the heart of the government policy lies two conflicting objectives

towards the SEEs in the plan. First the SEEs were subject to a policy to make them independent so that they can effectively compete with the private industry in generating their own investments for growth and profit. The second was to assure that they remain an instrument of the government's political economy and from time to time an instrument of politics.

The mixed economy has been chosen the economic model for the implementation of the Plan which made the private sector a core driver of employment and economic growth while state would take the role of leadership and guidance for provision of the incentives, information, training and credits.

One of the most important features of this plan was the implementation of the “*Community Development Programmes- Village Development*”, which was decoded by Eastham (1964, pp.136) “*a revival of Village Institutes*” abolished by the DP regime in 1950’s, thus it has been implied as the return of left politics. So the interventions encouraged under the community programs like incentives for the organization under the cooperatives, selection of bottom-up approach for the policy implementation and the implications for a birth control to hinder the rapid rise of population have been revealed by Eastham (1964, pp.136) as a development politics which awoke oppositions of both ultra-nationalistic and religious parties.

Another considerable feature of the plan was the “*land reform*” accompanied by the “*agrarian reform*” aiming at stopping the fragmentation of small holdings through the consolidation of the scattered small plots, composition of agricultural holdings with viable size, distribution of land. This policy choice was undertaken by Eastham (1964, p.136) as a solution of the problem of the peasant farmer statute and a first step to reach an economic and political stability in the Country.

Although, the plan did not prioritize a policy towards NGOs or CSOs to provide opportunities for organization of civil society, envisaged that worker unions would play an active role to the in politics. Fundamental rights of workers like collective bargaining and strike-lockout were enacted through establishment of an era where the labor force was provided with an equal power of speech and negotiations of their

interests with their employers by enhancement of worker unions. Moreover, the establishment of cooperatives, producer unions, and agricultural chambers was highlighted, although the primary goal was to increase the economic development in agriculture sector and to reach optimal sizes in the small and fragmented agricultural holdings, while the politics side of these society like seeking of their benefits, negotiation and bargaining powers, conflict of interest were missing.

The international politics and foreign relations were underlined under the “outer environment” in which comparative politics was chosen in order to describe the developments in the economic and social structure of the Country. When the plan was drafted, there were no relations with the outer environment and any international organizations since Türkiye had no attempts to apply to any international membership. Neither the plan envisaged any statements or contents regarding the environmental politics.

Within the overall context of the plan, it may be implied that it represents the signs of left politics, with the policies regarding the social equity, community development, agrarian reform, enhancement of cooperatives and state leaded economical approach by the form of mixed economy.

The political structure of the governments in the plan period was first İsmet İnönü lead coalitions and they implemented the plan till the year of 1965, after that time under the leadership of Justice Party, coalition took the flag. The plan implementation period witnessed in a short time ruling coalitions of multi-parties which resulted in the conflicts and disagreements between politics.

Second Five-Year Development Plan represented the implementation of the second five-year period of the Long Term Strategy. The preparation phase of the plan was carried out under a political conjuncture different from the first one. The Justice Party Government lead by Süleyman Demirel as the Prime Minister and the Plan was drafted in an era of single party hegemony. Although the plan showed similar politics to the first one; in giving the priorities to the three main goals as economic development, political stability and social justice, the main goal of the plan envisaged further

progress towards the reassurance of a democratic environment accompanied by increased freedoms, civilization, justice and welfare.

For the purpose of the establishment of effective cooperation between the public and the society, the "*Community Development*" method was chosen to be applied in order to stimulate, educate and organize the civil people. The people were determined as a resource for implementation of development actions effectively, thus, the society would contribute voluntarily and in close cooperation with the public institutions while providing services to them. In that way, the community development programmes were strengthened by village development interventions. One of the interesting features regarding the inclusion of politics in the plan, was the establishment of peasant associations and volunteer workers' camps at universities and training of those participating individuals under the community development programmes.

The plan gave high priority for the construction of an organized society to search for their interest and benefits. The plan highlighted that the social security of the self-employed tradesmen and craftsmen, the self-employed and the independent small farmers showed different characteristics from those of wage earners. These different groups had to be organized in various aid and solidarity organizations such as unions, associations, cooperatives and chambers.

The plan highlighted the rapid changing of the social structure of the civil society towards modernization and the interventions to meet the rapidly developing demands to reach the desired welfare level and to accelerate the development with voluntary organizations of workers. Another indicator of politics in the plan was that it was highlighted that society had a say in meeting its demands through the community development programs and village development interventions. The plan emphasized the increase in the influence of the villages in the political field since the needs of the villages had been considered directly at the national level.

While supporting the high and effective organization of civil society and private area, the second plan envisaged a mixed economy which compromise the public and non-

public businesses in line with the common interests without conflict of interests, bargaining or competition with the following words;

Another specific characteristic of the plan different from the first one is that international politics is included in the content of the plan for the first time. Türkiye had already applied for EEC membership and the economic cooperation had already started. The second plan envisaged the necessary works carried out by different institutions in order to strengthen this partnership would be coordinated by the SPO which became the sole authority of the international politics of the Country. The second plan had also no provisions regarding the environmental concerns and environmental politics.

Looking at the political environment when the Third Five-Year Development Plan was prepared, Turkish political era was under the stress of Military intervention of 12 March 1971, and an "supra-party" government which was leaded by Professor Nihat Erim who appointed a technocratic cabinet composed of representatives outside the politicians to carry out the Country's reform process.

The political signs of this government could be seen in the plan in such a way that the plan was differed from the previous ones in design showing very technical approach to reach the objectives. Moreover, planning has been expressed in various parts as a constitutional provision and a requirement of the constitution, thus planning became a political instrument adopted by the nation.

One of the key features of this plan was that it highlighted international politics with great concern almost all parts with the target of Customs Union to be completed in 22 years. The words below were repeated in various parts of the plan;

Türkiye has taken its place in international politics as a part of Europe for centuries. This necessitated Türkiye to make the choice to join the EEC by signature of Ankara Agreement which sets the target for full membership. The Customs Union process started with the signature of Additional Protocol and will be completed in 22 years; thus when it is realized; Türkiye will be subject to Membership.

High priority is given to the establishment and strengthening of cooperatives and their as a follow-up of previous two plans which gave high concerns to the establishment of cooperatives particularly in agriculture sector. The aim of the cooperatives policy in the third plan period was to use cooperatives as a tool in directing the dispersed individual labor, power, skill and saving potential to accelerate economic and social development. Cooperatives were defined as democratic organizations that gave equal rights and responsibilities to their members.

The plan brought to the fore “*the ideal of national exaltation*” and Article 41 of the Constitution under the title of “*order of economic and social life*”. State had to realize economic, social and cultural development through democratic means; for this purpose; it had duty to increase national savings, direct investments to the priorities required by the public interest, and make development plans. In addition, by referring to Article 129 of the Constitution, the plan emphasized that “*economic, social and cultural development given to the State as a duty is tied to the planning*” and that “*development will be carried out according to the plans*”. These sentences implying the political turmoil in that period, they were repeated in various parts of the plan in order to prove the needs for the planning, the legitimacy of the Government and the duty of the Government to make planning under the Constitution.

The plan emphasized the unionization of workers and gave statistics about the increase values of union, however; no interventions were pointed out in the plan how to guide the unions in the long-term strategy. On the other hand, the plan pointed out the growing importance of the social savings institutions, voluntary foundations and associations in the economy in terms of their investments as well as private and public sector investments. The following statements of the plan highlighted the emergence of the civil society organizations in the politics and economy.

In recent years, a third sector, consisting of social savings institutions, foundations and associations, has emerged in the economy in addition to the public and private sectors. Directing the activities of this sector in line with the objectives of the plan will enable to positively affect a significant part of the use of resources outside the public sector. In Annual Programs, targets and investments of this type will be shown to such organizations as the third sector.

Community Development and regional approach of first two plans were dismissed, while the territorial approach was downgraded to the province level instead. In line with this approach, the preparations of master plans for each provinces of the Country were included in the agenda.

Another new feature was the inclusion of the environmental politics for the first time in planning which could be interpreted as the reflection of the European interests and national concerns. Moreover, the inclusion of environment related politics showed that Türkiye began to come under the influence of industrial development in similar way with advanced capitalist countries (Aksu, 2014).

In the period of the preparation of the Fourth Five-Year Development Plan (1979-1983), Türkiye was under the pressure of major internal and external problems, as well as a fundamental effort to achieve and sustain the development breakthroughs carried out since the first years of the Republic. The society was faced with the necessity of recovery and solving significant problems. The mid 70's when the preparation of the Plan started, the Country remained unstable with the highly polarized structure of the society and disputes and fights between the two poles. High inflation decreased the public expenditures, and disputes led to protests and strikes. The economic crisis reached to the highest level due to the 1973 oil embargo and Cyprus issue. The ruling party in power during the plan preparation was Bülent Ecevit lead Republican People's Party, so the policies moved to the left politics (Narli, 2000, p. 113).

The introduction part of the plan highlighted that the economic, social and political problems of those days could be solved with courage and hope. These problems were encountered as the results of the rapid growth and democratic development. It can be implied that these hopeful approaches were made in order to relieve the bad atmosphere of those days.

The plan mentioned that self-efficacy, opening to the outside world, social justice and high income level were the main quality differences that distinguished the plan period from the previous periods. Moreover, the significant bottlenecks and problems; the infrastructure deficiencies, especially in energy, transportation and communication, and rural-urban, intra-regional and inter-regional imbalances created by rapid

urbanization could be eliminated with a healthy, balanced and social equity development model. The integrity of the development will be the solution to eliminate the economic, social and political crises.

Within this development model, the following priorities have been chosen for social equity and democratic environment:

- Making regulations that strengthen democracy, increase efficiency and effectiveness in public administration and public enterprises,
- Supporting, disseminating and activating public entrepreneurship and cooperatives,
- Reaching a balance in population movements,
- Reducing unemployment with new measures and projects,
- Providing social security by including the villagers in connection with cooperatives,
- Bringing a new operability for the credit system to support the production and social justice,
- Changing the internal marketing order in a way to protect the producer and the consumer and accelerate the increase in production,
- Realization of equality for nutrition, consumption and urbanization.

The Plan highlighted a democratic and balanced social structure and aims of realizing the basic conditions of a democratic and pluralistic society. In that context, education was chosen one of the most important tools in spreading and strengthening democracy. The dissemination of education at all levels and all geographical areas in connection with the requirements of planned development has gained great importance not only to develop the knowledge required by the economy, but also to develop national cultural values.

Furthermore, the policies for villagers were highlighted in order to improve an equal income distribution among different segments of the society; by equating the development of the villagers with the agricultural development, healthy transition from agriculture to industrial society with the contribution of the villagers was ensured. The strategies to increase the development opportunities, production power and income of the villagers, to accelerate rural development and raising the standard of living have been chosen. The tools for agricultural development were effective land

reform, democratic cooperatives, state regulated supports for peasants, and the establishment of a new production order through the use of köy-kent.

The land reform was identified as a basic rule of democracy and it would be ensured through the peasants' participation in the implementation of the reform process at every stage. These approaches have shown the features of “*agrarian reform*” that ensures a shift of the villagers quickly to production through integration with the cooperative movements, and the state has contributed to this reform process with intense supports.

The Plan has foreseen a new attempt named as “yaygın halk girişimciliği-widespread people entrepreneurship” besides “kamu girişimciliği- public entrepreneurship” which may be encountered as the civil society and public partnership. This new approach may also be evaluated as the starting point of the civil society entrepreneurship capacity development. This new attempt was based on the approach of third sector defined as the enterprises of institutions, associations and foundations that use public funds or the savings of the people (particularly those workers in abroad) to establish economic entrepreneurship. It was highlighted the contribution of the third sector on the economy besides the public and private sector. This approach brought about the first steps for the establishment of collaboration between the society and public on organized entrepreneurship by the investment projects. By this way, Turkish society would be prepared for the project-based investments by gaining experience on determination of entrepreneurship issues, preparation of necessary feasibility studies, preparation of projects and making necessary initiatives for the investment.

The plan also supports another civil society initiative which is the “*Foundation Institutions- Vakıflar*” that have active roles on social assistance and solidarity among citizens and one of the oldest legal phenomena that made substantial contributions to society in economic and social terms throughout history.

The plan has envisaged environmental politics under the title of “environmental problems” addressing soil, water, air pollution and deterioration of the ecological balance, generally as a result of human settlements, industry and agriculture. The plan

highlights that during the 1973-1977 period, public awareness about environmental problems was formed, the problems were defined. The plan has firstly envisaged the establishment of a communication network between the central and local government to ensure the collection of information about environmental policy and implementation. Moreover, first time in the planning, the encouragement of the establishment and works of foundations, associations and voluntary organizations was included in support scheme.

The fourth plan also addressed the re-arrangement and improvement of public affairs, by a new public reform by distributing the authorities to the local administrations and improvement of public works by combining the public entrepreneurship, widespread-people entrepreneurship and increasing of the initiatives of the foundations. Highlighting the democracy, social justice, equity and the Constitution in this reform process, the plan lacked the characteristic of a local governing unit that had autonomy against the central government regarding the working class and strata (TMMOB,1978).

To conclude; the basic approach of all four plans prepared and put into practice in this period has been to ensure economic development by building social justice and democracy. It is seen that the structure of agriculture and the peasantry has been handled on the basis of social equity in the plans. Agrarian reform and distribution of land have been evaluated as approaches in terms of the equal rights of the people living in the villages. Regarding the political perspective in the contents of the plans for this period, it is possible to see the signs that they have adopted the leftist politics, although these plans have been functioning as the tools for determination of policy framework should be neutral in the political framework. On the other hand, although the planning was put into practice in line with the provision of the constitution, it should be underlined that the plans making references to the constitution are a necessity of democracy, which means that planning at that time had a legitimacy concern.

When we look at the agricultural politics and policy approaches, it is stated that the dependence of economy on agriculture should be decreased in order to become a developed economy, and hence the target is to dissolve the peasant mode of

production. However, on the other side, the peasantry is seen as an important power and potential of the country and comes to the forefront as a tool for raising the income and wealth of villages. By the analysis of the political approaches included in the planning content of this period, it is possible to see the findings and signals that politics is implicitly included in the plans under the protective interventions of the state for agriculture sector. In this context, in order to see how agricultural politics took shape, the following section also examines the discourses of politicians in the Parliament before 1980.

5.2. Discourses in the Parliament before 1980

In order to understand and make comments on agricultural politics, the discourses in the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye have been analyzed. The minutes of 1950s have been analysed in order to obtain information about that period and to make the evaluations of the political atmosphere for the 60's. Thus, it is possible to make comments on the changes and breaks between the discourses of the 50s and after 60s.

The discourses of in the Parliamentary minutes before 1960 were full of conflicts and privileges of opinions between the opposition politics and the political power which were used as a political tool during the disputes in the Parliament. Some selected discourses in the Parliament have been included below in order to make a critical evaluation of these days' agenda and political era. The ruling Democrat Party was criticizing People Party's previous interventions in order to legitimize their policies.

During the Budget talks in February 27, 1958; Sırrı Atalay (Kars) stated the need to know better the Turkish peasant and their basis for survival for they relied on agricultural production; livestock and animal breeding. He urged to remember the poor animal husbandry situation during the People's Party's rule and the animal tax system of that time.

On behalf of CHP Assembly group Avni Ural (Uşak) stated that agriculture was the basis of the national economy. He stressed the small-sized agricultural production

structure which formed with family farmers with a size of 46 decares per family, the Turkish peasants could not afford the heavy interests and accumulated debts of Ziraat Bank and nobody was interested on the incapability of peasants for paying the interests of the debt to the bank. Moreover, he added agricultural credits were far from satisfying the small farmer, and they were oriented towards party politics. He brought to the fore the villagers' obstacles to find enough standard seeds. Although the office (TMO) gave seeds to the villagers, the capacities of TMO were not efficient to supply seeds and this problem showed the administrative inefficiencies of the Government.

During the budget talks in February 26, 1959; on behalf of CHP Assembly group Avni Ural (Uşak) again stated the importance of the agriculture sector and its abundance in the Turkish Economy by providing statistics of agriculture. In this context, agriculture corresponded to about 50% of national income and 85-90% of exports. Moreover, 75% of the population was peasant and 85% was engaged in agriculture. He clearly admitted that nearly 5 million families were engaged in farming which had great impacts on the Turkish economy. He continued his words by criticizing the Government due to the high prices of seeds and chemical fertilizers and difficulties to obtain inputs.

In response to the criticisms of the CHP, the DP deputies also criticized the previous interventions of the CHP and praised their services through the Turkish Grain Board (TMO) saying that the TMO was working in a corrupt order before DP government. The relations of the Grain Board with the villagers in terms of price management had been subjected to many complaints. The price policy followed by the Turkish Grain Board and its services for purchasing the grain from producers were quite effective and fair. The services of TMO to the producers were enormous.

During the budget talks in 1960; the problems of obtaining inputs, the high prices and costs for agricultural production, the importance of irrigation facilities were put on the agenda of disputes by various deputies. The discourses used may have been read as the signs of coming planned policy which would be the policy choice of Turkish Governments after 1963. The DP government was criticized for failure of policies in order to solve the problems. The partisan affairs were highlighted by giving the

examples of Ziraat Bank credit corruption and other malpractices on animal donations and forestry management. The DP attacked for not taking the measures on time and wasting the opportunities. During the DP governments; the agricultural credit policy favored the large-scale agricultural enterprises and the wealthy people. The deputies criticized Ziraat Bank credits which were used for different purposes and added that the animals were not distributed to the villagers aiming at development of animal husbandry but for party purposes. The criticisms were directed to the DP's unplanned and daily populist and partisan policies. In that context, the speech of Avni Vural on behalf of CHP group was composed of very strategic words which may have been read for the signs to pass the planned period; *"It is clear that we are compelled to pass to a planned system quickly, the prevailing mentality of today cannot sufficient to realize the importance and volume of our issues"*.

Adnan Çalıkoğlu's (from CHP) speech during the debates of the agriculture budget identified the solutions to the problems in a systematic way which can be interpreted showing the signs of a pass to planning and an agrarian reform;

The majority of the Turkish community is our peasant and farmer citizens, and the agricultural sector covers a large part of our national income. The first thing that comes to mind in the agricultural sector is the farmer and the soil. It is necessary to unite the farmer with the soil. For this reason, three important milestones must be realized;

1. To provide land to the peasants and complete the land reform,
2. To increase the productivity of the soil,
3. To increase the productive power of the farmer.

Speaking on behalf of the DP, Namik Tayşi criticized the land reform that was offered by the opposition and said that land reform with distribution of small amount of land would grow the peasant mode of production. By this way, the fraction of small land would be increased.

The discourses show the differences of opinions between the left and right politics. While the left politics advocated agrarian reform and land distribution for peasants, the right preferred agricultural reform accompanied by intensive farming methods and economically efficient and big sized farms in agriculture. The minutes of the National Assembly before 1960's included severe criticisms of DP's daily and unplanned

policies indicating that they were partisan and populist. After the military coup of 1960, the National Assembly started its works again after the adoption of the new Constitution and the elections of October 1961.

The discourses of 1960's were about the agricultural structure which was an important agenda item of Turkish politicians. It is striking that almost every politician has concurred with and acts in harmony on the agricultural issue. Representatives of the opposition and ruling parties made intensive speeches on the problems of agriculture at the technical level and their speeches were supported with statistics. In particular, the budget negotiations continued with a consensus on the structural problems of agriculture and the needs of the peasants.

For instance; İlyas Kılıç (Samsun) made an off-topic statement on 07 May 1965 that people living in forest villages came into conflict with the forestry administration due to forest works and they went to court. He pointed out that the draft law to amend the Forest Law should be enacted as soon as possible. The Minister of Agriculture, Turhan Kapanlı replied by addressing the rule of law for enacting this law and mentioned the results and comments of the agriculture commissions in Parliament. This reply of the Minister on enactment of the Forestry Bill is an example of the importance attached to the Parliamentary committees and their views which give the impression that agriculture is handled away from populism and partisan affairs in a rational way.

The issues raised by the opposition in 1961 were as follows:

- Debts of the farmers to Ziraat Bank,
- The flooding of the Meriç and Ergene rivers in 1961, the determination of the type, amount and value of the damaged crops,
- The return of the weapons used in the culling of harmful animals that were confiscated for administrative reasons following the coup,
- The conveniences for the producers who cannot pay their debts to Ziraat Bank and ACCs due to drought and low prices,
- The number of people benefited from the tractor loans of Ziraat Bank and the conditions for the loans,
- Facilitation of the payments of farmers to Ziraat Bank,

- The amount of wheat and barley seed distributed to farmers in 1961 and whether the distribution was made on time.

During the budget negotiations of 1962, the deputies raised the problems of agriculture as the low budget of agriculture, low productivity, high costs of agricultural inputs, low mechanization, small sized and scattered agriculture, all of which to be solved by agrarian development. The agrarian issue was being discussed in these days without blaming any party or authority, the discourse was aiming to determine the problems and to find solutions to these problems to accomplish an economic development of the Country by means of agrarian or agriculture development.

During the negotiations of 1963 agriculture budget; Kemal Ataman on behalf of the National Party (Millet Partisi) stated the problems of these days with very scientific and neutral approach by specifying the destruction of agricultural land with wrong settlement and the insufficient technologies for irrigation works. Besides, Faruk Küreeli (Çorum) on behalf of the Republican Peasant National Party (Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi) stated that the forests had been degenerated due to the ongoing mentality and the unserious intervention of the politician.

Mehmet Yüceler (Kayseri) on behalf of the Justice Party group; giving the statistical information about high shares of agriculture in economy, employment and exports drew the attention to the agricultural characteristic of the Country's economy. He added that traditional agriculture was still dominant, and primitive agricultural tools were exploiting the strength and energy of farmers, wasting their time and wasting their lives. He stressed that agriculture and Turkish farmers had been left to their fate and the negligence and mistakes of politicians, parties, governments, had opened deep wounds in agriculture as well as in the political, economic, social and cultural issues. He also insisted on the negligence of true policies and mistakes on implementation even at the time of planned policy framework. He took reference from the priorities of the plan claiming that stable and rapid development of this economically underdeveloped country could be achieved in a democratic order and when the necessary importance was attached to agriculture. The Justice Party deputy completed his speech by stressing that their policy choice was agricultural development instead

of agrarian development. In this context, he stressed that the Justice Party did not advocate the land reform because it would turn the rich and poor to enemies, violate the genuine justice with the chant of social justice; undermine the national values. Instead of agrarian reform he repeated that his party offered an agricultural reform that would provide peace, prosperity and security to the people and would be realized in a very short time.

During the debates on Ministry of Agriculture budget in 1964; Osman Avcı (Artvin) on behalf of the Justice Party group made similar speech including objective, technical and apolitical discourse by giving the same statistical information about agriculture to stress the importance of agriculture in economy and employment. He drew attention to the peasant mode of production in agriculture and proposed to increase the per capita income of peasants so that the economic life would be mobilized and relieved. He expressed three reasons why agriculture was important; it was the source of nation's foodstuffs, it provided the main raw material for the industry and it was a source of foreign exchange by issuing excess consumption. He proposed agricultural policy and the supports had to be determined considering those three facts. He pointed out that arable land had reached its final limit and the excessive agriculture would not be possible. In line with this fact, he made a note that it was necessary to look for ways to increase the productivity of the soil which could be possible by intensive farming which included the use of qualified seed, fertilizer, irrigation facilities and mechanization.

On behalf of the Republican Peasant Nation Party Group (Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi), Kadirhan Kaili (Konya) pointed out the importance of agriculture and related to Atatürk's statement "*The foundation of our national economy is agriculture*" and the proverb saying "*The countries conquered by swords can only be obtained with the plow*", continued to highlight the necessity to reinforce agriculture and industry together with equal emphasis and finalized by the importance of machine age in agriculture.

Zeyyat Kocamemi (Tokat) on behalf of the New Türkiye Party (Yeni Türkiye Partisi) group emphasized that his party attached great importance to the budget of the

Ministry of Agriculture since Türkiye was included in the group of agricultural countries. He highlighted that 75% of the population was peasants and their livelihood was connected to the land by dealing with agricultural activities. Without doubt, the main character of the economy was agrarian and completed his words with the need for agricultural development.

During the debates on agriculture budget of 1965, Mehmet Cobanoğlu (Denizli) who spoke on behalf of the Justice Party Group pointed out again the importance of agriculture in national income and in working population. He admitted regretfully the imports of wheat, corn, barley, oats and rice from America and criticized that the majority of Turkish farmers were deprived of technical knowledge to increase agricultural production. He also pointed out the obstacles of agricultural capital, credits, land and tools and concluded his words by taking attention to the inefficient work and financial loss of the State owned production farms.

On behalf of the Nation Party Assembly Group, İsmet Kapısız (Yozgat) pointed out that Türkiye was an agricultural Country. He criticized agriculture situation in a very descriptive and scientific discourse without partisan approach;

Türkiye is an economically underdeveloped country among the world states. Our underdevelopment in agriculture is an indisputable fact. Most of our soils are arid and semi-arid. The land is low in phosphorus and poor in organic matter. In addition, our arable land is exposed to water and soil erosion every year due to ignorance and this presents a complete disaster. The soil has become unproductive. We have experienced floods, drought and other natural disasters. Although Türkiye has been an agricultural country in terms of its characteristic situation for centuries, no measures have been taken to increase production. We have not been able to enter into an effective agricultural development and production. Only 1% of the farmers and 15% of the land benefit from mechanized agriculture. Machine farming requires long-term loan and assistance from the State. The increase in knowledge and information exchange requires hard work in the agricultural sector which necessitate the greatest responsibility of the State in the field of agricultural development. Unfortunately, the Ministry of Agriculture cannot fulfil its responsibility properly since the graduates of agriculture, forestry and veterinary faculties are too far to transfer their manners and knowledge to the local area. Unfortunately, most of these employees gather in big cities such as Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir and carry out office works far away from producers.

On behalf of the Republican Peasant Nation Party (Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi) group, Mustafa Kepir (Yozgat); described six main factors of agriculture; people, air, soil, water, light and heat, and pointed out that three of these six factors which were weather, light and heat were natural factors that mankind had not yet been able to control on a large scale. He continued; although soil and water were partially taken under the command and service of humanity, the human and soil factors formed the body of the concept of agriculture. He pointed out two pillars of agriculture civilization; one was animal husbandry and the other was the soil plants. He finalized his words by stressing the high prices of agricultural tools and scarce credits in the same way of other politicians of those days did; neutral and scientific.

On behalf of the New Türkiye Party (Yeni Türkiye Partisi) group Zeyyat Kocamemi (Tokat) took the floor and pointed out that all partners in the Assembly voiced either the spokesperson of the opposition and or the defender of the power and expressed their views in the field of agriculture. He continued by making a whole criticism of agriculture structure and stressed that there was nothing new to say about agriculture. He also underlined that it has become too difficult to prepare a speech, the most perfect, without taking a sentence from what has been said so far. He highlighted no one had a word to say to anyone, some fundamental criticisms were still repeated with varying tones according to changing situations since all of the parties had been able to take part in government or opposition. He finalized his words blaming all for being unable to solve the problems.

On behalf of the CHP group Ahmet Üstün favored the services of İnönü governments and planned period:

The efforts to improve the conditions of the Turkish peasants and to rescue them from being exploited started with the planned period of 1961. In three years, despite very limited opportunities, via the right decisions taken by İnönü Governments, the services have been directed to increase the yield per decare and to increase our national income in accordance with the plan targets. As it is known, the most important factors that increase productivity are water, fertilizer, machinery for timely processing of the soil, and agricultural pesticides for crop protection. The investments made by the State Hydraulic Works and General Directorates of Land and Water for the irrigation of the land are now at a level that can be praised. There is a great development in fertilizer production and usage. Moreover, there is an

increase in the use of agricultural loans. With the law that increased the capital of Ziraat Bank, which was prepared during the İnönü Government and approved by the Supreme Assembly, Ziraat Bank gained the opportunity to give more credit to the farmers.

During the agriculture budget debates in 1967; Hasan Lâtif Sarıyüce (Çorum) on behalf of National Party group stated the importance of agriculture and the role of agriculture in industrial development. He pointed out that industrial development would be achieved by increasing the technical capacity of agriculture with mechanization. He continued his speech by addressing the DP government of 1950's; referring the developments and services made for peasants after 1950. He emphasized the mechanization of agriculture by the tractors.

On behalf of the New Türkiye Party Group (Yeni Türkiye Partisi), Ali Karahan pointed out the importance of the agricultural reform. He emphasized the necessity of economic development to solve the problems. He informed that the concern of the masses was to meet their daily needs and the rapid increase of the population made living conditions more difficult. Reiterating the dependency of national economy on agriculture, he necessitated the organization of an agricultural reform according to the changing and developing new needs in the field of protection, improvement and development of natural resources, efficient use of manpower and equipment, full application of agricultural techniques, extension and training, research, organization, credit and marketing activities.

During the debates of 1969 Agriculture budget; Turan Şahin (Muğla) on behalf of the Trust Party (Güven Parti) group talked about the peasant question referring to the development plans. As other deputies, he drew attention to the unquestionable importance of the agricultural sector, and the necessity of economic development through industrial development. On the other hand, he took attention that an industrial development could not be achieved without agricultural development. He criticized the planned period and stressed that adequate investments were not allocated to the agricultural sector during the first and second planning periods in order to accomplish the economic development in this sense. He clarified that the concepts of village, agriculture, peasant and farmer had similar meanings and added the village development meant to raise peasants' conditions and it was in return the development

of farmers since 70% of population lived in villages and engaged in farming. He defended for ensuring of a social justice, the peasants, who suffered most in the Country wouldn't be neglected. Social justice would be accomplished by evaluating the labor of the peasants who work in villages and finding new job opportunities for peasants. He also stressed that the social justice could be provided to the village by providing legal guarantee to the workers on the land and by giving land to the landless ones.

Hüseyin Yaycıoğlu (Maraş) on behalf of the Nation Party (Millet Partisi) group stated the problems of peasants in a similar discourse of other parties expressing the main characteristic of agriculture as peasant form of production deprived of adequate agricultural tools, technical agricultural methods and the credit opportunities. He pointed out about the lack of development of scientific farming methods and the lack of taking the necessary measures to increase soil fertility. He continued his speech by emphasizing the methods of increasing the soil fertility with quality inputs and rehabilitation and irrigation of soils addressing an agriculture development in the Country.

In the first years of the 70s when the third plan was under preparation most politicians have started to defend their thesis and beliefs by referring to the first and second plans in their speeches. The success or failure of the plans was evaluated.

During the debates of Ministry of Agriculture budget for the year 1973; Ali Naki Üner (İzmir) who took the floor and made speech on behalf of the Democratic Party Group started by making strong and considerable references to development plans saying that 1973 was the first part of the third plan, so the other two plans had to be evaluated seriously in order to discuss the third plan period.

He continued by making an evaluation of the first two plans;

Despite the efforts to attach great importance to irrigation, fertilization, improved seed use, machinery and equipment in the agricultural sector in the first planning period, it was not possible to get rid of the negative effects of natural conditions and bad weather effects, so there were fluctuations in income figures varying between 3.3% increase and 11.4% increase during

the planned years. As a result, between 1963 and 1965, the income of the agricultural sector decreased to 3.3%, while an increase of 11.4% was achieved between 1965 and 1967. The increase in total production and the growth rate of agriculture was realized below the planned target.

He concluded his words by adding that although industrial development was thought to be a factor that would solve the employment problem, the result did not come out as expected and could not be helpful and supportive enough in strengthening the agricultural sector.

During the debates for Agriculture budget of 1974: On behalf of the Republican Trust Party Group (Cumhuriyetçi Güven Partisi) Salih Yıldız (Van) made a speech which was based on scientific and rational data on the high importance of agriculture in national income, exports and employment. He pointed out the goal was undoubtedly industrialization which was possible to cut off the link with agriculture. He highlighted that in an agriculture Country like Türkiye, it was necessary to strengthen the connection between agriculture and national income which requires to attach importance to agriculture much more than before. He stressed the need to increase the yield in the long run since all arable lands were opened for cultivation and no new land could be opened for production.

He continued by referring the agricultural reform for solution:

It is necessary to implement the land and agricultural reform in the best way in accordance with the scientific facts. Dissemination of mechanized agriculture, construction of irrigation networks, use of fertilizers, fighting seriously against diseases and pests, raising technical knowledge and education, and finally establishing a fair credit system are among the primary measures.

Hüseyin Keçeli (Konya) who took the floor on behalf of the CHP Group stressed the low budget of 1974 allocated to agriculture and mentioned that the development would start from the village, however, the budget lacked the real extent to contribute to the development of the villagers. The comparison of agriculture budgets of different years and making the critiques of low budget were usually put on the agenda of disputes of deputies since the peasants those dealing with agriculture had considerable poor living conditions and they needed public services and resources. In parallel with this trend,

the CHP deputy pointed out the low budget for agriculture by addressing the development plans;

We do not believe that the investments in the agricultural sector are sufficient. If we examine the first three development plan periods, the rate of investment allocated to the agricultural sector is gradually decreasing. In addition, the objectives of the plan were not fully achieved.

He also highlighted the “People sector-Halk sektörü” which was chosen as a policy choice in the plans for development of agriculture and motivation of people to actively participate in public affairs. He brought to the fore the people sector’s utilities for peasants by a politician discourse:

CHP believes that the People's sector, will find an application area of implementation firstly in widespread agricultural sector. If our peasants and farmers have the opportunity to they get rid of the exploitation of intermediaries with the help of organizations such as cooperatives while buying and selling, they will increase their production and sell their products at a high price. They buy the inputs cheap, their cost decreases, and this means that their solvency will increase. This means that our peasants and farmers will participate in the economic and industrial organizations with their own capital. In such an environment where large masses of people are left in debt and distressed, the people-sector cannot be achieved. The people suffer from the failure of the establishment and functioning of various partnerships and organizations and the lack of support of the Government as required. We are of this belief that if the people can be convinced that they can get real results for their benefits with concrete examples, they will join in their own organizations.

On behalf of the Justice Party Group, Haydar Özalp (Niğde) stated that the agricultural sector which was in very primitive conditions, ruled by the Governments of the Republic as the sole support of the Turkish society and economy for many years. Although Turkish agriculture was being developed after the planned period, we could not neglect the efforts of earlier Governments. He stressed agriculture sector’s important place for the transition to industrial economy in all developing countries as well as in Türkiye. He continued in a complementary discourse pointing out that all the politics had to move away from ideological debates and find a way for the nation to adopt a common view of development in the way of rational and harmonious work of the administration. He suggested not to blame the existing order, and to solve the national problems unity and solidarity. He made also an evaluation of agricultural

development policies through giving examples in the world by referring to the main doctrines, which was impossible to fit current conditions of the world and Türkiye. He stressed that it would be pointless for Türkiye to take any doctrine in its primitive form since it would be difficult for a scientist to make any attempt on a situation that 90% of agriculture is in the form of dwarf-cüce enterprises and the cooperatives could not compensate this issue technically. He also took attention on the CHP politics of "Village-City", "Satellite City", which the Government put forward in the development of villages and expressed that this method was inspired from the Agrendus Project, which was implemented years ago in many Central European countries. He described the goal of Agrendus Project was to employ the concentrated manpower in the agricultural sector. It was the way to establish an agro-industrial center in the central villages and thus to solve all the problems of the surrounding villages in the business centers where the weight was industrial and Agrendus was a term that arose from the combination of the first letters of agriculture and industry. He added that it was considered as a preventive measure in order to hinder the break away from the soil in the villages and to solve the problem of slums in the cities. He finished his words by recommending that the Minister could approach the Köy-kent issue from this point of view.

On behalf of the DP group Adnan Akarca said that the Republican People's Party and the National Salvation Party Coalition Government changed the name of the Ministry of Agriculture, replacing a short name with a long one, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock as the first act. He welcomed this change because the great importance of food and animal husbandry had become more evident all over the world. He continued his words in a uniting discourse as follows;

Turkish agriculture is characterized with a self-sufficient production of wheat if the weather conditions are good. In fact, it was announced that a production of more than 11.5 million tons is expected this year. The production, which was 13 million tons in 1971, decreased to 8.5 million tons last year due to bad weather conditions. The transition of Turkish agriculture from machine-dry agriculture to full irrigated agriculture will undoubtedly be the biggest step. We believe that the Government should focus on this issue in order to increase our agricultural production. Agriculture is a risky occupation. Especially in our country, the fact that agriculture is completely under the influence of weather conditions increases this risk even more.

He completed his speech by stating his wishes from the government to apply price support, which were not limited in quantity, and he highlighted the needs to include new products for government price support scheme.

On behalf of MSP Group Ömer Naimi Barım (Elazığ) referred to the Third Five-Year Development Plan while stating the reason of his Government's low financial allocations to agriculture. He addressed a National Plan that would be prepared by the Government and pointed out that the budget determined in the third plan would not be sufficient to solve the problems of the agricultural sector. He also addressed the SPO works and prepared plans while he mentioned about the low technical capacity of public staff;

According to the determinations made by the SPO in Türkiye, there is still a shortage of technical personnel working in the agricultural sector in the government institutions in our Country. For this, there is need for new faculties on agricultural subjects to be opened.

To conclude, the political discourses in the Parliament before 1980's was in consensus with the politics of planning and SPO. The policies of plans were repeated by the politics with an understanding of these days agrarian and peasant question. The legitimacy of the plans was not under any disputes of politicians since the planning was put into practice by the constitutional power. The agricultural politics concentrated on the structural problems and the economic importance of agriculture, while the policy choices of left politics like community development, people sector, village development and land reform were frequently used in the discourses of either ruling parties or oppositions.

Another important feature of agricultural politics before 1980, these days' politicians made very scientific and rational speeches on the structure of agriculture, the problems, the peasant question by using supporting statistical data and by taking reference the plans. The politicians criticized agricultural situation and governments in a very descriptive and scientific discourse without partisan approach. This implies the coherence between policy and politics that has been built through the development plans.

5.3. Politics and Populism

The political era when the Fifth Five-Year Development Plan (1985-1989) was prepared showed distinctive characteristics regarding the economic, social and political structure of the Country. The years of 70's can be characterized with the unsuccessful governments challenging no successive interventions to the severe economic instability, the existing political violence and unrest and societal disruptions. In those days' world oil crisis deteriorated the economy severely and resulted in political crisis in the Country. The military intervention in 1980 made a cut to Turkish politics until the 1983 elections. Moreover, a new constitution was issued for the purpose of reestablishment of democracy and order.

In 1983 elections, a new party under the control of a new leader Turgut Özal and the Motherland Party (Anavatan Partisi, ANAP) came to power. Moreover, the ANAP government was supported by the military regime in order to bring solidarity and implement a new economic programme implementing January 24 decisions. The aims of the new policies were to improve the balance of payments and reduce the rate of inflation in the short term and to create a market-based, export-oriented economy by liberalization of trade and payments regimes, elimination of price controls, liberalization of interest rates and removal of many government subsidies (Pamuk Ş.,2008, pp.286).

The fifth plan was prepared in line with these great changes in the society and government, so that the plan stresses that the strategies and priorities have been defined within the principles and essence of the Constitution. The plan prioritized the increase of welfare, financial power and happiness of the citizens, the enforcement of fundamental rights and freedoms in accordance with the requirements of equality and social justice, in line with the civilization and legal order by attaching great importance to the democracy and reconstruction of the democratic order.

Efficient use of resources, economic, social and cultural development and rapid development of industry and agriculture in a balanced and harmonious manner are planned. It was aimed to encourage and ensure that private enterprise activities operate in accordance with the requirements of the national economy in a competitive free market order, to prevent unemployment, and to increase the life standards of employees. It was targeted to take measures to ensure and improve the healthy and orderly functioning of money, credit, capital, goods and services and to manage a free market, to prevent monopolization and cartelization, to increase the agricultural development potential and industry share, and a structure that encourages productivity and export growth. It was a priority to determine the priority regions for development, especially in the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia regions, and to accelerate the development in these areas. Accelerating the technological accumulation, the project engineering and design phases and the development of manager principles and skills have emerged as new policies.

The needed measures to reorganize the international politics with the EEC have been defined in the fifth plan period in accordance with the policy of opening up the economy to outside conditions and for economic integration with the EEC. The final end of relations with the EEC has been chosen to joining the EEC as a full member.

The plan envisaged improving the public administration by taking the necessary measures to reduce bureaucratic procedures in order to ensure efficiency and speed up the public services delivered to the society. Particular attention would be paid to the harmonious execution of the administration-public relations in duties and services that require direct contact with the citizens. The public administration would be organized in accordance with the needs of the developing society and the development goals, and the administrative unit would be in close cooperation during the preparation and implementation of the development plans and annual programs. The uneven growth of the public administration would be prevented which recalls the prioritization.

The public revenue and expenditure policy would be implemented in a way that supports economic and social development. Economic and social infrastructure investments would be given priority in public expenditures. The guidance and

incentive function of the public would be brought to the fore. Profitable and efficient operation of SEEs would be ensured and their burden on the budget would be reduced.

To conclude, in the 1980s, Türkiye entered a new era of reform process in terms of its administrative, economic, social and political cases. The global neoliberal policies of that date had also influenced Türkiye's economic, social and administrative life. In this context, this plan period also marked a period in which liberal economic policies were adopted. In addition, it was worth noting that the downsizing of the state and privatization policies came to the fore in terms of development plans in the transformation process that started in Türkiye with the adoption of the January 24 Decisions (Bayar,1996; Pamuk, 2000; Öniş, 2010).

The patronage system and clientelism as the nature of Turkish politics has been referred to understand the privatization program of that time (Öniş and Webb, 1992; Ercan and Öniş, 2001; Öniş, 2010). Moreover, the presence of a centered, autonomous and strong executive authority ruled by Özal, and by taking the advantages of the new constitution has resulted in a high commitment for the implementation of the macro-economic, structural and infrastructural reform programs to make big structural changes towards privatization and implementation of free-market rules for liberalization policies.

The Sixth Five-Year Development Plan (1990-1994) which can be classified as the follow-up of the fifth plan, included the similar and overlapping policies with fifth plan. It was aimed to increase the welfare level of the citizens in a free and safe environment in line with the principles of an open society and competition economy. The main principles have been determined as to realize growth in an environment of free competition and free market and making maximum use of the dynamism of the private sector by giving a directing and encouraging role to the government and to establish an economic structure that will allow international integration. Efficiency and rationality principles were taken into account in production and investments, and it was stated that the share of private sector investments in total investments should be increased. Concentration of private sector investments in the manufacturing industry and especially in export-oriented sectors was encouraged. It was envisaged to take the

necessary measures to enter the EC and to train the public staff on topics related to the EC in order to apply international politics sufficiently and effectively. Moreover, the plan has highlighted the environmental politics in order to raise the awareness on environmental issues by stressing the environmental problems. It can be noted that the sixth plan mentioned for the first time to start the harmonization studies for the implementation of environmental policies of EC.

These two plans have no measures on agrarian question or land reform and have envisaged agricultural reform practices to be carried out in a structure that aims to increase the income of farmers, based on technological development and increasing productivity. The rural-service terms replaced the village-community services terms under a special and newly defined rural development planning. The increase of welfare and prosperity in line with the principles of an open society, free market and competition economy under the exports oriented strategies has been the choice of the political economy. In line with this, the plans can be implied weak for fulfillment of democratic aspects like social solidarity, social justice and equal opportunities for people since neoliberalism and maximum use of the dynamism of the private sector have been adopted.

5.3.1. Disputes in the Parliament

The National Assembly started its works after the 1983 elections when the ANAP was the first party and came as a ruling power. The first work of the National Assembly regarding agriculture was the modification of the Law on the Union of Chambers of Agriculture No. 6964 which was adopted in 1957. This amendment would hinder the political affairs of chambers and forbid the supports of political parties to chambers. The chairman of the Commission on Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Affairs Ahmet Altıntaş (Mugla) talked about the output of the Commission report on 14 February 1984. While presenting the report of the Commission on Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Affairs on amending the Articles of the Law in order to hinder the political affairs of the Union of Chambers of Agriculture, he gave explicit information about the political formation and the situation after 1980 coup in his speech. He addressed

the chaos of era before 1980 and pointed out that many of associations, public organizations and voluntary groups completely took the streets, engaged in politics and completely forgot their main purposes which resulted in big complains on these movements. He addressed the 1982 constitution that had introduced a new regulation and made efforts to create a peaceful environment. He highlighted that the Article 13 of Constitution no longer allowed the unions and organizations to deal with politics and take the streets for protests. Cahit Tutum (Balıkesir) from People Party warned about the discourse of Altıntaş that would cause troubles in the future and stated that;

It is clarified by the Constitution, which means that public institutions and organizations have been asked to avoid associating with a number of political parties, especially using political slogans, in order to maximize their self- interests. Therefore, these ambiguous statements may cause trouble in the future.

It can be implied that the debates about changing the law of the Chambers of Agriculture show the peculiarities and tendencies of the inclusion of politics in agricultural policy. However, the fact that this political tendency aims to prevent farmers from getting support from agricultural chambers in order to meet their own rights and needs, actually means that the society is depoliticized and the politics of power groups can only be tolerated. Moreover, the disputes on the Law for Agricultural Chambers were clear examples of how the political era before 1980's could be abused by ANAP government for proving their legitimacy and selling on their political purposes.

In those days, besides the discussion on modification of the Agricultural Chambers' law, the questions were raised to the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Affairs H. Hüsnü Doğan on the differences between the purchase and selling prices of soil crops by the TMO. He answered this question referring the objective and rational determination and announcement of 1984 prices which were determined according to the developments in the domestic and foreign markets. This gave some idea about the approach of the political power to agriculture which may be interpreted that in these years' agriculture price determination of TMO were dealt away from political and partisan aspects.

The deputy Muhittin Yıldırım (Edirne) from People Party pointed out the problems of the farmers by giving examples in his province and he repeated the misery of farmers due to the high prices and low affordability. This speech was also remarkable for showing the start of polarization of opposition and political power again in agricultural politics.

In my visit to Edirne, I listened complaints and concerns of farmers. I have seen that a large part of our people is in distress and misery because the cost has reached very large level. I would like to point out that the government has done great damage to the Turkish economy by removing the loans that were previously given to our farmers. The government cannot control inflation; our farmers need high level prices to be given by the TMO to relieve their grievances.

The question of Hilmi Nalbantoğlu Erzurum Deputy on 9th of October 1984 was important because it was asked directly to Prime Minister Turgut Özal. The question was on the exploitation of first, second and third class agricultural lands via usages for improper industrialization, unplanned urbanization and tourism purposes which increased in 1984. He asked also information about the measures taken to ensure that agricultural land was not degenerated.

The answer of Turgut ÖZAL was important since it referred to the development plan and attached great importance to the plan; *“The problems caused by the misuse of the agricultural lands and tourism areas were also addressed with great importance in the 5th Five-Year Development Plan”*. The final words were also addressed to the development plan, which can be implied that the plans were again used to legitimize the agricultural politics:

By implementing the policies contained in the development plan and by making the necessary arrangements during the planning period, positive steps will be taken to use both agricultural lands and tourist areas in line with the targeted goals.

Thus, the fifth development plan and its identified priorities were used as the defenders and reasons of the populist approaches of the party. Moreover, in these days ANAP used the development plans and its priorities in order to prove the legitimacy of the

government. The power of the plans coming from the constitutional provisions became the tool of politics and legitimacy.

During the debates on 1985 budget of the Ministry of Agriculture; on behalf of the Nationalist Democracy Party Group (Milliyetçi Demokrasi Partisi), Ertuğrul Gökğün stated that;

On the 26th page of the Government Program, Mr. Özal showed farmers in the front row of the Orta Direk. On page 28 of the program, he also said, that our country was one of the few countries in the world which was self-sufficient in supply of food. However, it is the reality that at the end of a year of government implementation, it has been revealed that none of the issues determined in the program has been followed. Although it was said that the peasants were the master of the Country, it was not seen the master was treated well. The peasants collapsed by the high inflation and they cannot get affordable credits from the banks.

He continued his words by criticizing the affairs of Government on peasants whom were pushed into the lap of poverty. It was stressed that the peasants did not live in golden age contrary to Özal's saying; however, they were crushed under the destructive influence of high prices and inflation. He also stated in a populist discourse that the current situation of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Affairs was "*heartbreaking*". He addressed the staffing in the Ministry as "*a terrible slaughter*" and "*a human eating machine*".

On behalf of the Nationalist Democracy Party Group (Milliyetçi Demokrasi Partisi) Mehmet Abdurrezak Ceylan said that the agriculture budget discussed was directly related to the 60% of the country's population directly and biggest source of employment opportunities with the largest contribution to the national revenue. He pointed out that the peasants on whom the talks were made got the least from the national income, they were often poor and were deprived of social opportunities. However, the budget allocated to peasants and farmers that Atatürk described as Nation's Lord was a disaster. After talking about the importance of agriculture on the County and its role to become an industrial society, he pointed out the poverty since agricultural potential in Türkiye had not been adequately evaluated. He highlighted

the product prices, large imbalances in growth and the troubled subsistence farming by addressing the Prime Minister's talk:

Despite these miserable conditions of our peasants, the Prime Minister in this Country addressed in the media that the farmers were happy with their lives, because they did not make any sound intervention against the fertilizer and diesel high prices. The year of 1984 was declared by the Prime Minister as the golden year for the farmers which we could not accept.

In those days "the golden age" discourse of Prime Minister was criticized seriously in the debates. This actually can be interpreted that although ANAP government behaviors were away from partisan approach and populism, at first, later the increase of power of the party resulted in start of populist approaches again in the politics. The deputies of opposition criticized the Government interventions on the irrigation targets of Fifth Five-Year Development Plan to be insufficient. It was highlighted that current goals in agriculture would not increase the current agricultural capacity and efficiency. Moreover, the opposition speeches of these days showed that the ANAP government had gone far away to solve the peasants' problems and the poverty of peasants increased with the policies implemented. Thus, this implies the politics and populism of ANAP government repressed the plans and the policy became nonfunctional.

The Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Affairs H. Hüsnü Doğan referred the development plan in his talks that there was significant development in the agricultural sector in the planned period. However, he pointed out that the goals of the plan were not achieved during this period. He blamed the increase in the number of organizations providing services to agriculture and the decrease in services due to incoordination among the institutions for the failure to achieve the planned targets and pointed out the reorganization of public services to agriculture which had become a necessity.

During the budget debates for 1987 agricultural budget; on behalf of the DYP group Mehmet Abdurrezak Ceylan (Siirt) criticized the ANAP government that during three-year rule, the ANAP government did very little useful things to the Turkish peasants and farmers. The wrong decisions and practices caused the increase of imported seeds in high prices and farmers were deprived of the opportunity to use good seeds at a sufficient rate. He pointed out the high inflation rate which brought up burden and

poverty to the farmers. He wrapped up his words by giving a necessary list to be done for solving the agricultural problems which were crucial for the approach of DYP to agricultural issues; in a neutral and objective way and away from a political approach. He highlighted the irrigation problems, the high prices of electricity, low infrastructure in villages and lack of soil analysis laboratory. He concluded his words reiterating the importance of the peasants for agricultural development and pointed out that the rapid development of villages in social, economic and technical terms stopped in 1986. He completed his speech that during the power of ANAP, it was forgotten that the national economy and the village economy had to support each other. Moreover, he drew the attention to the lack of a program to invest in roads and drinking water facilities of all villages defending the necessity for the provision of equal and fair services to everyone, not according to the votes coming out of the ballot box.

The Deputy of DYP, Mustafa Murat Sökmenoğlu's speech who took the floor during the negotiations for agriculture budgets of 1987 and 1988 was meaningful regarding his addressed policies for agriculture. He criticized the government policies that had brought the Turkish agriculture to the wrong state and proposed a new agriculture program to be put forward. He said that it was necessary to bring agriculture to an organizational structure that could provide sufficient production and agriculture that could afford to compete with foreign marketing. He blamed the government for the abnormal prices and costs for diesel and fertilizer which brought the Turkish farmers to a misery. He urged the government to make a fair program in order to take the services to the villages equally and not to make the supports according to the votes coming out of the ballot box. He criticized the populist approaches of ANAP government.

The Deputies Zeki Ünal (Eskişehir) and Halil Çulhaoğlu on behalf of the Social Democratic People's Party (SHP) group addressed the same problems in the same discourse by criticizing the wrong affairs of government directed to farmers which resulted in difficulties in providing their livelihood. They criticized the January 24 decisions which caused destructions in the agricultural sector in very serious dimensions. They pointed out that the agricultural enterprises that could not withstand the unfair competition of a free-market economy were closing down, and producers

got out of work. They highlighted that the big holdings used the agricultural loans in increasing amounts, such as Akfa, Beslen, Maret, Pınar, Lades poultry. They also criticized the loans of Ziraat Bank that had been donated to the ANAP executives and their close circle instead of small producers.

The Deputy Sabri Araş (Kars) on behalf of ANAP group during the debates of budget of 1989 emphasized the achievement of the representation of Türkiye in the EC agricultural meetings during the time of the ruling Anavatan Party and added that there was no opportunity to get into these meetings or joining them previously. Moreover, since the criticism against the Minister was increasing; the deputy of ANAP Party, Ali Er addressed the legitimacy of the Minister coming from the elections.

During the debates of budget of 1990, Doğan Baran (Niğde) spoke on behalf of the DYP group, taking reference the fifth development plan, he evaluated plan development objectives. He pointed out that an average annual investment of 11.4 percent and a development rate of 3.6 percent were targeted for agriculture in the plan, while an investment of 7.2 percent remained well below the program, the development rate in agriculture was achieved close to the plan goal. He emphasized that during 1984-1988, the Government supported the product prices behind the increase in input prices which resulted in impaired balance and declining purchasing power among farmers. So farmers could not use enough fertilizer, and fail to struggle effectively against the disease, insects, weeds. The insufficient loans and high interest rates brought troubles. He continued in highly critical words on ANAP government saying that agriculture became the sector of poor people and instead of the golden period of farmers.

The Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Affairs Lütfullah Kayalar (Yozgat) replied the criticisms by talking about the expectations on a healthy level of production that would be achieved with the opening of agricultural areas that were not currently allowed to production. By the way, he reiterated that the grain stocks were at level meeting the needs and there were no problems. He talked about the international protectionism movements in foreign trade as a result of multifaceted trade negotiations of GATT in Uruguay. He stressed that the long-term goal of these negotiations was to

establish a fair and fully market, an agricultural products trading system. The supporting and protecting policies in agriculture would be gradually reduced by which a fair system of trade was targeted.

The debates for agriculture budget of 1990 witnessed the increasing importance on agriculture due to the drought experienced in 1989. The vital place of agriculture to feed the people was recognized again. The contribution of agriculture to the economy and employment was still at significant levels and agriculture was seen a tool for food industry, thus agriculture retained its importance. In the light of this vital point of agriculture; Anavatan Government, which strictly adhered to the 24 January decisions criticized for impoverishing the peasants through decreasing state supports on agriculture.

During the debates for Agriculture budget of 1991, Ümit Canuyar (Manisa) spoke on behalf of the DYP group by making comparisons of agriculture situation before and after 1980 and he refuted the government saying that farmers lived their golden years with solid examples by following words;

“The Turkish farmer, peasant is the largest and most altruistic mass that provides great resources to the economy, powers industry and trade. Economic development will not be possible to reach the desired level unless the contribution of the agricultural sector to economic development is accepted. Our farmer, who had the affordability to get the tools and equipment necessary for production before 1980 without any problems, now, has fallen into such great distress and poverty that he has no longer been able to get any materials related to production. In the 1970s, our peasant, who could fill his annual diesel need with advance money into his tanks, could not buy diesel fuel for his tractor today. Moreover, our peasant cannot even get an Agricultural Bank loan. Our producers, who stock their annual fertilizer at the beginning of the season, cannot get it today due to the debts and high interest rates. The government, with great indifference, does not want to hear the facts, as well as being able to say that the condition of our producer is fantastically good, that the farmer is experiencing his golden years”.

Another opposition party speech during the debates for Agriculture budget of 1991, Halil Çulhaoğlu (İzmir) on behalf of the SHP group described the situation with the similar words. He emphasized the place of agricultural sector, providing a living and

working environment for a wide portion and covering almost 50 percent of the population, despite being neglected by the government retained its priority and importance with its contributions to the country's employment, foreign trade, services sector, industrial sector. He reiterated the destructive effects of the economic measures taken with the January 24 decisions which created structural problems unsolved and accumulated with years. The ongoing policies resulted in an important transfer from the agricultural sector to other sectors. He reemphasized the limit of cultivable land and the necessity to increase yield by the use of inputs, to increase agricultural production and yield per unit, on the one hand, and to change the production structure and product pattern, on the other hand. He pointed out the dominant small and medium-sized enterprises, their limited opportunities and low capital accumulation.

Another deputy Gürcan Ersin (Kırklareli) talking again on behalf of the SHP group said that;

For many years, Türkiye has been one of the rare countries that is self-sufficient in terms of agricultural products. Moreover, agriculture played the role of a locomotive in the development of exports and industry. In particular, agricultural products, especially in export items, took the largest share until 1983, when ANAP came to power. This date is the bad fortune of agriculture. That is, the date when the ANAP Governments were pushed agriculture away, ANAP Governments were assumed that its function was over, the logic prevailed that industry would come to the fore and only industry would bring the country to prosperity. The most important indicator of this is the export of agricultural products. While the share of agriculture in general exports was around 50 percent in 1983, this rate has fallen day by day and has decreased to 20 percent today. This is due to the fact that there has been no significant increase in exports of agricultural products over the past seven years. The resetting of customs under implementing a liberal economy has allowed many goods to easily enter our country. Since agricultural products are of vital importance for the continuation of life, great supports to agriculture have been allocated even by the countries that implement liberal economies. However, this was not the case in our Country.

All the opposition talks on ANAP government were focused on the economic measures taken by January 24 decisions and their effects on agriculture. The ANAP government was blamed to ignore the vital importance of agriculture in the economy and employment as well as in feeding the people. The drought in 1989 was also taken great parts of opposition parties speeches in 1990 and 1991. The disputes on the “Draft Law for Amendment of the Law on Borrowing Seed to Needy Farmers” showed how

agricultural production was important on supplying food during a natural disaster year like 1989 drought. The supply of seed and postponement of debts by the government were critical affairs. The Government had to determine the damage and the needs carefully. It was necessary to act objectively and create objective commissions in order to identify the needs. In line with these realities the oppositions asked the government to focus on this issue.

In 1992, when the DYP was in rule, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs Necmettin Cevheri (Şanlıurfa) mentioned again the importance of agriculture during the debates of agriculture budget. He reiterated the necessity of a developed economy by withdrawal of agricultural population and its transfer to industry. He mentioned that it was not possible for a country whose 40 percent lives in agriculture to make a healthy development. He emphasized there were no developed countries in the world where 40 percent of the population lived in agriculture and 40 percent lived in rural areas. He called the small-sized producers in agriculture as another bottleneck. He referred the science of economics for the inefficiency, low yield and low income of those small businesses and specified the necessity of structural transformation. He added these enterprises consumed their own products, and therefore did not add much value to the general economy of the country. He also made remarks for the lack of capital in agriculture which was again caused by the overabundance of the agricultural segment of the population and, consequently, the small size of enterprises. Small businesses were deprived of the opportunity to collect their savings in the form of a capital accumulation. When the enterprises became large, they made high savings and they changed their savings to capital. He blamed this fragmented and small business to hinder the formation of capital. The marginal lands with very poor agricultural productivity could not reach the yield of world standards. He signified that the land had to be worked in line with the scientific standards. He advocated the land consolidation and agricultural reform approach for Turkish agriculture to solve the problems by giving statistical information on wheat productivity values from other developed countries like US and Germany where the productivity was about two times bigger than Turkish wheat productivity. He criticized that the land reform would be in the form of the reduction of plots and it would be impossible with farms of 3 acres, 5 acres or 20 decares of land to reach an economical size. Thus, he concluded his speech

that it would be no longer possible to get a productive result from this small-sized and underdeveloped agriculture which was contrary of the world standards.

In the days of 1992, when the draft Law on waiving the interests of the debts of small farmers to Ziraat Bank and the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives was sent to the Parliament for reconsideration by President Turgut ÖZAL, it showed the political conflict and competition between the presidency and the government. This issue also affected agriculture policies and the political division occurred even during taking a highly needed decision on agriculture.

During the debates on the budget of 1995, Ali Er (İçel) speaking on behalf of the ANAP group, started his word by expressing his condolences for the snowslide disaster in the southeast, the grizu disaster in Zonguldak, the earthquake disaster in Erzincan. He continued by undermining the low budget of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs to solve the problems of the half of the population engaged in farming. He advocated the ANAP rule, that their allocation of budget was better than DYP and added it was not possible to give much to the Turkish farmer by this budget.

The dialogue between Ahmet Sayın (Burdur), the deputy of DYP and Ali Er (İçel) was notable in order to have an idea about these days' conflicts and competition between the power and opposition. The dialogue also showed how agricultural politics became partisan and populist in these days. Apart from this, these dialogues became individual and sharp in criticizing agricultural policies. This kind of dialogues with similar discourses have become usual and frequent in the disputes in Parliament.

The dialogue between Ali Er (ANAP) and Ahmet Sayın (DYP) continued as below:

We, as politicians, say very nice things in the squares. We, as politicians, say my farmer, my peasant, my shopkeeper, my widow, my orphan in the squares, and then, when we come here and sit down, we forget about them, we start saying other things... According to my understanding, the budget debate is a discussion of what can be done with this budget in Türkiye, how to do best. But when we take the stand, we all come to such a place that we turn the issue into just a form of party contention. Of course, it seems to me that our friends who come here as the power, the opposition of yesterday's continue to blame the past rulers and they are pulling us into a vicious circle.

Ahmet Sayın : before 1980...

Ali Er : Dear Ahmet Sayın, if I talk about the period before 1980 and after 1980, you'll never get out of it.

Ahmet Sayın : You have repeated this for eight years.

Ali Er : What did you say in the squares? You said; my farmer. In these days the Anavatan Party was blamed to sell the 800 Lira costing diesel to 2,700 Lira. You said that this was unfair and named as violence to sell diesel for 2,700 Lira. We always get into a dispute by blaming each other. While a friend of ours who belongs to the DYP was talking here, he told that this situation was the fault of the ANAP. The peasant experienced the past practices of the ANAP, for better or for worse. However, DYP has been in power for three years. What had you done in these three years for peasants? Today you increase the liter of diesel oil to 14-15 thousand Lira, and you still blame the ANAP! I did not understand this.

This dispute between these two party deputies could be also characterized as a good example of how discourses had been changing when a party was in power and opposition. This speech was also worthy to examine the polarization of opposition and political power in agricultural politics. The years of sixth development plan between 1990-1995 which showed high competition between ANAP and DYP, could be marked in agriculture politics with instabilities, uncertainties and populist discourses. To conclude; it can be said the politics and populism of the opposition and ruling power repressed the plans and the policy turned to become nonfunctional and illegitimate particularly after mid 80's.

5.4. Repression of Agricultural Politics

During the Seventh Five-Year Development Plan implementation period (1996-2000), four different coalition governments served as the prime ministers; Tansu Çiller (1995-1995), Necmettin Erbakan (1996-1997), Mesut Yılmaz (1997-1999) and Bülent Ecevit (1999-2002). In this context, domestic political interruptions and problems affected public policies, public administrators and practices.

The seventh plan has the character of full liberalization of the Country with reform programs. Every sector includes a reform process of privatization and implementation of free-market rules. The international politics in the way of adoption of Customs Union, WTO rules and EU acquis and standards have brought about neoliberal reform process under the guidance of WB and IMF.

The plan shows the neoliberal transformation of the Country in its economy and society which have been subjected to a long process of structural adjustment. With the rise to hegemony of the neo-liberal orthodoxy, “market rationality” has been dictated by the international politics. The conception of the integration with the world economy thus became an end level of economics and politics. Moreover Türkiye-EU relations became one of the critical components of Türkiye’s mode of integration into world economy from the 1990s and onwards and neoliberal transformation in the era of financial and economic policies (Yalman & Göksel , 2017, p.24). In line with this approach, a list of the legal and institutional arrangements to be adopted for the alignment to international standards and EU policies has been determined. The state has become an enterprise withdrawing from the provision of welfare services and act as a facilitator, rather than a regulator of economic relations or provider of public services. The markets have become free of state and have been regulated by the participation of many actors, including civil society organizations and private sector searching for their self-interests in most cases (Acar & Altunok, 2013).

Coming to the discourses of Parliament regarding agriculture; during the debates on the agriculture budget of 1995, Musa Demirci’s (Sivas) talk on behalf of the Welfare Party (Refah Party- RP) group was remarkable. He criticized the agriculture budget to be short of solving the problems of Turkish peasants and farmers. He continued his speech in a unifying discourse saying that Welfare Party was constantly constructive and far from criticism in 1991, 1992 and 1993. He made a remark that his party had patiently waited between 1992 and 1994 in order to see the result of policies. He referred a Hadis-i Şerif of the Prophet: *"You are the shepherd; you are responsible for what you do"*. He, then criticized the Minister for not taking the responsibility of being a shepherd: *"In this regard, it is impossible for us to understand why our Minister continues these behaviors"*. He also criticized the staff policy of the Ministry that the workers did not have the required qualifications.

During the debates on the budget for financial year of 1996, İsmet Atilla, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs started his word by emphasizing the low financial resources allocated to agriculture due to the economic burden. He noted the development regarding seed management through the incentives brought to the private

sector. He emphasized that there had been a significant increase in the use of various hybrid and standard seeds with high yield potential, and as a result of joint productions with international seed companies, serious increase was seen in seed exports. He referred to the seventh plan using praising rhetoric and positive approach for liberal policies regarding WTO and Customs Union arrangements;

Investment policies will be supported within the framework of the agricultural provisions of the WTO and requirements for alignment to the CAP of EU as it is envisaged in the seventh plan. Agricultural support policies will be restructured based on the development of production in accordance with free competition and market rules. The use of public resources will be allocated rationally for this purpose. On the other hand, with the aim of rearranging agricultural policies, efforts are underway to provide DIS by giving priority to small farmers.

The opposition deputies criticized the government in the way that the policies were not sufficient to solve the main problems. They pointed out the policy of becoming an industrial society was good but the transformation had to be considered carefully. The supports to agriculture and animal husbandry had to be designed well, the peasants; the master of the nation had to be treated well.

In 1998, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs Mustafa Rüştü Taşar (Gaziantep) started his word by following discourse which adopted the 2000's dynamics for reforms in agriculture in order to solve the problems;

As the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the 55th Government, we continue our efforts to bring this picture in line with world standards and to break the chain of backwardness in agriculture, we are also making the base to establish a permanent agricultural policy worthy of the 2000s. Our basic approach is to maintain an agricultural policy that is not populist, producing realistic prescriptions for the problems of the agricultural sector in line with economic facts.

These words could be characterized as the precursor of the future liberal policies in agriculture. He denigrated the previous policies that brought the agriculture sector to the point of collapse. He blamed the previous governments' populist behaviors which made it impossible to eliminate the problems. He addressed the medium and long-term plans and programs in order to construct the agriculture sector of 2000s with creation

of a permanent state policy reform. As the Ministry, he pointed out that of their most important goals were to pioneer that reform. In that context, the written query addressed to the Minister by opposition was notable in order to see the restructuring efforts of those days to adopt the EU structure. The query questioned the establishment of the agricultural restructuring committee. The answer for the question was also remarkable since the words were in close parallelism with the development plan:

In order to realize the agricultural policy objectives and to fulfil our obligations arising from international agreements, it is necessary to establish the market arrangements for agricultural products in order to compete in the foreign trade, to ensure restructuring in the agricultural sector, to organize institutional arrangements and to carry out agricultural policies from a single source. A draft law has been prepared on the establishment of the Agricultural Guarantee and Guidance Fund within the body of our Ministry to accomplish these necessary measures.

During the debates on the budget for financial year 1999 and 2000, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs Hüsnü Yusuf Gökalg (Sivas) noted the bankruptcy and stressed that Türkiye being one of the seven self-sufficient countries in the World in previous years, unfortunately was not in the current situation. He remarked the necessity of a legal application that would force the farmers to work more efficiently and direct them to make production on economically optimal lands, in order to realize the idea of preventing agricultural incomes from falling below a certain minimum subsistence level, which was one of the classical targets of agricultural policies. He referred the five-year development plans, in which the priorities had been settled for ensuring sufficient food, providing food at reasonable prices to the consumers, increasing production and efficiency, ensuring a production that was less affected by adverse weather conditions, providing a sufficient and regular income to those working in agriculture and improving export opportunities for agricultural products. He mentioned about the goal for the year 2000, which were in parallel with the development plan. He said that the goal for Turkish agriculture was to increase the welfare level of farmers, to create the opportunities of competition with the EU and other competing countries, to produce high quality products, to ensure food safety and security, to protect natural resources and to create a livable environment within the framework of sustainability principles. The use and dissemination of information and technology was selected as the main objective. While achieving these goals, the

principles of efficiency, sustainability, participation, organization and transparency would be validated. He then addressed the restructuring program which was remarkable in the way of repeating the development plan priorities. These words of the Minister showed the coherence and complementarity of agricultural politics with policy and polity choices of plans.

An agricultural reform project has not been prepared before. The agricultural support and steering committee will be established chaired by the Undersecretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, with the participation of persons at high level from relevant ministries and organizations; that is, this is a board that can prevent misuses and wastefulness in agriculture supports which we all criticize.

He concluded his speech with the words assuring to follow up the policies of the EU since the candidacy for the EU was accepted and Türkiye became a candidate for Membership. He pointed out that the rules and systems in the EU would be applied. These words actually were a start of the adoption of a process of agricultural reform programme for Türkiye, with future expectations of EU Membership.

During the debates on the budget for financial year 2000, the deputies from Fazilet Party, again repeating the importance of agriculture sector in economy and employment using statistical data, criticized the EU Membership process. The standards that IMF and EU requested would bring the agriculture to a worse condition. The Fazilet Party Chairman and Malatya Deputy Mehmet Recai Kutan and his 35 friends brought to the agenda of the Parliament a motion of interpellation against the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Hüsnü Yusuf Gökalp, alleging that he caused the agricultural sector to be adversely affected by his wrong policies. The Minister, replied to this motion underlying that all the political parties present in the Parliament, had been in power at least once and ruled the agriculture sector. He pointed out this interpellation was unfair and spoke in a populist discourse that they had created opportunities for agriculture despite the limited sources of the Ministry. In these years, it was remarkable that all these issues, interventions and laws which were discussed and criticized in the Parliament had been present and defined as priorities of the agriculture sector in the development plan.

On behalf of the DSP group, the speech of Yücel Erdener (Istanbul) was also noteworthy on the point of the DSP's rapprochement to the EU and neoliberalisation. He repeated again the basic economic development theory which required the development of the agricultural sector. He addressed WTO arrangements of 1995 and the candidature status of Türkiye in 1999, bringing a new dimension to the agricultural policy to the rapprochement with the EU and he found obligatory to determine new agricultural policies in line with the age of globalization. He emphasized the implementation of direct income support policy instead of the current agricultural support policies. He stressed the development plan objectives which envisaged to completely abolish agricultural supports coupled with production by 2005.

The speech of Malik Ejder Arvas (Van) on behalf of the AK Party group was significant in order to show how political discourses could be changed when a party was in opposition and power. In 2000's when the AKP was in opposition, the deputy of AKP, Malik Ejder Arvas criticized seriously the agriculture policies for being ineffective and far from the aim of developing the villages and solving the problems. He made a sign to the promise given to the IMF which would liquidize the agricultural sector. He also strictly attacked the implementation of the direct income support program in agriculture which did not coincide with the realities of the country. He also behaved in similar way of opposition attacking the wrong policies implemented over the years which changed the Country from one of the seven self-sufficient countries in agriculture twenty-five years ago to an importing country of agricultural products today. These opposition politics of AK Party changed in 2002 when they won the elections in November 2002 and came to the power.

The electoral victory was exceptional, since the 90's was marked by crisis of political hegemony where no single party was able to govern alone. This power of AKP has revitalized the IMF and WB oriented neoliberalist agenda (Akça & Balta-Paker, 2013, p.78; Akça, 2014). In that context, the strong economic program including the neoliberal reforms in all areas that was strictly defined in the Eight Five-Year Development Plan (2001-2005) were acquired by the AKP government.

Although the eight plan was prepared under the prime ministerships of Bülent Ecevit (1999-2002) of DSP leaded coalition government, the implementation of the plan was managed by the prime ministership of Abdullah Gül (2002-2003) and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (2003-2007) of AKP governments. The plan coincided with a period of economic depression in which debts and high inflation were dominant. Moreover, the eighth plan describes the years 1996-1999 as a period dominated by macroeconomic imbalances and instability, which emerged as high inflation and rapid rise in public deficits.

An important process that shapes the strategies of the eight plan is the status of a candidate country to the EU and it has been envisaged to prepare an Accession Partnership which became later the main tool for implementation of EU policies. In line with the European politics, it is frequently stated in the plan to make legislative changes by public institutions and organizations in the political, economic and social fields. The details of policy and polity choices of the plan are available in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

Although the implementation period of eight plan witnessed a big economic crisis of 2001, the AK Party government's commitment to the IMF and WB stabilization plan (Öniş & Caner, 2002) produced positive results, such as falls in inflation, decrease in real interest rates and public debts thus brought the high economic growth. The new government was able to accelerate the economic and political reforms in a more favorable environment conducive to economic reforms under the neoliberal agenda. In this framework the WB was strictly recommending to take advantage of the EU accession process as “an anchor” for reform and macroeconomic stability (Yalman & Göksel, 2017, p.24).

When it comes to the disputes of politics, the National Assembly of new government started the works after the 2002 elections with the sole AK Party power replaced the coalition governments of 90's. Most of the oral and written questions that marked the year of 2002 were on DIS payment which was implemented as one of the schemes under the newly launched Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP).

During the debates on the budget for fiscal year 2003, the deputy Mehmet Mehdi Eker (Diyarbakir) on behalf of the AK Party group spoke by stating the importance of agriculture using common discourse which prioritized agriculture as one of the leading sectors of the Turkish economy, although it had lost its relative importance compared to the rapidly developing industrial and service sectors. He also pointed out the main functions of the sector as to produce food to feed the rising population. He stated the importance of the sector in employment with a share of 40% of the economically active population and providing raw materials for industry, foreign currency through exports and contributing 14% of GDP. He brought to the fore the chronic structural problems of the sector; the small-sized producers, the low yield, the pressure of agriculture on employment and the high proportion of agriculture related population in the Country.

The Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Sami Güçlü (Konya) repeated similar words in order to describe the significance of the agricultural sector in economy and employment. He mentioned the problems of agriculture and the measures specified for remedy the structural problems in parallel with the priorities of the development plan. It is noticeable that these measures are not outside the framework set by the EU as an assignment for Türkiye for Membership. He specified that the public resources were not used very efficiently and stressed the necessity of privatization; for making entrepreneurial activities.

In these days, high number of queries were directed to the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Sami GÜÇLÜ; the topics were on; staffing of the Ministry, agriculture policies, promotion of agricultural, forestry and livestock products to foreign markets, studies on the self-sufficiency of the agricultural sector, studies on mixed and alternative agricultural production methods, supply of domestic and foreign market demands with alternative products, activities to strengthen the market structure of the agricultural sector. It can be concluded that these debates of oppositions show a character of acquiring the reform needs in the sector in line with the waves of EU Membership process, to make agriculture sector effective, efficient and compatible with international standards.

On behalf of the CHP group, the speech of Gürol Ergin (Mugla) took notes in the way to find solutions with good intentions addressing the positive developments that was achieved in grain and animal breeding. He stressed that the problems would be solved by making a policy reform in agriculture and with a national consciousness to the impositions of international organizations. He continued his speech in similar discourse of other opposition parties, by making critique of the policies of government ruining the farmers. He stated that the AKP government forgot about what they had said before they were elected, in the same way of populist approaches of opposition parties.

During the debates on the budget for fiscal year 2005, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Sami Güçlü (Konya) spoke in praise of the policies implemented after 2002 referring the ARIP Project which had been seen a tool for performing harmony and conformity with international institutions and EU. He highlighted the increase in the share of investments in health, transportation, justice and safety which were identified by free will of the Country without imposition of others.

Coming to the year of 2007, the talks of Gürol Ergin (Mugla) on behalf of CHP group, criticized government policies that were implemented were unaware of the realities of the country, and fully surrendered to the IMF. Although he referred the Agricultural Law that envisaged the support for agriculture to be higher than 1 percent of national income and criticized the low level of agricultural supports, it was notable that this law actually was prepared in line with the EU standards.

The Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013) which was prepared under the AK Party sole power welcomed the new period in the relations between EU and Türkiye. The target was to become EU member by completing the accession process by the end of the plan period and envisaged the transformation of the Country in economic, social, and cultural areas by an integrated approach. The democracy and a democratic environment were related with the acquisition of EU norms and standards, effective public administration and complementing civil society. The plan refers the enhancement of education system to ensure social development and democracy for the acquisition of EU criteria.

The enhancement of democratic participation and transparency in public policy making and improvement of social dialogue by setting up mechanisms that would allow NGOs to participate in the decision making processes were notable for the inclusion of politics in the plan. In that context, the debates on Agriculture Budget of the year 2008 in the National Assembly, were intensely concentrated on the harmonization actions to EU norms and standards, particularly the EU CAP and rural development policy.

The Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Mehmet Mehdi Eker's (Diyarbakır) information about the interventions for coming period were remarkable in the sense of harmonization with the EU and its impositions. He made remarks on the draft Law for restructuring of the Ministry, in a new structure that would accelerate the process of integration with the EU. He pointed out the rural development programme (IPARD Programme) by which the funds of the EU would be directed to Turkish producers. He also mentioned a new Law for the establishment of an institution called Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institute for implementing EU financed IPARD Programme. His talk focused on the fulfillment of EU necessities which were identified in the development plan.

The debates in the National Assembly for the years of 2008 were concentrated on the agricultural drought, which made the production worse. The government agricultural support policy was criticized for their negative effects to the farmers by keeping prices low, imposing quotas and raising input prices. The opposition deputies stated that the drought resulted in reduction in wheat production and for the first time in recent years, wheat imports came to the agenda since wheat production did not meet the demand of population for bread.

The minutes of the 23th period of National Assembly between the years of 2007 and 2011 were marked by written questionnaires to the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs' interventions and answers given to them. It has been noticed that the Assembly had been only working on written and oral queries and answers. The following are the main topics of the queries forwarded to Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs:

- Loans extended by ACCs and the frauds;
- Control documents for imports of rice,
- Price increases of fertilizer and supplies, fertilizer controls,
- Food additives and the problems on the country of origin,
- Problems in implementation of agricultural insurances especially the payments regarding the hail and frost,
- Sales of rice and imports of wheat by TMO, the effects of wheat imports,
- Postponement of debts of drought-affected farmers, use of farmer credits.

Additionally, the oral queries on incentive premiums for livestock and plant production, projects for Rural Development, permissions for imports of nuts and honey, electricity debts of farmers for irrigation purposes, transportation of seasonal workers, measures against drought and low yield have been forwarded to the Minister by the opposition. Mostly in these queries the credits and loans directed to the farmers were used as the populist purposes either by the opposition and political power.

The proposal of opposition dated 19th of October 2010 to start a motion of censure against the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Mehmet Mehdi Eker was worthy. He was accused to push farmers into unemployment and poverty with his wrong agricultural policies, to cause an increase in red meat prices, and to act contrary to the requirements of his duty by encouraging imports instead of supporting agricultural production and producers. In addition, various proposals of opposition to submit a motion of censure against the Minister, Mehmet Mehdi Eker about his wrong policies and misconducts were discussed in the 24th period of National Assembly between the years 2011 and 2015.

One of the oral query conversations of 2010's from the speech of Mehmet Serdaroğlu (Kastamonu) from Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) was notable since he remarked the imports in agriculture had increased as a result of the Minister's wrong policies that had been implemented for three years. He also pointed out that the livestock production was finished and criticized imports of meat and milk from the EU. Ankara Deputy Özcan Yeniçeri's query dated 14th of November 2012 addressed to the

Minister, Mehmet Mehdi Eker on the issue that he kept the problems in the field of agriculture away from the public's eyes was also another worthy case for making an idea about the discourse and attitude of opposition on these days. The oppositions were criticizing seriously the increase of agricultural product imports and they were insisting the Turkish peasants would be disappeared.

During the debates on the budget of the year 2010, Mehmet Mehdi Eker (Diyarbakır) talked about the firsts those achieved in the agriculture sector. The minister highlighted that twelve basic new laws on agriculture had been adopted, and he stressed the opening of negotiations with the EU on the chapter related to food, veterinary and phytosanitary issues would be possible by adoption of these new laws. The minister, also referred the strategic plan in which the agricultural priorities and policies were identified until the year 2014. He emphasized the planning approach which was adopted for the policy determination in line with the wave of EU Membership target, and informed about plans those prepared for the first time for agriculture sector such the sectoral depth analysis, the agricultural vision document, Agricultural Drought Action Plan, NRDS and IPARD Programme.

During the debates on the budget of the year 2011, the conversations between the Minister of Agriculture and oppositions were on the increase of imports. The Minister and the AKP government were criticized the policies that made the Country the net importer of agricultural products while Türkiye had been one of the seven self-sufficient countries in the world before. Mehmet Mehdi Eker denied the “net importer” term by addressing the imports during agricultural drought years and stated that the imports were essential. He stressed that fourteen new laws were passed from the Assembly and pointed out that most of them had been characterized as the firsts of Turkish agriculture. He also informed with proud that Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations had been firstly determined the agricultural sector and the rural development policy in Türkiye as a model for paths to success and an example of the best practices in the world.

The speech of Minister of Food Agriculture and Livestock, Mehmet Mehdi Eker (Diyarbakır) dated 19th of November 2013 gives some idea about the volume of queries in those days:

I will present the answers to 67 of your questions today. One of them is the oral question asked to the former Minister of the Interior, Mr. Idris Naim Sahin, and 66 of them are the questions related to our Ministry. From these 66 oral questionnaires those I will answer; 23 of them asked by Ensar Öğüt (Ardahan Deputy), 12 of them by Mesut Dedeoğlu (Kahramanmaraş Deputy), 11 of them by Ali Halaman (Adana Deputy), and 20 of them belongs to 13 different Deputies. I will respond by combining the answers of similar questions”.

The speech of Minister of Food Agriculture and Livestock, Mehmet Mehdi Eker (Diyarbakır) dated 25th of March 2015, on the occasion of the discussions of proposal given by Peoples’ Democratic Party (HDP) group to open an allegation due to his wrong policies, was also meaningful for characterization of these days’ politics for their inability against the public policy choices and the polity for EU Membership.

The agricultural politics of this period were mainly overwhelmed by the policy targets strictly followed in partnership and complementarity with the negotiation process for alignment to EU policies. The polity that adopted the full integration with the EU CAP and rural development policy, repressed agricultural politics and their concerns on peasant mode of production. The ninth development plan priorities and measures have been strictly fulfilled in order to conduct the EU Membership process successfully.

CHAPTER 6

CHANGING POLICY-POLITY AND POLITICS WITH GLOBAL CRISES

6.1. Crises and Rising Concerns

The Tenth Development Plan, covering the period between 2014 and 2018, has been a milestone in advancing the society to high prosperity levels, in line with the 2023 targets. The important aspect of the plan is that it has been prepared in an environment where international cooperation has been diversified and become further complicated, uncertainties and risks have increased, the new balance of economic and political powers has been settled among countries, a global process of re-balancing started, and new political, social and economic aspects have been raised in world era.

This new globally occurred situation of risks resulted in the development of more strategic approaches in making of the policies and planning. Furthermore, in order to identify long term priorities, the needs for long-term planning increased. The countries in the world initiated new cooperation areas and improved their capacities in innovation and technology. Coupled with political, economic and financial risks and the rising tensions and uncertainties growing at the global level, made difficult for countries to take firm solutions. New protectionist trends and strategies have been settled in areas of conflict and alliances, trade, competition and technological improvements.

On the other hand, the growing intensity of international migration and geopolitical tensions have raised xenophobia. Moreover, the terrorist acts globally have grown the defense expenditures of Countries. In this context, coupled with the global liberal democracy, more protectionist and inward oriented populist policies have strengthened and interventionist policies have taken root.

The rise of extreme rightist and xenophobic policies, the Eurozone financial crisis, the Brexit and the accelerated irregular migration have reduced the normative power of the EU and has broken out the “crisis of values”. This has made it imperative to re-define the role of Union particularly in security terms. In this context, it has been stressed in the first sentences that the global economic environment showed the characteristics of protracted risks, uncertainties, changes and transformations, with emerging and reshaping power balances among developed and developing economies.

The tenth plan is designed to include not only high, stable and inclusive economic growth, but also issues such as the rule of law, information society, international competitiveness, human development, environmental protection and sustainable use of resources. In addition, it is emphasized to have a place in the international value chain hierarchy, to become a country that has entered among the high-income countries and has solved the problem of poverty. This aim of raising Türkiye's position in this value chain which had been determined since the eighth plan, has been emphasized continuously.

The objectives and policies of the plan are included in four main development axes. These axes are: (1) Qualified people, strong society; (2) Innovative production, stable high growth; (3) Livable spaces, sustainable environment; (4) International cooperation for development. The “Priority Transformation Programs” have been designed for the first time to solve the basic structural problems, to contribute to the transformation process, to enable an effective coordination and responsibility between ministries.

Economic and social development processes of the Country have been defined with a holistic and multi-dimensional view, and a participatory approach has been adopted within the human-oriented development framework. In that context, the implementation of coherent and integrated policies in areas such as fundamental rights and freedoms, democratization, justice, education, health, employment, social security, food security and public management have been highlighted.

The pluralist and liberal democracy perspective has been chosen as the main objective for guaranteeing fundamental rights and freedoms and non-discrimination on the basis of all ethnicity and political view. Within the framework of pluralist and participatory democratic political process, the strengthening of the social groups and NGOs has been prioritized. The increase in the role of local authorities, encouraging participation of private sector and civil society, public-private sector-civil society cooperation have been enhanced. The strengthening of SMEs in succeeding in global competition, accessing sufficient capital, developing the innovative projects and businesses and establishing partnerships have been selected as the priorities.

The Plan addressed the governance crisis that emerged with the global financial crisis of 2008 which brought up reform needs to the agenda of the EU integration process. In line with this perspective, while pursuing the EU membership target, Türkiye continued to improve the global economic and social cooperation activities, and relations with neighbors by pursuing integration with the world and to implement effective cooperation and aid strategies.

The main objective is to enhance relations with Islamic countries, EU, other regional countries and regional initiatives in political, economic, social, cultural and scientific fields and to make more effective use of multilateral and regional cooperation. Development of political, economic, cultural, social and scientific cooperation with the Turkic world has also been settled as the priority.

The people-oriented development which is the basis of the new government system, rule of law and democratization has been one of the main axes of the plan. One of the fundamental objectives of the plan period is to strengthen democratic institutions and procedures in the public sector through establishing an understanding of transparent, accountable and effective democratic governance. Moreover, it is aimed to improve active citizenship awareness, to ensure effective participation of NGOs in decision-making processes, to increase cooperation between civil society-public-private sectors and to develop social dialogue environment, and to strengthen institutional, human and financial capacities of NGOs.

While the goal of full membership to the European Union is directly included in the vision statement in the Ninth Plan, it is noteworthy that the emphasis on the EU has weakened in the Tenth Plan. Although there are messages that the EU perspective will be preserved, the EU membership goal has been moved away within the scope of the general content of the Plan and it is understood that the relations with the EU will be carried out within the framework of international relations with the following words;

Work towards the full membership to the EU will continue however the reforms to be realized for the full membership will focus on maximizing the benefits of the process, relations will be carried out on the basis of the rule of law, in line with the principle of mutual benefit and in the long-term.

The fourth development axis in the plan, “*International Cooperation for Development*” draws attention as a priority that has not been seen in previous plans. In the plan, Türkiye's current position in international development cooperation has been underlined and the ways to strengthen this position have been given a wide place.

It has been emphasized that Türkiye's relations with the countries of the region should be increased. In this context, it is stated that Türkiye should benefit more from these multilateral structures such as the Standing Committee for Economic and Commercial Cooperation of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (COMCEC) and the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) and should play a more active role in the process of increasing the effectiveness of these structures.

In the Tenth Plan, the measures for the agriculture and food sectors have been identified under the development axis of “*Innovative Production, Stable High Growth*”. It is aimed to create an agricultural sector that is based on adequate and balanced nutrition of the society, utilizing advanced technology, having strengthened organization and high productivity. The plan targets to solve infrastructure problems, to increase international competitiveness and to build an efficient and demand-based production structure that uses the natural resources sustainably. The prevention of land fragmentation, establishment of a well-functioning agricultural land market, increase of efficiency and the agricultural enterprises’ businesses have been prioritized to reach a sufficient income size in agriculture. The transition to a new support mechanism based on watersheds arranged with social and environmental purposes and

production-oriented has been determined as a new policy. The product pattern, water potential and certified production methods have been emphasized in agricultural support schemes. Priority has been given to the food sector and supply of enough food as a reaction to climate change and global crises. The assessments of risks and the reduction of losses in the agri-food chain have been highlighted in order to ensure food safety and security.

In the Tenth Plan, the measures for the agriculture sector have been also identified under the heading of “soil and water resources” in the development axis of *"Innovative Production, Stable High Growth"*. The main objective has been identified as to protect and develop the amount and quality of water and soil resources, and to develop a management system that will ensure their sustainable use, especially in the agricultural sector, where demand is the highest. This policy choice has considerable place in response to the rising climate change crisis globally.

The aim of the rural development policy is to improve the working and living conditions of the rural community. Strengthening the rural economy and increasing the employment, developing human resources and reducing poverty, improving social and physical infrastructure and protecting the environment and natural resources have been chosen as the general framework of rural policy. The Plan has envisaged that rural development supports would be used to improve competitiveness in agriculture. The Plan has emphasized the supporting of the local development initiatives that can provide local ownership and improve the problem-solving capacity of rural areas.

The measure regarding agricultural supports to form an organized and highly competitive agricultural structure ensuring food safety and security and enabling the sustainable use of natural resources deploying with the crises has been included in the *"Rationalization of Public Expenditures Priority Program"* of the plan.

Under the Priority Program for *"Use of Water in Agriculture"*, the measures to increase the training and extension services for the sustainable use of water resources and to increase the use of climate adapted product patterns by agricultural supports have been included targeting the water constraints with the global warming. Within the scope of

the “Healthy Life” priority program, it has been foreseen to develop food labeling, traceability and product tracking system for reliable and safe food and to strengthen institutional structures for healthy food production.

Eleventh Development Plan (2019-2023) can be characterized as the first development plan prepared under the Presidential Government System. With the Constitution amendments in 2017, Presidential Government System was adopted and after the elections held in 2018, new government system was initiated. The first sentences of the Plan showed that, it has also a long-term objective of fifteen years and the Plan was identified as the first five-year part of these fifteen years.

The Plan presents this long-term perspective based on the vision of “stronger and more prosperous Türkiye that produces more value added and shares more fairly”. In the context of this vision, the Development Plan focuses on facilitating competitiveness and efficiency increase in all fields. The Plan has five fundamental axes; 1) Stable and Strong Economy, 2) Competitive Production and Productivity, 3) Qualified Human and Strong Society, 4) Livable Cities and Sustainable Environment, 5) Rule of law, Democratization and Good Governance.

The plan aims at transforming the economic structure maintaining stability and sustainability while improving human capital through reforms in education and raising the technology and innovation capacities through a breakthrough in national technology. In line with this approach, the Plan also aims at increasing of the national production and accelerating the industrialization particularly in priority sectors identified in the manufacturing industry.

Agriculture, tourism and defense industry have been chosen as the priority fields of development. In these fields of development, the priority has been given to increase the export scale and accelerate the value added through productivity and efficiency rise. The Plan has highlighted the needs for the research and development, innovation and digitalization to put into action with focus on high technology. It has been emphasized that the agriculture sector would be affected also with the information platforms and digitalization. The agriculture sector’s main strategies and policies have

been mentioned under the two axes of the Plan; Axis 2) Competitive Production and Productivity and 4) Livable Cities and Sustainable Environment.

In the Eleventh Development Plan, under “Competitive Production and Productivity” a manufacturing industry oriented approach has been adopted to increase competitive production and productivity by use of the R&D, technological developments, innovation and digitalization. The priority sectors have been identified to provide the productivity growth and to ensure a structural transformation in the manufacturing industry. The establishment of a strong financial structure with easily accessed financing instruments and the digital transformation in the manufacturing industry have been chosen as the accelerating policies of this axis in order to lead to a significant increase in productivity. In this axis, the increase of the productivity in agriculture, industry and services and making these sectors more competitive have been chosen as the policy areas. The adoption of high technology, improvement of labor skills, and rise of the quality of corporate management, improvement the era for investment, supporting the incentives for innovation and entrepreneurship and easy access to finance have been settled as targets.

The main objective of the plan regarding agriculture has been to create an efficient agricultural sector that is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable, globally competitive with its production structure. The agriculture has been defined strategic in order to balance the food supply and demand and to provide adequate and balanced nutrition of the people of the country. The expected food deficit and insecurity which may come due to the global climate crisis made clear to take the measures to increase of agricultural production. The agriculture policy part of the Plan recognized first the need for the impact analysis of the agricultural supports to increase the efficiency of the agricultural supports.

The plan has prioritized the provision of accurate and reliable data at macro and micro level and recording of the whole chain extending from seed to table by institutionalization of the annual monitoring and evaluation activities by the completion of the agricultural information systems. Moreover, the main resources for agricultural activities; the soil and the water management have been prioritized for the

purpose efficient use of land for agricultural activities and water for irrigation. In order to evaluate the unused land, the establishment of land banking system has been put as the priority.

The increase in plant production and development of livestock farming have been put as the policy in the Plan which shows the recent global concerns on food security and climate change. In addition, the Plan has prioritized the development of innovative and smart agricultural technologies. Small family enterprises have been underlined for protection within the policy of land acquisition which aims to increase the agricultural enterprises to size of agricultural land with sufficient income. Training measures to improve agricultural skills have been chosen for the reduction of production costs, use of technology, production of high quality and healthy products, especially for women and young farmers.

The Plan under Livable Cities, Sustainable Environment axis addresses the obstacles resulted by increasing population and urbanization. The urban economic activities and diversified consumption habits have negative effects on the environment and natural resources. The recent environmental problems such as environmental pollution, climate change, desertification, deforestation, loss of biodiversity and droughts have also emphasized. Moreover, the climate change was blamed to cause natural disasters and threats to human life; sustainable environment and natural resource management has become the main priority in this axis.

The main target under Rural Development is to enhance the capacity of producer organizations and family farms. Rural Development aims to activate the rural labor force, improve the living conditions, eliminate poverty and improve the welfare of the rural communities. These policy tools will help to keep the rural population in their territory, so sustainable rural development will be achieved.

The improvement of the social and physical infrastructure of the rural settlements, by previously started projects; Village Infrastructure Support Project (KÖYDES) and Rural Infrastructure Project of Metropolitan Cities (KIRDES) have been prioritized in the plan.

The complementarity between the Rural Development Support Program (KKYDP), the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance Rural Development Support Program (IPARD), the Development Agencies and other related support programs have been chosen as the policy to ensuring the unity among different rural development supports. Rural women and young farmers have been prioritized to give support primarily in agricultural training and extension activities, rural support projects and occupational health and safety trainings in agriculture. Strengthening of rural statistics for the data-based rural policy approach, the revision of the definition of rural, the establishment of the rural indicators information system basic and update of the village inventory have been selected as the policy measures for the rural development part.

The Eleventh Development Plan draws attention with its feature of being the first plan of the Presidential System in the new formation of the Country. With this new structuring, the public organization has completely changed and a new structuring has emerged. In parallel with this development, the plan includes a new axis targeting “good governance”.

Although there are many targets and policy measures on agriculture in the development plan, agricultural policies are handled under two axes in parallel with the previous planning period. The most striking policy choice in the plan is that the resolution of the statistical deficiencies of agriculture. For example, measures to strengthen the agricultural data infrastructure, such as conducting a new agricultural census which was made in 2001, revising the definition of rural areas which was determined in 2007 within the framework of the IPARD Program, and renewing the village inventory studies are noteworthy.

The measure of “doing the impact analysis of agricultural supports” in the plan, on the other hand, stands out as a matter that has come to the fore as a need, especially in recent years. Digitalization, innovation and technical developments, which are primarily included in the Plan, have come to the fore as a globally prominent direction recently.

6.2. Changes in the Parliamentary Discourses

The years after 2014 witnessed the changes in the political discourses due to the rising uncertainties and risks in the world. This change has been clearly noticed particularly in the speech of the Minister of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, Faruk Çelik (Şanlıurfa) in 2015. The Minister stressed the high importance of agriculture since 40% of the world's population made a living from agriculture. He pointed out the growing world population, the rising need for food and the global concerns on the reduction of agricultural land in the world due to the distorted urbanization and desertification. In line with these global concerns, the importance of agricultural production in terms of evaluating the potentials, increasing the welfare of farmers and leaving a more productive Türkiye for future generations came to the agenda. Despite the global financial crises, political tensions and climate crises experienced in recent years, showed that the significant place of Turkish agriculture in the economy and employment was an opportunity to withstand crises. These words of the Minister took substantial place regarding the food security concerns of the world.

The oppositions also drew attention to the rising concerns of food security, and the reduction of pastures with the opening for urbanization. The politicians were in same opinions on the point that world had approaching was much more serious than thought. The most important problems of those who earn a living by agriculture were identified to resist the costs of labor, fertilizer, diesel fuel, electricity and irrigation which were constantly increasing with the global crises. Moreover, the agricultural sector, which had a downward trend due to the impacts of the embargo crises with Russia in 2016 led to a major collapse in the export of fresh vegetables and fruits. The debates in the Parliament concentrated to find alternative new markets having the capacity to close the gap. Moreover, the debates were developed to recompense the negatively affected economic situation due to the global crises.

During the debates on 2017: Minister of Food, Agriculture and Livestock Faruk Çelik (Şanlıurfa) spoke was remarkable since he clarified again the strategic importance of

agriculture. He highlighted that the future of agriculture would be an issue of the whole world. He uttered after the industrialization revolution, agriculture was pushed to the second level and left behind the industry. Industry came to the fore and it was thought that this would continue like this, but it was seen that this would not be the case. He drew attention to the increasing world population and the rising need for food. He specified that there was a reduction in agricultural land in the world and addressed the coming food crisis due to the climate change, water scarcity and serious difficulties in accessing food. He concluded his speech stressing that the importance of agriculture started to increase globally.

During the debates on budget for 2018, Minister of Food, Agriculture and Livestock Ahmet Eşref Fakibaba (Şanlıurfa) spoke in the similar way, stressing that agriculture was a vital sector whose importance and strategic dimension were increasing every day, the world's population was growing rapidly, arable land was declining, the industry was developing and the urbanization were growing, and human was neglecting the soil which provided the food. He emphasized the increase in agricultural production was essential and the farmers would be remained in production channels. He concluded his speech by pointing out their belief for a strong national with a slogan “nationalist agriculture for strong tomorrow”. In his talk, the Minister prioritized the petty family businesses once again after long time passed since 70s, recalling the peasant form of production. He said that petty family businesses would be encouraged with high amount of support. Moreover, the Minister pointed out that the meat imports would be stopped and the small livestock producers would be supported.

During the debates on 2019 budget, the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry Bekir Pakdemirli (İzmir) said the similar words that they would support the young farmers and small holders in rural areas. He pointed out the data of UN ranking of Türkiye under the 1st in agricultural production in Europe and the 7th in the world. He also stressed that the agricultural land in Türkiye ranked the 17th in the world. He emphasized the effective use of agriculture production and evaluation of national resources well. The protection of small producers was identified as the main task since the future world would face famine. During the debates on 2020 budget; the increase of the importance of agriculture and sustainable production was clear and it was

accepted that the future world would be expected to be an era of crises one of which would be for sure food crisis.

Coming to the 2022's minutes of National Assembly; the concern was on climate crisis and the natural disasters that were foreseen due to the climate change in the world. The deputies were concentrated to put on the agenda the struggles and policies related to climate change. Moreover, attention was also given to the millions of hectares of land in the world that were becoming desert every year. The deformation, degradation and desertification of lands cost the world economy billions of dollars and half of the world's poorest people live on these degraded lands. The coming food crisis raised by the other crises effecting the agricultural production worse, means there will be food shortages, high prices, and problems in accessing food, especially for urban residents who do not contribute to food production. These consumers living in cities have exceeded those living in rural areas, and it is a fact that agricultural production should be increased by using the agriculture land in rural and urban areas. These discourses means that the necessary work for the struggle to protect the naturalness of soil, air and water, and thus peasant mode of production are reproduced for remedy for food crisis.

6.3. Remarks on Triads of Policy Analysis and Future Prospects on Peasant Question

In order to make the concluding remarks on the triangle of policy, polity and politics dimensions regarding agricultural policies and to comment on peasant and agrarian question, the critical turning points, the pushing factors and main internal and external dynamics are summarized in Table 8.

In line with multidimensional approach under the triads of the policy, polity and politics, agricultural policy choices can be clarified in line with three main facts of the Turkish agriculture which have been discussed very deeply in the context of this thesis. The first and the undiscussable one; agriculture is one of the main strategic sectors in Türkiye since it has power in economy and employment particularly in rural areas.

The development of economy and raise in welfare of Turkish people has been overloaded to the agriculture in all periods of Turkish agriculture policy development. Agriculture was a locomotive sector especially during the Single Party, Democrat Party and Justice Party periods for development of economy, employment and feeding of industry. The Country was proud of its self-sufficiency in producing food to feed of own people. The Country ranked in tops in terms of agricultural production values comparing to other countries.

The second fact which was the main source of the policy choices of all planning in Turkish agriculture, related to a theory of comparative politics for the classification of countries as developed or underdeveloped. In an underdeveloped country; agriculture corresponds highly important share in GDP and in total employment. Moreover, engagement with agriculture is higher than these numbers in remote and rural areas with small-sized land or landless agriculture, unwaged labor and very low levels of productivity named as peasant mode of production (Johnston & Mellor, 1961, p.566-572; Byerlee et.al., 2009, p.16; Marume et.al., 2016). In that context, the classical literature advocates a scientific argument which is an empirical regularity for the developed countries in the World that the structural transformation in agriculture may occur when the shares of agriculture in employment and economy declines and this liquidating mass transforms in a way to feed the industry causing increase per capita income and prosperity (Johnston and Mellor, 1961, p.566-572; Byerlee et.al, 2009, p.15).

The third fact of Turkish agriculture is related to its structure; the important character of Turkish farms is their size, they can be characterized in their small size of an average of 6 hectares (ha) well below the average size of farming in developed Countries, typically family-owned using unwaged labor particularly women, highly fragmented almost more than half of the farms have sizes below 2 or 5 ha. In line with this, Turkish agriculture can be characterized as peasant form of production which prove the structure mainly oriented towards the self-sufficiency or low economic capacity having low structural efficiency and incomes lower than average income of the Country (OECD Report, 2011, p. 19). Although this peasant mode of production is defined “suigeneris” and “a value for strategic importance” in early periods of planned

economy, the targets for globalization and liberalization de-emphasized peasants and envisaged a structural change in favor of economical, efficient and big-sized farms.

In this thesis, within the framework of these defined economic and social status of Turkish agriculture, these problematics of agriculture are actually shaped to become economically strong agriculture that can pave the way for the structural change by decreasing the share of agriculture in economy and employment and by liquification of the small and non-economically agricultural labor-intensive rural population to non-agricultural activities (deagrarianization) or economic farms (depeasantization). The Turkish agricultural policies have taken its shape in line with these approaches and within historical turning points of Turkish polity and politics. In sum, the policy choices aimed to be classified as a developed country, to globalize its economy and to accomplish the integration with the EU CAP and rural development.

Table 8. Analysis of Agricultural Policies

PERIOD	Main Motivation	Main Agricultural Policies and Political Economy	Main Plans/Programmes for Agriculture Policies
1950-1960	Collaborating with West and US, adopting Western Institutions (Marshall programme)	- Partially open economy - Import substitution policy - Agriculture supports industry	Unplanned period
1960-1980	- Democratization Environment after Military Coup of 1960 - Additional Protocol with EU for the Customs Union	- Developmentalist Policies - Input and market intervention supports - Import substitution policy - Mixed economy	First Development Plan (1963-67) Second (1968-1972) and Third (1973-1978) Development Plans

Table 8 (cont'd)

1980s-90s to 2001	- Democratization and re-establishment of order and solidarity Environment after Military Coup of 1980 - Integrating with and competing in international markets, -Establishment of Customs Union with EU -Customs Union completed in 1995.	- Open Economy (except agriculture) - Premature external liberalization - Export promotion policy - Structural adjustments, the necessary institutional building - Privatization (SEEs and ASCUs)	-Fifth (1985-1989) and Sixth Development Plans (1990-1994) -Seventh Development Plan (1995-2000)
2001-2006	-Opening of Membership negotiations with the EU - Integration with EU and International organizations, TNCs -Europeanization of Agriculture with alignment to EU-CAP	-Free Market Economy -Direct Income Support (decoupled from production) -Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP)	-Eight Development Plan (2001-2005) -National Rural Development Strategy -Agriculture Strategy -Agriculture Law
2007-2013	- Strategic Planning - Institutional and legislative arrangements for implementation of reforms.	-Programming of rural development - Abolishment of DIS - Input subsidies for fertilizer, diesel and seed, - Rural development supports - Bottom-up approach (LEADER) for rural areas	-Ninth (2007-2013) Development Plan -IPARD Programme I (2007-2013), - Rural Development Action Plan -Rural Development Investments Support Programme - Strategic Plans -Agricultural Drought Action Plan (2008-2012)
2014-date	-Presidential Government System - World Crises (infections, tensions, global uncontrolled movements of people) - Covid-19 -Tension between Ukraine and Russia	-Agri-Environment policies -Sustainable Development Goals -Rise of Food insecurity and input deficiency -De-Europeanization and nationalization - e-governance	-Tenth (2014-2018) and Eleventh Development (2019-2023) Plans - Agricultural Drought Action Plan (2013-2017) and (2018-2022) - Strategic Plan (2019-2023) -IPARD Programme II (2014-2020) -National Rural Development Strategy (2014-2020)

Source: Derived from Boratav et al., (1996, p.374-375), Aydın, 2017, Development Plans

Talking about the historical turning points of Turkish polity and politics and their effects on policy choices, the analysis should start from the 1950's. So, turning to 1950's, the statist policies of 1930's were replaced by the open economy and liberal policies, with the foreign Marshall Aid entered to Türkiye, the mechanization of agricultural production, the use of tractors resulted in intensive agriculture and opening of new land to agriculture in order to increase agricultural production hence the agricultural area expanded. Marshall Aid contributed to the intensification of state support, already in place since the 1930s, for agriculture which involved government credits, input supports and guaranteed state purchasing of main crops (Oyan, 2004, pp.57). The policy of agricultural production extensively carried out in newly opened agricultural lands (Parvin and Hic, 1984, pp.230) and high mechanization of that time formed by importing of outer polity (Marshall aids) and activation of populist politics.

Between 1961 and 1980's, import substitution industrialization (ISI) was the official development strategy with protectionist imports of agricultural products and inputs by SEEs. The agricultural supports were implemented for the protection of the domestic production with price supports and intervention buying by the state monopolies. The “*developmentalist*” and “*state-led policies*” made a mark in agriculture sector, the price supports and input subsidies of that period resulted in high growth rates in agriculture (Imrohoroglu et.al, 2014, pp.1000; Aydın, 2010, pp.152-155, McMichael, 1997, pp.635). In this period, the agricultural policies mostly directed the use of agriculture sector for economic growth with high shares of land and labor involved in agriculture aiming to transfer extensive farming to intensive farming in order to get high agricultural production to provide food for increasing urban population (McMichael, 1997, pp.635; Pamuk, 2008, pp. 382-386). The developmental policies have been implemented by the leadership of state brought about a rapid modernization of agriculture based mainly on small-scale producers and peasants. The period between the years 1960 and 1980 can be commented as the policy become political since planning had gain constitutional power and polity act in line and in compliance with the policy and politics.

After 1980's, the ISI has changed to export-oriented growth strategy with liberalization of entire economy and society. The liberalization of agriculture gained

momentum with the Customs Union in 1995 and the construction of WTO in conjunction with the internationalization of agriculture and the dominant role played by transnational corporations (TNCs). The gradual restructuring of the agriculture sector has picked up tremendous speed after 1999 with the letters of intends given to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and efforts became concentrated on a comprehensive restructuring of agriculture (Gunaydin, 2009; Oyan, 2001; Aydın, 2010 and 2017) accompanied with the speedy decreasing share of agriculture in employment and economy. Moreover, with the decision of EU December Summit in 1999, as accepting Türkiye a candidate country for Membership, the process of reform in the agriculture sector came with the Agricultural Reform Implementation Project (ARIP) as part of the World Bank's structural reform program for adoption of EU-CAP in 2001. This reform package was the break for the previous developmentalist and state control policies in agriculture (Aydın 2010; 2017). The ARIP was the starting point for the fast liberalization and internalization of agriculture. Türkiye had entered into a number of preferential agreements with trading partners and Free Trade Agreements with the EFTA countries (Oskam et.al, 2004).

Türkiye's membership to Customs Union in 1995, announcement of candidature to EU in 1999 made clear the complete restructuring and liberalization of Turkish agriculture. This restructuring of the Turkish agrarian structure has formed a reform package by ARIP, this project started the implementation of "*neoliberal policy agenda*" (Aydın 2010, pp.150) which was the beginning of new era for the agriculture policy to implement full neo-liberal policies (Oyan, 2001; Aydın 2002 and 2010; Günaydin, 2009). This restructuring of agriculture under the neoliberal agenda was characterized for the dissolution of the small peasant farmers form agriculture called "*depeasantization*" and "*deagrarianization*" (Aydın 2010 and 2017).

The year 2005 when the negotiations for the EU Membership were opened can be named as a turning point for the Country and agriculture. The Europeanisation of Turkish agriculture in structural and institutional context started with adoption of numerous laws in order to align to EU CAP and Rural Development Policy with the ninth development plan period (2007-2013). The agricultural reforms mainly targeted to pass the free-market conditions that has led to the partnership and complementarity

between the WTO and the EU as “a *double external anchor*” (Yalman & Göksel, 2017, p.28). In the light of these development, the prescriptions and legislations identified in the plans have been implemented without any doubts by the politics; policy became technocratic, polity absorbed two external anchors and liberalization; politics were repressed by policy and polity.

Although the breakout time is not exact, starting from the 2010's, the changing of World order with crises resulted in the efforts for providing sustainability of soil and water resources against the negative effects of rising climate crisis, ensuring food security, keeping agricultural population in rural areas and increasing agricultural production by efficient use of inputs. The phasing out of ARIP and EU cloning of agricultural support schemes, after 2008's has somehow stopped the high critiques of Turkish politics directed to the government agricultural support policies, however, criticized by the WTO and the EU that the supports was again coupled with the production in the way to distort the international marketing conditions. The study of evaluation of the level of support as producer support estimates based on an OECD methodology carried out on agricultural support figures of 2011 showed that Turkish agricultural supports level for producers were greater than OECD average, the EU and US after 2008 (Larson et al., 2016, pp.1207). These years can be characterized as fluctuations in policy and polity choices and critics of politics.

The plans after 2014; the tenth and eleventh development plans, have encountered the worlds turmoil, crises and chaos in approaches to absorb national and locally forwarded policies and increasing importance of agriculture. The Covid-19 crisis and the tension between Ukraine and Russia raised seriously in the World the food insecurity and famine fears thus the target in agriculture became to protect the agricultural production structure and balance between the supply and demand in order to ensure adequate nutrition of the Turkish citizens.

Recently there is a process leading to a global food insecurity and food crises as a result of a globally spoken energy crisis, turning into a chronic problem with excessive rises in input prices, continuing global climate change risks, reflection of pandemic effects on agriculture and food, and continuing tension between Ukraine and Russia.

Türkiye has been also affected by these crises and problems; agricultural producer price index became higher and there was a contraction in agriculture in recent years despite the economic growth. The world has turned to a place where the agriculture and food sector has become a matter of national security. In this period, the correct implementation of support and incentive mechanisms for protecting agriculture emerges as a possible way to successfully overcome the crisis. The importance of the value chain from farm to fork and the effect of the Green Deal, as well as socio-economic criteria and environmental ethical values, are approaches that cannot be ignored.

Food nationalism also emerges as a protection mechanism against crises. Countries implementing food nationalism policies have imposed export restrictions especially under pandemic conditions and had to implement policies to increase their agricultural potential in order to be able to meet their own needs. Situations such as the reversal of capital transfer towards agriculture have arose globally. Food sovereignty, sustainability of agriculture and provision of food within nationally and locally own means became the policy choices for the polity and politics. All these rising new situations, which emerged as a result of the turmoil and crises in the world, have started to bring the peasant mode of production into the agenda compulsorily and resulted in re-reading of peasant mode of production “repeasantization and reagrarianization” in Europe and in the World.

The climate change became a crisis and water stress are felt intensely all over the world country and Türkiye. Agricultural outputs have been lost due to drought and flood. As a solution to such situations, the tendency towards peasant mode of production in the world and in Türkiye is now striking in the discourses. The preference of this mode of production is now on the agenda for two reasons regarding the rural areas. First, ensuring on-site food supply due to the costly food chain and rising prices, and the second is to reduce poverty in remote and rural areas and to prevent intranational and global migration. In this context, with this mode of production legitimized by the definitions of "new-peasantry" or "repeasantizaiton"; it is possible to implement new innovative agricultural methods such as the cultivation of local animal breeds and plant varieties, the use of natural and organic fertilizers, the activation of pastures for sheep

and goat breeding, the activation of cooperatives in the common use of agricultural machinery. Thus, this mode of production also stands out as agricultural activities with a low carbon footprint. On the other hand, with the method known as "urban agriculture" and described close to this mode of production, measures are taken to prevent the small agricultural lands in the cities to disappear due to urbanization. Policy choices come to the fore on combating climate change and poverty by making a living for the small producers in places where they are located. Support for the revival of local breeds and local plant varieties and ancient breeds is on the agenda.

It can be commented that two very important global changes stand out in the world for policy choice regarding the climate crisis:

- 1) Controlling carbon emissions in order to reduce global warming to normal level with international agreements and subjecting countries to sanctions;
- 2) Transferring supports and finance to policies those fulfill social and environmental responsibility and act accordingly, that is, supporting "greening",

Banks and financial institutions are establishing systems that start to transfer their funds to environmentally sensitive investments. Agricultural production has two-sided characteristics regarding climate change; in one side it is the most affected by global warming and also affects global warming. In addition, food is one of the sectors with the highest ecological footprint. The pollution of surface waters due to chemical fertilization and the high impact of the meat sector (particularly cattle and pig farming) on global warming have made agriculture an area that needs rethinking and radical reforms.

In order to overcome the global crises, the interventions are directed to crisis management and to the application of adaptation policies for ensuring resilience to crises in the agriculture sector. Within the framework of reactions to these world's crises and alarming food insecurity, the peasant mode of production has been brought into the agenda as remedy. So, the international institutions and countries recall the importance of small-sized production for provide food territorially and locally in line with the needs of rural and urban inhabitants.

Thus the “*suigeneris*” characters of peasants have come to the agenda as “repeasantization” or “new peasantry”, but in different and new terms and definitions such as “small farms”, “small holders” or “family farms” recently. Although the denial of peasant question is evident in the discourses of global approaches for crises management, the implications for the reproduction of “new peasantry” are arising obviously in order to response food insecurity risks and food crisis.



CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The main subject of this study is to make a multidimensional policy analysis of the agricultural sector in terms of policy, politics and polity dimensions starting from the planned period in 1960, and putting emphasis on the period of reforms initiated after 1980. In order to make the policy analysis, the Development Plans have been analyzed from the first one which was put into effect in 1963 using the Qualitative Content Analysis. Although the content analysis of the development plans has been highly useful to give an insight on the agricultural policy and polity, it has failed to give a full comprehension on the research questions regarding politics dimension and has been fairly useful to give an idea about agricultural politics. In order to compensate this lack of political dimension of the study, the discourses of the politicians on agriculture issues in the minutes of Grand National Assembly of Türkiye have been analyzed. In line with the research method of the study, it is aimed to make implications and comments on the transformation of Turkish agricultural policies by using a perspective of multidimensional policy analysis including on public policy, polity and politics dimensions.

The Turkish Development Plans define very well the rational goals like eliminating the economic problems, increasing the welfare of the people, creating high level of economic, social and cultural structure, increasing the level of development. However, the content analysis of the plans has put forward very limited expressions or concepts regarding politics. This issue could be understood clearly with a quick review about the historical background of the State Planning Organization (SPO) which is currently the Presidency of Strategy and Budget, the government authority responsible for preparing the plans and having a high say in the social, cultural and economic development of the country. The establishment logic of SPO, has been discussed later,

however, it may be said that the organization is mainly responsible for the development of the country within the course of politics and public policy relations in line with the public administration theories.

The fact that planning is a part of public policy that requires expertise in itself and the public system is based on the principle of rationality, this feature of planning may cause tensions between the polity mechanism established as a constitutional organization and the field of politics. However, it is perhaps inevitable that the plans prepared by the public, which should be based on rational, scientific and real foundations, should be made the subject of politics due to the socio-economically differentiated character of the society in the agricultural sector, its numerical size and its geographically dispersed structure throughout the country. So, a compromise might be expected sometimes. It is closely related to the tension between the need for public administration and politics. Politics, which takes its legitimacy from the elections when deciding on goals has become more in need of public administration; since the success of the policies desired to be implemented required bureaucrats to cooperate more effectively and closely with politicians. In other words, politicians need bureaucrats to implement their decisions. If the bureaucrats are not involved, the government programs put forward or the laws drafted by sole authority of politicians will only be a list of wishes on paper (Bayırbağ 2013; Bayırbağ & Göksel, 2018). The practical application of this situation as examples of politician/public administration reconciliation can be seen in parliamentary speeches of pre-1980 politicians referring to the plans on agriculture-related issues.

When it comes to the history of establishment of SPO; this public authority was established in 1960 after the Military Intervention. The Article 41 of the 1961 Constitution gave power to SPO with the provision that “*To realize economic, social and cultural development through democratic means; it is the duty of the State to make development plans*” and this arrangement has made SPO a part of the constitutional and democratic structure. The establishment of SPO was a turning point in the history of Turkish planning, and an economic model based on planned development was adopted accordingly. Moreover, SPO became a powerful authority by being attached to the Prime Ministry and the legal guarantee of the SPO as a constitutional institution

gave tutelage against the politics. On the other side, the establishment of SPO could be regarded as a reaction of the DP's unplanned development and economic activities. In that context, the first sentences of the First Development Plan have addressed this political choice that the planned development model, which was tried to be created after the 1960 coup, emerged as a reaction to the DP unplanned policies with the phrases:

Türkiye has entered a period of planned development within the democratic order. The effort to realize the desire for development within the framework of plans and programs is not a new event in the history of this country. The plans prepared in the Republican years helped to get important and successful results. Today, Turkish society has a great desire for development. The painful consequences of the unplanned behaviours have adopted planning as an indispensable way of development (First Development Plan).

In this context, planning and the organization are included in the Constitutional structure. It is hard to say that SPO and the plans are quite systematic, objective and scientific and the "public policy" is unique. On the other hand, it should be noted that the SPO draws its strength from knowledge and expertise, with the understanding that the state should make a comprehensive planning through rational and systematic use of national resources and scientific information. In this context, it is clearly seen that the plans include features that are very comprehensive, based on scientific approaches and statistical foundations. In addition, the SPO led to the establishment of a school of technocrats, which can use its power extremely effectively in bureaucracy and for political powers, and trains personnel for senior bureaucratic positions and the leadership of political parties (Karpat, 2013, pp. 88; Eryılmaz, 1998, pp. 163).

It may be implied that especially until the 1980s, the prepared plans belonged to the political authority, with its superior effectiveness in determining the decisions and preferences, being taken as the main source in the context of criticisms of the opposition and political power. Moreover, the plans having a more extensive field of activity outside the scope of a convenient planning including in terms of all aspects of the Country, in addition to the policy making field the plans showed the characters as being used the tools for legitimate and tutelage within the framework of politics. The Plans were used in the text of speeches of the politicians in the National Assembly, in

order to prove their legitimacy and power. The speakers of opposition parties and ruling power have taken the plans as a reference to empower their ideas and interventions during the negotiations on agricultural budget and disputes in the National Assembly.

On the other hand, the legitimacy of the SPO was criticized from time to time in the politics, but it was remarkably high during the ANAP and AK Party governments, for which the criticisms were about the followed policies that were firmly committed to liberal policies. The planning policy as an administrative form of statism is unfounded after the structural adaptation reforms presented as a package with the neoliberal ideology of the post-1980 period, which left its mark on the discourses based on statism and the elimination of the interventionist state, can be clearly seen in the parliamentary minutes. However, it is because of the fact that SPO had constitutional power and relations to the Prime Minister, the administrators and the bureaucrats in SPO had also relations with the political power and opposition parties. Moreover, SPO, due to its responsibility of preparation of the Plan, had close cooperation with the economic, social and environmental actors, universities and private sector, all of which formed the Specialized Committees on the target sector of plans. The impact of the SPO on the economy after the start of EU negotiations reduced with the integration of classical planning function into the international system through the Treasury (Yılmaz and Güler, 2016, pp.306). The SPO was closed and transformed into the Ministry of Development in 2011 which in turn implying no longer attachment to the Prime Minister could be regarded as the result of this approach. This arrangement could be also considered as the separation of polity and politics.

While investigating the Development Plans, in the context of politics-bureaucracy relations, it is found that from time to time they show the features of bifurcation or integration of politics and bureaucracy. For example, there are foundations for the integration of politics and bureaucracy, especially in the plans before 1980's. On the other hand, it is difficult to answer the question of whether it is a politics/administration distinction or an integration, since the AKP government adopted the same policies of liberalization in agriculture, which was targeted in the Development Plan for 2000's. In fact, the Eighth Development Plan (2001-2005),

which was implemented during the AK Party power, had been prepared under the authority of previous ruling power. However, one of the priorities of the plan, the WB supported ARIP, by which neoliberal policies and free economy in agriculture were imposed under a “neoliberal agenda” by the EU was privileged for Membership, its reforms undoubtedly implemented by the AK Party government. Moreover, it cannot be ignored that the strict adherence of AK Party to this plan’s priorities brought about the opening of EU accession negotiations which was worthy in one side for the empowerment of AK party government but on the other side was meaningful for acquisition of liberal policies for politics of AK Party. Besides AK Party, the EU membership process might have been exploited by the SPO as well to strengthen its own administrative power and organization policy. Thus, some bureaucrats of the organization took part in the political arena as deputies or became minister by the preferences of the political authority. In this case, it would not be wrong to say that Development Plans were used as a determining factor in agricultural politics from time to time.

On the other hand, the Eighth and Ninth Development Plans, especially targeting the EU membership, have been meaningful in terms of determining the mandatory laws to be enacted as homework. Moreover, the sharp and undisputed targets and priorities showed how effective the plans and the bureaucrats who prepared the plans were powerful in determining the policies. For this period, it can be said that politics was going on the path drawn by the bureaucracy. In fact, it was not possible to go out of the scene and pathway described in the Ninth Development Plan;

The Ninth Development Plan has been prepared within the framework of the vision and the Long Term Strategy (2001-2023) for Türkiye that grows steadily, shares its income more equitably, has competitive power on a global scale, transforms into an information society, and has completed the harmonization process for EU membership.

Special Commissions, formed with the participation of representatives of public, private sector, universities and non-governmental organizations, had an extremely important function in the preparation of this plan. The seventh plan differed from other plans, and first time in planning history, the plan was prepared for seven-year

perspective instead of five-year in order to be in line with the EU budget period. This was striking and meant, the planning was cloning the EU approach.

On the other hand, another remarkable feature is that although it was stated that the plan was prepared with social consensus through the Special Expertise Commissions in which all the stakeholders were involved, it was impossible to prevent the policies from being sharply criticized by different stakeholders in various platforms (Aydın, 2010;2017; Günaydın, 2009). Especially the ARIP project, a new support scheme the DIS, laws and regulations that were enacted for EU membership (such as Organic Agriculture Law, Seed Law, Licensed Warehousing Law and Agriculture Law), EU Rural Development Program (IPARD Program) and newly established Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institution were highly criticized by opposition parties and had a broad repercussion in the press. There was very sharp criticism in the National Assembly against Mehdi Eker, who was the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs at that time, numerous written/oral questions and motions of interpellations about his wrong policies were marked. Moreover, political debates and academic articles have repeatedly criticized the liberal policies of that time on the arguments that these policies have destroyed the peasantry (depeasantization), destroyed agriculture (deagrarianization) and the country has been no longer of an agricultural country.

Coming to the agrarian question, the agricultural sector has been given an important place in economic and social terms since the First Development Plan. Because, Turkish agriculture has special characteristics, has a large share in the country's economy and employment and it is the main employment source of the population especially in rural areas. In addition, agriculture has often been exposed to the populist and vote-oriented approaches of political parties. On the other hand, it can be said that development plans and agricultural policies followed a path in relation to the developed economies' targets which brought to the fore the change from agrarian economy to industrial one. This policy choice, though it was dominant in plans before 1980's, was particularly seen almost in all plans.

Moreover, although development was tried to be made in a holistic approach where appropriate, the planning was sometimes forced to make territorial policies and populist approaches according to the conditions of the time.

The First Development Plan having special characteristics with the initiation of planned period aims at economic, social and cultural development and it particularly emphasizes the achievement of goals through democratic means. In the plan, although agriculture is one of the main sectors that will ensure development, it is emphasized that the agricultural goals should be achieved within the framework of social justice. Steps have been taken to increase local employment to both contribute to the country's economy and development by increasing agricultural production and to prevent the uncontrolled migration from rural to urban areas. As the strategy of the first development plan, a balanced development rate between agriculture and industry was achieved and a balance was tried to be established between population growth and development rate. The above mentioned context of First Plan and its saying "*The importance of agriculture in economic development and in employment*" were used as same motto in all plans and in the speeches of all politicians in the Parliament. In addition, all governments and political parties in Türkiye have accepted the fact that the development of the country will be through "production" in line with the plan objectives, and this will be achieved primarily through agricultural production. In discussions in the National Assembly, agriculture, farmers and so the plans were often used as a means of legitimizing the policies by the political power or criticizing the Governments by the opposition.

In the plans prepared before 1980, great importance was attached to the discourse of "village development" and "peasant question". In addition, the use of the phrase "peasant" by politicians, whether in power or opposition, in the parliamentary speeches may be an indication that the plans and politicians kept agriculture away from the capitalist framework at that time. In addition, "state economic enterprises" and the role of the state in production have been emphasized. In institutional terms, the establishment of the Agricultural Products Support Institution has an important place in determining the foreign trade targets of producer cooperatives and public institutions in the agricultural sector, which can be seen also as terms of adaptation

with the European Union. The establishment of this Institution was also demanded by various pressure groups. During the preparation process of the Fourth Plan, the Union of Chambers of Turkish Engineers and Architects (TMMOB) on behalf of eighteen professional chambers sent a report to the relevant commission emphasizing the necessity of an institution responsible for supporting agricultural products within the Ministry of Agriculture (TMMOB, 1978). In this respect, it is possible to state that policy makers can take into account the demands of the relevant actors while preparing the development plans. However, the establishment of this institution will not be possible within the framework of the political atmosphere of those years. Although the construction of this institution was not achieved, this target of establishment an EU similar institute was finally achieved during the Ninth Plan period.

The Plans after 1980's, particularly after the Seventh Development Plan (1996-2000), in line with the adoption of the neoliberalist agenda; new terms for peasants were defined and used such as "family farms" or "smallholders" since the term "peasant" was generally avoided although never explicitly rejected by policy makers and politicians. Rather "smallholder" or "family farm" was used to denote rural producers operating on their own account on relatively "small" farms. By this way, rural producers were politically subordinated in state and market relations and that their work motivation derived from provisioning family subsistence. This way of production which named as peasantry attached by the reforms after 1980's and the agrarian character of the economy was blamed to hinder the development capacity of the Country. Thus the plans, particularly after the eight plan which envisaged the implementation of the ARIP, identified the policy choices that favoring deagrarianization and hence depeasantization.

However, the crises in the world; initiated with the drought of 2008's, following global warming and climate crisis, the recent Covid-19 outbreak and tension between Ukraine and Russia created the concerns and fears on food insecurity and famine that the world unavoidably will face as a future crisis (OECD, 2022). This worries recall the agrarian and peasant question again in the global agenda with the form of repeasantization and reagrarianization since peasant form of production can be regarded as remedy for food

insecurity and hunger. Thus, the peasants, those local and territorial producers would be considered a good solution for forming resistance to the upcoming agri-food crisis.

Almost all plans addressed that inappropriate use of resources and inability to follow technological developments delayed the development of the sector. In particular, the fact that traditional habits cannot be easily abandoned has hindered the technological development of the sector. The irregular management in the field of agriculture, the inadequacy of the marketing system, the high prices of inputs, high cost of production and the small-sized and scattered farms have been defined obstacles to agricultural development.

In particular, in the minutes of the Assembly, it is seen that the Governments and the oppositions referred to the Plans and made their actions or criticisms in parallel with the plans. Thus, it may not be a wrong assumption to evaluate that the plans that are supposed to be prepared in a purely technical and systematic way on the basis of the bifurcation of public and politics may be politics itself. On the other hand, as a result of the analysis of the political findings in the contents of the development plans, it could be clearly seen that none of these plans were prepared on political grounds. They were very purely created rationally and entirely with detailed analyzes of the agricultural sector.

The common discourse of the first four plans is that they are focused on production and development; that the economy is targeted at a certain annual rate of growth, that the industry is a priority sector and part of a long-term strategy, and that the industrial move can be achieved through agricultural development. In this context, they set a certain annual growth rate economically and a certain agricultural growth within this growth as a target. On the other hand, the Turkish economy experienced radical transformations in economical, sociological, cultural and political fields with the military intervention in 1980. With the 24 January 1980 Decisions, it was aimed to integrate the change experienced all over the world. This integration was of vital importance for the world economies, which was again influenced by the Neo-Liberal Economics understanding in those years. The January 24 Decisions reflect a neo-liberal understanding, as they are based on the “price mechanism” and defend the free

market economy. The feature of these decisions taken with the aim of "starting economic development" is to ensure the development of industry in the country and to increase foreign trade. The Fifth Development Plan (1985-1989) could be considered as a package in which the January 24 decisions were implemented. On the other hand, in order to prevent the turmoil and political polarization in the society before the 1980s, it can be said that the emphasis was placed on "democracy", while keeping the people away from politics was adopted as a policy.

The Turkish economy had to struggle with serious political and economic crises in the 1990s. As a result of the involvement of international financial institutions in the economy, the imbalances created by the inability to determine an effective legal and political system, as well as economic problems, high inflation and economic crises left their mark on this period. The intensity of criticism of liberal policies between the political power and the opposition continued on the basis of populism in the National Assembly. It would be a necessity to admit that the Ninth Plan period (2007-2013) undoubtedly took place in public policy and politics as the acceptance of the whole approach of the EU. In these years, even though, the minister of agriculture of that time was heavily criticized by the opposition parties in the National Assembly, we have actually tested how politics and public policy acting could work together and in harmony.

Although the Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018) clearly emphasizes the importance of wealth and social solidarity in addition to economic growth, it also includes the impression of a slowdown in "liberalization" in terms of "social welfare" discourses, which is similar to the plans that took place before 1980. In terms of the political formations of that period, it would be the right choice to approach the issue cautiously. Because, although the EU approach in agriculture was no longer applied as before, it was clear that the impositions of globalization and the WTO still continued. It was also inevitable for this period as the determining factors around the world were crises and that the current order was "disorder" in every field. The global turmoil, the economic problems seen in 2008, the crises brought on by migration, climate change and infectious diseases, and the strengthening of far-right politics in the countries gave the signs that the world and Türkiye had entered a new era. This

new era necessitated inclusion of measures to prevent imports and increase production, and the involvement of discourses “*national and domestic*” in the plans. In addition, the indicators of progress from quantitative targets to qualitative targets were clear in the discourses of the Turkish economy and development plans.

Development plans have enabled important structural changes in the administrative field as a means of bringing the public administration to a more functional structure in terms of Turkish public administration. It is necessary not to keep the development plans in Türkiye independent from the universally accepted administrative reforms. In this context, development plans are documents that determine the policies for administrative reform or reorganization approach to be followed in the medium and long term. In line with this, the reorganization and institutional measures for the Ministry of Agriculture have also been determined through the plans.

In the context of institutional arrangements and public administration (polity), the plans before 1980’s referred to the well-functioning of SEEs, more effective execution of public administration and to implement a series of reforms on law and justice to construct the social equity and democracy. The importance of SEEs in terms of public entrepreneurship draws attention in development plans. In the plans before 1980, the public policies of the welfare state and the elements of social justice drew attention. The fifth plan, on the other hand, undertook the reform of public administration on the basis of liberalization within the new constitutional order adopted after the 1980 coup. The sixth and seventh development plans took measures to carry out institutional reforms through "restructuring" and "privatization". While the Ninth Development Plan adopted the "new public management" structure, the tenth and eleventh development plans applied the public management method via strategic planning and performance budgeting. In the tenth plan, law, information society, human development, environmental protection issues were emphasized, and the understanding of participatory and human-oriented development was adopted. The eleventh plan (2019-2023) has given great importance to the administration within the framework of the 2023 targets of the Country via the priority axes being the “state of rule, democratization and good governance”. Under this title, justice and security services, administrative structuring, policy making, strategic management in the public

sector and e-government applications are among the most important issues. The first emphasis of the eleventh plan in terms of Turkish public administration is the new government system. As a matter of fact, it was stated in the Plan that a human-centered development approach was aimed within the framework of the Presidential Government System, which was accepted with a referendum in 2017 and started to be implemented effectively and officially as of 2018.

The plans prepared after 1980 showed a tendency that the political power of that period when the plan was prepared had an effect on the policy choices. The new system included changes and new constructions in the institutional arrangements mechanisms. For example, the "reorganization of Agricultural Sales Cooperatives in a rational way", which was a priority in the fifth plan, gives the impression that it emerged as a result of the parliamentary debates and the political conjuncture of that day. In fact, although similar goals were undoubtedly repeated in the five-year development plans, public administration is always used at the focal point of Turkish politics and in terms of the opposition's criticism of the current government. The Ministry of Agriculture's affairs and the Minister were frequently criticized; reorganization of the Ministry were discussed in debates of budget in the Assembly. Starting from the seventh plan, it is clearly stated that the institutional arrangements should be made for a rapid transformation within the scope of the globalization process and EU harmonization policies. We see the reflection of globalization and liberal policies as the restructuring of the Ministry of Agriculture and SEEs.

The recent three development plans emphasized the strategic planning approach by performance budgeting of the institutions. The Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Agriculture has been prepared since 2008. The eleventh plan aimed to strengthen the awareness and organization of a democratic, participatory and accountable civil society and to ensure the active participation of non-governmental organizations in the decision-making processes of the state. Within the framework of this objective, it is stated that administrative and economic arrangements will be made for the role of non-governmental organizations in decision-making and legislative preparation processes related to various public policies. It is the first time that such importance has been

given to the role of non-governmental organizations in public policies and decision-making processes in a development plan.

The eleventh plan has marks on the development process regarding the polity dimension namely on the development of institutional capacity and e-government applications in public services. Within the framework of the new Presidential Government System, the plan gave special importance to strengthening the institutional, economic and human capacities of both the public administration and the organizational structure of the presidency within the framework of the Presidential Government System. Moreover, the plan offered the development of the e-Government Gateway in line with e-government applications and the development of activities related to cyber security management.

The era of after 80's, controlling the workers' movements and political polarization, which were thought to have been the source of various debates and conflicts in the pre-coup period brought up first among the subjects included in the Plan. In this context, the discourses in the Assembly during the draft law preventing the activities of the producer organizations with political parties drew attention.

The ninth plan had marks on gender issues while addressing the studies for women farmers in rural areas, which have an important place in agriculture, and preparation of action plans. Problems of women farmers have also taken an important place with the candidacy for the EU membership.

The last three development plans have turned to strategic planning in line with the reflections of New Public Management such as; assessment of situation, information gathering, determination of strategy and objectives, programming, implementation and evaluation of plan outputs and measurement of success. After the ninth plan, and by the adoption of the Law No. 5018 (Public Financial Management and Control Law) the strategic planning has become mandatory. Strategic plans, which determine the policies and priorities of the ministries have started to be prepared. On the other hand, in the preparation period of the ninth plan, in addition to public institutions and organizations, Special Expertise Commissions, formed from representatives of various

actors like non-governmental organizations, private sector, universities, etc. contributed significantly to the emergence of this plan from a functional point of view. It is clear that the content and structure of the ninth plan was prepared entirely within the scope of international politics, especially EU membership and negotiations.

The governance approach and New Public Management break the bifurcations between the public and private sectors, the actors performing the act of governance have increased, especially as a result of processes such as globalization, internationalization and Europeanization. Public services have no longer considered interdependent and solely on the state; social and economic responsibilities are carried out jointly by - and multiplied - actors, networks, private sector and civil society. The agriculture policy cannot be considered within the separation of politics and public administration, and public administration has become one of the actors that cooperate and ensure coordination and interaction. This approach was strictly followed during the EU funded Rural Development Programme (IPARD Programme). In the framework of network governance, IPARD Programme LEADER approach can have remarkable place regarding the inclusion of economic, social and environmental actors and bottom-up approach in the policy making process.

Although NPM and governance were based on minimizing the state and making market conditions dominant and shrinking the bureaucracy in practice, the Turkish case didn't show a decrease in the "effectiveness" of public administration and polity. On the contrary, in order to ensure the neoliberal transformation process and to manage the EU accession period, the public authority became a stronger executive system, a stronger administrative structure than before, in order to co-ordinate the decision-making and implementation processes, to operate the multi-part state structure in a coordinated manner and to act quickly. So the policy acting became strong, planning had gained technocratic character, and politics was repressed by policy and polity.

It could be said that all strategies of agriculture sector were made from a single command center of state authority, so the resulting plan was carried out in a disciplined manner under the constant supervision of the political authority. It is possible to say that the Planning Authority which emerged as an organization affiliated to the Prime

Ministry and later Presidency in Türkiye, has political elements from the very first moment, despite all its rationality and objectivity claims. Türkiye aimed to transform from an agricultural society to an industrial society since the first Plan. It was planned to achieve this by using agriculture in providing raw material for industry and accordingly by the development of industry. There have always been ruptures, economic, social and political responses that the country has experienced within itself and with its surroundings in terms of planning. On the other hand, it is very difficult to identify what planning means. It is difficult to answer the question of whether planning is the result of a political decision or is a planning tool of the public system. The abolition of the SPO, which was a strong, centralized structure affiliated to the Prime Ministry in Türkiye, and the establishment of the Ministry of Development in 2011, and then the establishment of the Presidency of Strategy and Budget in a centralized structure within the Presidential Government System may indicate transformations regarding the political nature of planning. Taking this into account, it is noted that in order to prove their legitimacy and to satisfy their desire to have a say in the management or supervision of the agricultural society, the political powers and the oppositions in Türkiye have frequently addressed the development plans. It is a realistic approach to say that the plans are used as a tool for political purposes as well as for policy making. The plans have also been a good method for the survival of Türkiye's "statist-central government" tradition.

In addition, as for the polity dimension, the empirical case of Türkiye's neoliberalism, shows that the state remains an important actor for shaping the policies. In this context, it might be said that the Turkish polity has always been state-centered despite the liberalization policies implemented since 1980s. Although different economic, social and environmental actors have appeared particularly after the start of EU Membership negotiations, they have never had sounds in the policy cycle in the way that should be. The state has always been hostile towards the demands of interest groups and has traditionally had a top-down governing style. Although the last plans envisages numerous measures for the network governance and pluralist approach in all sectors, the governance mechanism lacks, whereas liberalization did not lead to a society-centered polity; instead it led to party-centered polity where paternalistic relations and populist approach are abundant with economic, social and environmental actors. In

the agriculture sector, this party-centered polity has been experienced time to time with respect to government subsidies, credit payments, investments etc. in the minutes of the National Assembly.

It is not surprising to find out in the Parliamentary discourses how agriculture and agricultural lands were dealt for political and populist purposes and how ruthless the neoliberal policies were implemented. In fact, the agricultural land statistics clearly showed how the agriculture-friendly and production-oriented policies implemented until 1980 were overturned afterwards. In addition, this issue has been repeated many times by the opposition deputies in the Assembly. The deputies in the Parliament have stressed how agricultural land started to shrink rapidly as of 2000 due to the interest of the political powers in urbanization and housing construction and the neoliberal agenda that started with the ARIP. This situation caused agricultural lands to decrease after 2011. Although this reduction in the agricultural land appeared in the content of the Development Plans, the reason for this reduction has never been connected with the political dimension or the populist approaches of the political powers, but the reason has been explained by scientific reasons such as drought and wrong land use.

While some actions related to rural development were noted in the first development plans before 1980, the village-city (Köy-Kent) project has had a considerable importance. With this project, it was aimed to collect social and cultural services that could not be delivered to some villages and made them accessible to other villages. In the first four plans, the subject of "priority regions in development" was given a lot of attention and it was aimed to put the Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) into practice. Rural development replaced village development after 2005 with the EU Membership negotiations. The IPARD Programme has been prepared and implemented to develop rural economies.

To conclude; almost all development plans have addressed that the misuse of resources and the inability to follow technological developments delay the development of the sector. In particular, the fact that traditional habits cannot be easily abandoned has hindered the technological development of the sector. Irregular management in agriculture, inadequacy of the marketing system, high input prices, high production

costs and small-scale and scattered farms have hindered agricultural development. Particularly in the minutes of the Assembly, it is seen that the Governments and the opposition refer to the plans frequently and make their actions or criticisms by taking the plans as a reference. Therefore, it may not be a wrong to say that the plans that are prepared technically, systematically, independently and rationally can be politics itself. On the other hand, as a result of the analysis of the political findings in the content of the development plans, the idea that none of these plans were prepared for political reasons, but were created with detailed analyzes of the agricultural sector.

In order to summarize on the basis of the main question of the study, it can be seen that since the planned period started in 1960, the peasants question was changed in discourses, and the “peasant” term changed to new terms as “small holders” or “family farms”. The peasant form of production which means farming with traditional methods on small-scale, scattered and fragmented land, has not completely disappeared despite the agricultural reforms, the peasants have persisted today without breaking their structure of which can be seen both in the statistical data and in the discourses of the Parliament. In other words, despite the reform practices that can be read in many capitalist frameworks such as globalization, neoliberalization, harmonization with the CAP under the membership negotiations with the EU, the country-specific agricultural characteristics of “the peasants” resisted which can be implied also in terms of continuity. However, it is necessary to say that it is not easy to interpret the agricultural approaches (agrarian approach) or agricultural reforms (agricultural reforms) preferences applied against this mass as an administration (polity)/politics bifurcation or integration under ruptures and returns.

An issue that can be considered as an important potential for Türkiye is the evaluation of the resilience of these private small producers, which have survived somehow, against crises and sharp capital-oriented policies. Thus, it is impossible not to see the findings that Türkiye's "*suigeneris*" agriculture can be placed on the agenda of policy makers, in order to meet the nutritional needs at the local and national level against the food insecurity and hunger crisis that the world will definitely experience in the future.

Maybe, it is not wrong to say that, the recent global crises and expected food crisis recall the “peasant” question in the new discourses such as “small farms”, “small holders” or “family farms” and for the purposes of “enhancing the local production” and “providing sufficiency in food territorially” represent the reproduction of peasantry called in terms of “repeasantization” or “new peasantry” globally.



REFERENCES

- Acar, F., & Altunok, G. (2013). The 'politics of intimate' at the intersection of neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism in contemporary Türkiye. In *Women's Studies International Forum*, 41, 14-23.
- Adaman F., & Arsel M. (2010). Globalization, Development and Environmental policies in Türkiye, in T. Cetin, F.Yilmaz (eds), *Understanding the Process of Economic Change in Türkiye*, 319-335, Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Altuntaş, C., & Türker, D. (2012). Sürdürülebilir tedarik zincirleri: sürdürülebilirlik raporlarının içerik analizi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(3), 39-64.
- Akça, İ., & Balta-Paker, E. (2013). Beyond military tutelage? Turkish military politics and the AKP government. *Debating Security in Türkiye. Challenges and Changes in the the Twenty-First Century*, 77-92.
- Akça, İ. (2014). Hegemonic projects in post-1980 Türkiye and the changing forms of authoritarianism. *Türkiye reframed: Constituting neoliberal hegemony*, 13-46.
- Akram-Lodhi, A. H. (2008). (Re)imagining Agrarian Relations? The World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development. *Development and Change*, 39(6): 1145–1161.
- Akram-Lodhi, A., & Kay, C. (2009). *Peasants and globalization: Political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question*. London: Routledge.
- Aksu, Gündüz (2014), “Üçüncü Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı’nda Çevreye İlişkin Düzenlemelerin Politik Kaynakları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5 (2): 2-13.
- Araghi, F. A. (1995). Global Depeasantization, 1945-1990. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36 (2):337-368.
- Aydın Z., 2002, The New Right, Structural Adjustment and Turkish Agriculture: Rural Responses and Survival Strategies, *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol.14, No.2, December 2002, p.183–208.
- Aydın Z., 2010, “Neo-liberal Transformation of Turkish Agriculture”, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 149-187.

- Aydın, Z. (2017). Çağdaş Tarım Sorunu; Ekonomik, Politik ve Sosyolojik Kuramlar, Yaklaşımlar, Politikalar, Imge Kitabevi.
- Bache, I. (2003). Governing through Governance: Education Policy Control under New Labour Political Studies, 51, 300–314.
- Banaji, J. (1990). Illusions about the peasantry: Karl Kautsky and the agrarian question. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 17 (2), 288-307.
- Banerjee, A. (2009). Peasant Classes under Neo-liberalism: A Class Analysis of Two States. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44 (15), 49-57.
- Basaj, M. (2007). The Solution to the Agrarian Question in Poland in the Light of the Concept of Sustainable Development. *Management and Sustainable Development*, 2 (17), 76-82.
- Basu, R. 2004. Public Administration: Concepts and Theories. Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. pp.507.
- Bayar A.H. (1996), The developmental state and economic policy in Türkiye, in *Third World Quarterly*, 17(4), 773- 785.
- Bayırbağ, M. K. (2013). Kamu politikası analizi için bir çerçeve önerisi, METU Public Policy, Course notes.
- Bayırbağ, M. K., & Göksel, A. (2018). Kamu yönetimi. Siyaset Bilimi: Kavramlar, İdeolojiler, Disiplinler, 153.
- Behn, R. D. (1981). Policy analysis and policy politics. *Policy Analysis*, 199-226.
- Bengtsson, M. (2016) How to Plan and Perform a Qualitative Study Using Content Analysis. *Nursing Plus Open*, 2, 8-14.
- Berk, M. (1968). *Structural changes in Turkish agriculture during the initial Five year Development Plan (1963-1967)* (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University) <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/38921661.pdf>
- Berkovich, I. (2013). A multidimensional approach in international comparative policy analysis based on demographic projections. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 32(6), 943-968.
- Bernstein, H. (2001). The Peasantry in Global Capitalism: Who, where and Why? *Socialist Register*, p.25-52.
- Bernstein, H. (2018). Agrarian political economy and modern world capitalism: the contributions of food regime analysis. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol.43. No.3; pp. 611-647.

- Bhavana, R. (2016). The Peasant Farmers of India: The Need to Classify and Recognise Their Rights. *ILI Law Review*, 96-112.
- Boğuşlı Ö., & Oğuztimur S. (2021). 2000 Sonrası Kalkınma Planlarının Ulaştırma Politikaları Bakımından İncelenmesi, *Kent Akademisi*, 14(2), 452-467.
- Bole, D., Pipan, P., & Komac, B. (2013). Cultural values and sustainable rural development: A brief introduction. *Acta geographica Slovenica*, 53(2), 367-370.
- Boratav, K., Türel, O., & Yeldan, E. (1996). Dilemmas of structural adjustment and environmental policies under instability: Post-1980 Turkey. *World Development*, 24(2), 373-393.
- Brass, T. (2000). *Peasants, Populism and Postmodernism, The Return of the Agrarian Myth*. New York NY: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.
- Bryceson, D. F. (1996). Deagrarianization and Rural Employment in sub-Saharan Africa: A Sectoral Perspective. *World Development*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 97-111.
- Bryceson, D. F. (2000a). Peasant Theories and Smallholder Policies. Past and Present. In D. F. Bryceson, C. Kay, & J. Mooij, *Disappearing Peasantries: Rural Labour in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (pp. 1-35). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Bryceson, D. F. (2000b). Disappearing Peasantries? Rural Labour Redundancy in the Neo-liberal Era and Beyond. In D. F. Bryceson, C. Kay, & J. Mooij, *Disappearing Peasantries: Rural Labour in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (pp. 299-326). London: Information Technology Publications.
- Bryceson, D. F. (2004). Agrarian Vista or Vortex: African rural livelihood policies. *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 31, No.102, 617-629.
- Bryceson, D. F. (2005). Chapter 4: Rural Livelihoods and Agrarian Change in Sub-Saharan Africa: Processes and Policies. In F. Ellis, & A. Freeman, *Rural Livelihoods and Poverty Reduction Policies* (pp. 48-61). London: Routledge.
- Bryceson, D. F. (2019). Gender and generational patterns of African deagrarianization: Evolving labour and land allocation in smallholder peasant household farming, 1980–2015. *World Development*, Vol. 113, pp. 60–72.
- Bryceson, D., Sarkar, P., Fennell, S., & Singh A. (2010). Globalisation, Structural Adjustment and African Agriculture: Analysis and Evidence. *European Report of Development in Cambridge* (pp. 1-40). UK: Munich Personal RePEc Archive.

- Byerlee D., Janvry A., Sadoulet E., 2009, Agriculture for Development: Toward a New Paradigm, *The Annual Review of Resource Economics*, Vol.1, pp.15-31.
- Capano G., 2011, Government continues to do its job: A comparative study of governance shifts in the higher education sector, *Public Administration*, Vol. 89, No. 4, pp.1622–1642.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*, Sage Publications, London.
- Chayanov, A. (1966). On the theory of non-capitalist economic systems. In D. Thorner, B. Kerblay, & R. Smith, *On the Theory of Peasant Economy* (pp. 1-29). Homewood: The American Economic Association.
- Chiengthong, J. (2010). State and market: the Politics of development, “Peasantization,” and Agrarian restructuring, in Northern Lao PDR. *Research in Rural Sociology and Development*, Volume 16, 95–112.
- Cho, J. Y., Lee, E. (2014) Reducing Confusion about Grounded Theory and Qualitative Content Analysis: Similarities and Differences. *The Qualitative Report*, 19, 1-20.
- Considine, M. & Lewis, J.M. (2003). Bureaucracy, Network, or Enterprise? Comparing Models of Governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp.131-141.
- Considine, M. (2012). Thinking outside the box? Applying design theory to public policy. *Politics & Policy*, 40(4), 704-724.
- Çiçekdağı, M. (2020). Kalkınma Planlarında Turizm: İçerik Analizi Yöntemi ile Türkiye Kalkınma Planlarının Analizi. *International Journal of Tourism and Social Research*. 5, 1-11.
- Demir, Ş. Ş. (2014). Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planlarından Türkiye Turizm Stratejisi 2023’e: Turizmde Tanıtma Çalışmalarına Yönelik İçerik Analizi. *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5 (15), 101-119.
- Denhardt J.V. & Denhardt R.B. (2007). *New Public Service; Serving, Not Steering*, M.E.Sharpe, Armonk, New York.
- Dryzek, J.S. (1993). *Policy Analysis and Planning: From Science to Argument*. In
- Dunn, W. N. (2015). *Public policy analysis*. Routledge.
- Dye, T. R. (1987a). Policy analysis. What governments do, why they do it, and what difference it makes. In: Dye, Th. R. *Understanding Public Policy*, 1-18. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, Inc.

- Dye, T.R. (1987). *Understanding Public Policy*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Eastham, J. K. (1964). The Turkish Development Plan: The First Five Years. *The Economic Journal*, 74(293), 132-136.
- Easton, D. (1976). Theoretical approaches to political support. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 9(3), 431-448.
- Edelman, M. (2013). *'What is a peasant? What are peasantries? A briefing paper on issues of definition'*. Geneva: Intergovernmental Working Group on a United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas.
- Elo, S. & Kyngas, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115.
- Ercan M.R, & Öniş Z. (2001). “Turkish Privatization: Institutions and Dilemmas”, *Turkish Studies*, 2(1), 109-135.
- Erlingsson, C. & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis, *African journal of emergency medicine*, 7 (3), 93-99.
- Eryılmaz, B. (1998). "Bureaucracy-Power Relations from the Establishment of the Republic to the Present", Dursun and H. Al (Ed.), *Management Tradition in Türkiye*, Istanbul: İlke Publishing, 153-166
- Eryılmaz, B. (2008) “Bureaucracy and Politics”, Istanbul: Alfa Publications
- Fischer, F., Miller, G. J., Sidney, M.S. (2007). *Handbook of public policy analysis: theory, politics, and methods*. Routledge.
- Flick, U., Von Kardorff, E., Steinke, I. (2004). What is qualitative research? An introduction to the field. In Flick, U., Von Kardorff, E. and Steinke, I. (Eds). *A companion to qualitative research*, Sage Publications, 3-11.
- Flick, U. (2018). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, 6. ed., Sage Publications, Los Angeles, California.
- Forman, J., & Damschroder, L. (2008). Qualitative content analysis. In Jacoby L., & Siminoff L.A. (Eds) *Empirical methods for bioethics: A primer*. Elsevier Ltd., 39-63.
- Foster, G. M. (1965). Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good. *American Anthropologist*, Vol.67, pp.293-315.
- Frederickson, H.G., (2004). Whatever Happened to Public Administration? Governance, Governance Everywhere, Working Paper QU/GOV/3/2004,

Institute of Governance Public Policy and Social Research, Queen's University, Belfast.
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.537.8624&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Friedman, M., & Friedman, R. D. (1981). *Free to choose: A personal statement*, Milton and Rose Friedman, New York, Avon.
- Friedmann, H. (2006). Focusing on Agriculture: A Comment on Henry Bernstein's 'Is There an Agrarian Question in the 21st Century?' *Canadian Journal of Development*, 27(4), 461-465.
- Fry, M. J. (1971). Türkiye's first five-year development plan: An assessment. *The Economic Journal*, 81(322), 306-326.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. London, UK: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Gong, X., Liu, Y., & Sun, T. (2020). Evaluating Climate Change Governance Using the "Polity–Policy–Politics" Framework: A Comparative Study of China and the United States. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 6403-6421.
- Graham, G. J. (1988). Theoretical contributions of political science to policy analysis: "The policy orientation" Revisited. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 463-479.
- Größler, A. (2010). Policies, politics and polity: Comment on the paper by Bianchi. *Systems Research & Behavioral Science*, 27(4), 385–389.
- Gruening, G. (2001). Origin and theoretical basis of New Public Management, *International Public Management Journal*, 4, 1–25.
- Gunaydın G., 2009, "Türkiye Tarım Politikalarında Yapısal Uyum", *Mülkiye*, Vol. 33, pp. 175-222.
- Günşen, H. B., & Atmış, E. (2020). Kalkınma planlarında yer alan orman köylüsüne ilişkin politikaların zamansal değişimi. *Bartın Orman Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(1), 256-272.
- Hajer, M. (2003). Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy sciences*, 36(2), 175-195.
- Hajer, M. (2003a). A frame in the fields: policymaking and the reinvention of politics, In M. Hajer ve H. Wagenaar (Ed.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, Cambridge University Press, 88-110.
- Hampton, G. (2009). Narrative policy analysis and the integration of public involvement in decision making. *Policy sciences*, 42(3), 227-242.

- Hebinck, P. (2018). De-/re-agrarianisation: Global perspectives. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol.61, pp.227-235.
- Heisler, M. O., & Peters, B. G. (1977). Toward a multidimensional framework for the analysis of social policy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 434(1), 58-70.
- Heynig, K. (1982). The principal school of thought on the peasant economy. In R. Prebisch, A. Gurrieri, & G. Weinberg, *Cepal Review* (pp. 113-141). Santiago de Chile: UN Economic Commission for Latin America.
- Hill C.J. and Lynn L.E., 2004, Is Hierarchical Governance in Decline? Evidence from Empirical Research, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp.173-195.
- Hilmi A. and Burbi S. (2015). Peasant Farming, A Buffer for Human Societies. *Development*, Vol. 58 No.2-3, 346-353.
- Hobsbawn, E. (1992). The Crisis of Today's Ideologies. *New Left Review*, Vol.192, pp.55-64.
- Hobsbawn, E. (1994). *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*. London: Michael Joseph.
- Hood C., 1991, A Public Management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, Vol. 69, pp.3-19.
- Hoppe, H. (1993). Policy Cycle: The Case of Ethnicity Policy Arguments in the Netherlands. In Fischer, F., & Forester, J. (Eds.). *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 77-100.
- Hsieh, H-F., Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Hüller, S., Heiny, J. and Leonhäuser, I.U. (2017). Linking agricultural food production and rural tourism in the Kazbegi district—A qualitative study. *Annals of Agrarian Science*, 15(1), 40-48,
- Hysing E., 2009, From Government to Governance? A Comparison of Environmental Governing in Swedish Forestry and Transport, *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 647-672.
- IAASTD. (2009). *Global Report*. Washington: International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development.
- Imrohoroglu A., Imrohoroglu S., Gungor M., 2014, Agricultural Productivity and Growth in Türkiye, *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, Vol.18, pp. 998-1017.

- Jann, W., & Wegrich, K. (2007). Theories of the policy cycle. In Fischer, F., Miller, G. J., Sidney, M.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis*, Routledge, 43-63.
- Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (1990). *Democratic politics and policy analysis*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Johnston B.F., and Mellor J.W., 1961, The Role of Agriculture in Economic Development, *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 566-593.
- Jordan, A., & Lenschow, A. (2010). Environmental policy integration: a state of the art review. *Environmental policy and governance*, 20(3), 147-158.
- Karpat, K. H. (2013) "Turkish Political History, Evolution of the Political System", Istanbul: Timaş Publications
- Katatas, C. (1966). *A study of the 1963-1967 Turkish five-year plan for economic development with special reference to investment decisions and resource allocation* (Doctoral dissertation, Durham University). http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9853/1/9853_6647.PDF
- Katsamunsk, P. (2012). Classical and Modern Approaches to Public Administration, *Economic Alternatives*, 1, 74-81.
- Kautsky, K. (1988). *The Agrarian Question*. London: Zwan Publications.
- Kautsky, K. (2017). The Development of a Marxist. *Historical Materialism*, Vol. 25, No.3, pp.148-190 .
- Kay, C. (2015). The Agrarian Question and the Neoliberal Rural Transformation in Latin America. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, pp. 73-83.
- Kerney, M. (1996). *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry: Anthropology in Global Perspective*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Kersbergen K.V. and Waarden F.V., 2004, 'Governance' as a bridge between disciplines: Cross-disciplinary inspiration regarding shifts in governance and problems of governability, accountability and legitimacy, *European Journal of Political Research* Vol. 43, pp.143–171.
- Klijn E.H., 2008, Complexity Theory and Public Administration: What's New? *Public Management Review*, Vol.10, No.3, pp.299-317.
- Knoepfel, P., Larrue, C., Varone, F., & Hill, M. (2007). *Public policy analysis*. Policy Press. United Kingdom.

- Köse, M. A. (2012). Agricultural Policy Reforms and their Implications on Rural Development: Türkiye and the EU. *Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 75-98.
- Köseoğlu, Ö., & Demirci, Y. (2017). Türkiye’de Büyük Veri ve Veri Madenciliğine İlişkin Politika ve Stratejiler: Ulusal Politika Belgelerinin İçerik Analizi. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22 (Kayfor 15 Özel Sayısı), 2223-2239.
- Krippendorff, K. (1989). Content analysis. In E. Barnouw, G. Gerbner, W. Schramm, T. L. Worth, & L. Gross (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of communication* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Vol. 1, pp. 403-407.
- Kuckartz, U. (2014). *Qualitative Text Analysis. A Guide to Methods, Practice & Using Software*, Sage Publications, London.
- Lamba, G. (2017). *Development and Change in Agrarian Society:Emerging Issues*. Patiala: Twentyfirst Century Printing Press.
- Lange, P., Driessen, P. P., Sauer, A., Bornemann, B., & Burger, P. (2013). Governing towards sustainability—conceptualizing modes of governance. *Journal of environmental policy & planning*, 15(3), 403-425.
- Larson D., Martin W., Sahin S. and Tsigas M., 2016, Agricultural Policies and Trade Paths in Türkiye, *The World Economy*, pp. 1194-1224.
- Lenin, V. I. (1964). *Lenin's Collected Works*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Leong, C. (2017). Hajer’s institutional void and legitimacy without polity. *Policy Sciences*, 50(4), 573-583.
- Lynn L.E., Heinrich C.J and Hill C.J. 2000, Studying Governance and Public Management: Challenges and Prospects, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol.2, pp. 233-261.
- MacRAE, D. Jr. (1993). Social Policy Analysis: Roles and Prospects. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 99-124.
- Magdoff, F. and Tokar B. (2009). An Overview of the Food and Agriculture Crisis. *Monthly review*, Vol. 61No.3, pp. 1-12.
- MARA, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, (2008). Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance Rural Development (IPARD) Programme (2007-2013). Ankara,TÜRKİYE [Online] Available: https://www.ab.gov.tr/files/ardb/evt/2_Türkiye_ab_iliskileri/2_2_adaylik_su_reci/2_2_7_Türkiye_ab_mali_isbirliigi/2_2_7_1_ipa/2_2_7_1_9_ipav_2007_2013/2007_2013_ipard_programi____tr.pdf
- MoD, Minisrty of Development. (2013) .The Tenth Development Plan. (2014-2018), <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>

- Marume, S. B. M., Jubenkanda, R. R., & Namusi, C. W. (2016). Comparative public administration. *Int. J. Sci. Res*, 5, 1025-1031.
- May, P. J. (1986). Politics and policy analysis. *Political Science Quarterly*, 101(1), 109-125.
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis, *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Art. 20, 2000. [online access on; 07.04.2022]:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/215666096_Qualitative_Content_Analysis
- Mayring, P. (2004). Qualitative content analysis. In Flick U., von Kardoff E.,Steinke I.(Eds.) *A companion to qualitative research*, Sage Publications, 266-270.
- McMichael P., 1997, Rethinking globalization: the agrarian question revisited, *Review of International Political Economy*, VOL. 4, No.4, pp. 630-662.
- Mee Kam N.G., 2008, From Government to Governance? Politics of Planning in the First Decade of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, *Planning Theory & Practice*, Vol.9, Issue:2, pp.165-185.
- Meijers, E., & Stead, D. (2004, December). Policy integration: what does it mean and how can it be achieved? A multi-disciplinary review. In *Berlin Conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change: Greening of Policies-Interlinkages and Policy Integration*. Berlin. [online access on; 07.04.2022]
http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/ffu/akumwelt/bc2004/download/meijers_stead_f.pdf
- Migdal, J. S. (1974). *Peasants, Politics and Revolution*. Surrey: Princeton University Press.
- Misra, M. (2016). Is Peasantry Dead? Neoliberal Reforms, the State and Agrarian Change in Bangladesh. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, pp.1-18.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization: Updated edition of international bests*. Sage Publications.
- Morell, I. A. (2014). I do not understand how I became a farmer”: The small-peasant path to family farm enterprise in post-socialist rural Hungary. *Development Studies Research*, Vol 1, No. 1, 88-99.
- Mullally, G., & Dunphy, N. P. (2015). State of play: review of environmental policy integration literature. Research series paper no. 7. [online access on; 07.04.2022]
[https://cora.ucc.ie/bitstream/handle/10468/3029/Mullally & Dunphy 2015.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1](https://cora.ucc.ie/bitstream/handle/10468/3029/Mullally_%20Dunphy_2015.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1)

- Narli, N. (2000). Civil-military relations in Türkiye. *Turkish Studies*, 1(1), 107-127.
- Nedergaard, P., & Wivel, A. (2017). Conclusions: Scandinavian polities, politics and policies reconsidered. In Nedergaard, P., & Wivel, A. (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Scandinavian Politics*, London: Routledge, 306-312.
- O'Connor, M. K., & Netting, F. E. (2008). Teaching policy analysis as research: Consideration and extension of options. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44(3), 159-172.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1993). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Penguin.
- Oskam A., Burrell A., Temel T., Berkum S., Longworth N., Vélchez I.M., 2004, Türkiye in the European Union Consequences for Agriculture, Food, Rural Areas and Structural Policy, Report Commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, Wageningen University, pp. 285
- Ostrom, V. & Ostrom, E. (1971). Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration Author(s): Public Administration Review, 31 (2), 203-216.
- Ostrom, E., & Polski, M. (1999). An Institutional Framework for Policy Analysis and Design. In *Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis Center for the Study of Institutions, Population, and Environmental Change Department of Political Science Indiana University*. [online access on; 07.04.2022] <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.691.5464&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- OECD Report, 2011, Evaluation of Agricultural Policy Reforms in Türkiye, OECD Publishing. [Online] Available: (Access dated on 27.06.2022); <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264113220-en>
- OECD (2022), States of Fragility 2022, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/c7fedf5e-en>.
- Oyan O., 2001. 2000 ve 2001 Programlarında Ulusal Tarım Politikalarının Tasfiyesi, Mülkiye, XXV/ 228, 33-59.
- Oyan, O., 2004, “Tarımsal Politikalarından Politikasız Bir Tarıma Doğru”, in N., Balkan and S., Savran (eds) Neoliberalizmin Tahribatı 2000’li Yıllarda Türkiye 2, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 55-71.
- Öniş, Z. (2010). Crises and Transformations in Turkish Political Economy, in *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 9 (3), 45-134.
- Öniş Z., and Caner B.(2002). 'Türkiye's Political Economy in the Age of Financial Globalization: The Significance of the EU Anchor', *South European Society and Politics*, 12 (2), 147 – 164.

- Öniş, Z. and Webb, S.B. (1992), Political Economy of Policy Reform in Türkiye in the 1980s, Country Economic Department, The World Bank.
- Özkan, A. G. E. S., Karataş, İ. H., & Gülşen, C. (2016). Türkiye’de 2003-2013 yılları arasında uygulanan yabancı dil eğitimi politikalarının analizi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(1), 245-256.
- Pal, L. A. (1992). *Public policy analysis: An introduction*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada.
- Pal, L.A. (2014). *Beyond Policy Analysis – Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times*, Fifth Edition, Nelson Education, Toronto.
- Pamuk, Ş. (2008). Economic change in twentieth-century Türkiye: is the glass more than half full? University of Washington, Cambridge University Press, 266-300
- Parsons, W. (2002). From muddling through to muddling up-evidence based policy making and the modernization of British Government. *Public policy and administration*, 17(3), 43-60.
- Parvin M., and Hic M., 1984, Land Reform versus Agricultural Reform: Turkish Miracle or Catastrophe Delayed? *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 207-232
- Patel, R. (2008). *The Worldbank and Agriculture*. South Africa: Action Aid.
- Patton, C. V., Sawicki, D. S., Clark, J.J. (2016). *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning* (3rd ed.). Routhledge.
- Peters B.G., 2011, Steering, rowing, drifting, or sinking? Changing patterns of governance, *Urban Research & Practice*, Vol. 4, No.1, pp.5-12.
- Peters B. G., 2014, Is governance for everybody? *Policy and Society*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 301-306.
- Pierre J. and Peters B.G., 2000, *Governance, politics and the state*, Macmillan, Basingstoke, Hants published in the USA by St Martin's Press, New York, pp. 231.
- Pierre J., 2009, *New Governance, New Democracy? The Quality of Government* Institute Working Paper Series, Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg. Online address: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43559046.pdf>
- Pignatti, E., Carli G., Canavari M. (2015) What really matters? A qualitative analysis on the adoption of innovations in agriculture, *Agrárinformatika/Journal of Agricultural Informatics* 6 (4), 73-84. Pollitt C., 2000, Is the Emperor in His

Underwear? Public Management: An International Journal of Research and Theory, Vol.2, Issue.2, pp.181-200.

Pisano, U., Lepuschitz, K., & Berger, G. (2013). National sustainable development strategies in Europe 2013. *Taking stock and exploring new developments*. European Sustainable Development Network Quarterly Report. [online access on; 07.04.2022]

<https://www.sd-network.eu/quarterly%20reports/report%20files/pdf/2013-July-National Sustainable Development Strategies in Europe 2013.pdf>

Pisano, U., Lepuschitz, K., & Berger, G. (2014). Sustainability transitions at the international, European and national level. European Sustainable Development Network Quarterly Report. [online access on; 07.04.2022] https://www.esdn.eu/fileadmin/ESDN_Reports/2014-July-Sustainability transitions at the international European and national level.pdf

Pollitt C., 2001, Clarifying Convergence. Striking similarities and durable differences in public management reform, *Public Management Review*, Vol: 3, Issue 4, pp.471-492.

Presidency of Strategy and Budget (2018). Eleventh Development Plan. (2019-2023). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>

Prittwitz, V. (1989). Multifaceted analysis of international environmental policy. *Industrial Crisis Quarterly*, 3(1), 77-99.

Prittwitz, V. (June 20,2012) Multi-Dimensional Political Analysis. New Perspectives for Political Science, Consulting, and Political Education. [online access on; 07.04.2022] https://userpage.fu-berlin.de/vvp/multidimensional_political_analysis_200612.pdf

Rao, B. (2016). The Peasant Farmers of India: The Need to Classify and Recognise their Rights. *ILI Law Review*, 96-112.

Redfield, R. (1956). *Peasant Society and Culture: An Anthropological Approach to Civilisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reichertz, J. (2004) Objective Hermeneutics and Hermeneutic *Sociology of Knowledge*, A companion to qualitative research, 290-295.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1996). The new governance: governing without government. *Political studies*, 44(4), 652-667.

Rhodes R.A.W., 1997, Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity, and Accountability. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Rhodes R.A.W., 2008, Understanding Governance: Ten Years On, *Organization Studies*, Vol 28, pp.1–22.

- Robert, C., & Zeckhauser, R. (2011). The methodology of normative policy analysis. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30(3), 613-643.
- Roller, M.R. (2019). A Quality Approach to Qualitative Content Analysis: Similarities and Differences Compared to Other Qualitative Methods, [online access on; 07.04.2022] <https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/download/3385/4485?inline=1#g7>
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*, Sage Publications, Los Angeles, California.
- Seddon, D., & Margulies, R. (1984). The Politics of the Agrarian Question in Türkiye: review of a Debate. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 11(3), 28-59.
- Sexsmith, K. and McMichael, P. (2015). Formulating the SDGs: Reproducing or Reimagining State-Centered Development? *Globalizations*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 581-596.
- Sidney, M. S. (2007). "Policy Formulation: Design and Tools". In Fischer, F., Miller, G. J., Sidney, M.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*, Routledge, 79-87.
- Snyder, W. W. (1969). Turkish economic development: The first five year plan, 1963–67. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 6(1), 58-71.
- Somel, A. (2009), "The Myth of Planning in Türkiye", *Political Thought in Modern Türkiye 9: Periods and Mentality*, ed. HE. Laciner, 1st Edition, İletişim Publications, Istanbul.
- Soper, R. (2015). Globalization and the Agrarian Question: Divergent Development of Two Export-Oriented Farming Communities. *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, Volume 34, 235-260.
- Specht, K., Siebert, R., & Thomaier, S. (2016). Perception and acceptance of agricultural production in and on urban buildings (ZFarming): a qualitative study from Berlin, Germany. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 33(4), 753-769.
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (1963). The First Five-Year Development Plan. (1963-1967). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (1968). The Second Five-Year Development Plan (1968-1972). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (1973). The Third Five-Year Development Plan. (1973-1977). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (1979). The Fourth Five-Year Development Plan. (1979-1983). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>

- SPO., State Planning Organization. (1984). The Fifth Five-Year Development Plan. (1985-1989). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (1989). The Sixth Five-Year Development Plan. (1990-1994). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (1995). The Seventh Five-Year Development Plan. (1996-2000). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (2000). The Eight Five-Year Development Plan. (2001-2005). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- SPO., State Planning Organization. (2006). The Ninth Development Plan. (2007-2013). <https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kalkinma-planlari/>
- Stemler, S. E. (2015). Content analysis. *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource*, 1-14.
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Tacoli, C. (1998). Rural-urban interactions: a guide to the literature. *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol.10, No.1, pp. 147-166.
- Taylor, F.W. (1914). Scientific Management. *The Sociological Review*, 7(3), 266-269.
- Treib O., Bähr H., Falkner G., 2007, Modes of governance: towards a conceptual clarification, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.14, No.1, pp.1-20.
- Throgmorton, J. A. (1991). The rhetorics of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences*, 24(2), 153-179.
- Timmer, C. P., Falcon, W. P., & Pearson, S. R. (1983). *Food policy analysis*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- TMMOB. (1978). Türk Mühendis ve Mimar Odaları Birliği, Dördüncü Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı Taslağı Konusunda DPT Tarafından Düzenlenen Toplantıya Sunulan TMMOB ve 18 Odasının Görüşleri. [online access on; 07.04.2022] https://www.jmo.org.tr/resimler/ekler/ccae08c176dc746_ek.pdf?dergi=JEOLOJ%DD%20M%DCHEND%DDSL%DD%D0%DD%20DERG%DDS%DD
- Torgerson, D. (1986). Between knowledge and politics: Three faces of policy analysis. *Policy sciences*, 19(1), 33-59.
- Torgerson, D. (2007). Promoting the Policy Orientation: Lasswell in Context. In Fischer, F., Miller, G. J., Sidney, M.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis*, Routledge, 15-28.

- Treib, O., Bähr, H., & Falkner, G. (2007). Modes of governance: towards a conceptual clarification. *Journal of European public policy*, 14(1), 1-20.
- Türker, A. (2020). Environmental Problems in Development Plans in Türkiye. *Journal of Current Researches on Educational Studies*, 10 (1), 89-102.
- TBMM. (2022). Grand National Assembly of Türkiye, The Department of Library and Archive Services,
https://www5.tbmm.gov.tr/kutuphane/tutanak_sorgu.html
- Öztürk, M., Jongerden, J., & Hilton, A. (2018). The (re) production of the new peasantry in Türkiye. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 61, 244-254.
- Ulusal İstihdam Stratejisi (2014-2023), Aile, Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı, [Online] Available: (Access dated on 27.06.2022); www.uis.gov.tr/media/1430/tarim.docx
- Van den Berg, L., Hebinck, P., & Roep, D. (2018). ‘We go back to the land’: processes of repeasantisation in Araponga, Brazil. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol.45, No.3, pp.653-675.
- Van der Ploeg, J. D. (2018). From de-to repeasantization: The modernization of agriculture revisited. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol 61, pp.236-243.
- Vanhaute, E. (2010). Peasants and depeasantization. *Handbook of World Systems Analysis*, 1-11.
- Varone, F., Jacob, S., & De Winter, L. (2005). Polity, politics and policy evaluation in Belgium. *Evaluation*, 11(3), 253-273.
- Vollstedt M. &Rezat S. (2019). An introduction to grounded theory with a special focus on axial coding and the coding paradigm. In Kaiser G, Presmeg N. Compendium for early career researchers in mathematics education. Springer Nature; 2019 Apr 26;13:81-100.
- Walker, W. E. (2000). Policy analysis: a systematic approach to supporting policymaking in the public sector. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 9(1-3), 11-27.
- Wharton, Jr. C. R.,1969, Subsistence agriculture and economic development, Taylor & Francis, New York, pp.639.
- White, L. G. (1994). Policy analysis as discourse. *Journal of policy analysis and management*, 13(3), 506-525.
- White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: A flexible methodology. *Library trends*, 55(1), 22-45.

- Wilson W. (1887). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2 (2), 197-222.
- Wolf, E. R. (1966). *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- World Bank. (1992). Governance and Development, <http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/604951468739447676/pdf/multi-page.pdf>
- Woods, M. (2007). Engaging the global countryside: globalization, hybridity and the reconstitution of rural place. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(4), 485–507.
- Woods, M. (2017). Globalization and rural areas. In N. C. Douglas Richardson, *The International Encyclopedia of Geography* (pp. 1-6). USA: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Yalman G.L., & Göksel A. (2017).Transforming Türkiye? Putting the Türkiye-European Union Relations into a Historical Perspective, *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 14 (56), 23-37.
- Yapar S.(2005), Türkiye'de Tarımsal Ekonomi ve “Destekleme” Politikasının bir aracı olarak Doğrudan Gelir Desteği Sistemi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Karaman İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 2 (5), 21- 37.
- Yılmaz, A., & Güler, T. (2016). Reading the Power Struggle Between Politics and Bureaucracy Through the State Planning Organization during the AK Party Governments. *Journal of Management and Economics Research*, 14(2), 294-316.

APPENDICES

A. CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name and Surname	İlknur DEDE
Office Address	
Tel	
Mobile phone	
E-mail	
Date of birth – Place of birth	
Marital status	

ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

[Date from - Date to]	Degree(s) or Diploma(s) obtained/Institution
15.09.2015- date	<i>PhD. All but Dissertation (ABD) student, Institute of Social Sciences. Department of Political Science and Public Administration. Middle East Technical University. Ankara. TÜRKİYE</i>
15.09.2012 –15.02. 2015	<i>MSc. European Integration. Centre for European Studies. Middle East Technical University. Ankara. TÜRKİYE</i>
01.11. 2010- 01.03.2011	<i>Certificate. Farm Management. University of Wolverhampton, Business School. Wolverhampton/ENGLAND</i>
16.10.2007- 09.01.2008-	<i>Certificate. European Union Common Agricultural Policy European Community Research Center. Ankara University. Ankara. TÜRKİYE</i>
10.02. 2000 -01.07. 2001	<i>Certificate. European Union Policies. European Community Research Center. Ankara University. Ankara. TÜRKİYE</i>
1988-1993	<i>BSc. Faculty of Engineering. Chemical Engineering Department. Middle East Technical University. Ankara. TÜRKİYE</i>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

•Date	22 October 2013– Date
• Name of the Employer	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry/ General Directorate of Plant Production
• Position	Government senior officer (Chemical Engineer)
• Main activities and responsibilities	As of 2013 working in the departments making and implementing policies on agricultural inputs (fertilizer and seed), the following duties have been performed; - Expert in the Climate Change Working Group, - Attendance in the European Green Deal, Farm to Fork Strategy working group Committees, - Projects Monitoring Expert of the International funded Projects, - Civil expert in the area of Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) in Food and Agriculture Planning Group (FAPG) under NATO since 2016, - Preparation of comments and recommendations regarding the CBRN issues based on International and National legislation and implementation, - Preparation and coordination of agriculture and rural development plans, programs and strategies, - Project preparation and management on agriculture and rural development regarding the International funds, - Negotiation of agriculture related bilateral agreements with other Countries, EU and Free Trade Agreements, World Trade Organization (WTO) - Licensing, certifying and control of Fertilizer Companies and implementing the “Regulation (EC) No 2003/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 relating to fertilizers in Türkiye.
•Date	15 May 2011 – 22 October 2013
• Name of the Employer	Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock/ Strategy Development Board /Coordination and Administrative Affairs Department
• Main activities and responsibilities	- Preparation and coordination of rural development plans, programs, and Strategic Plan of the Ministry.
•Date	December 2009 – 15 May 2011
• Name of the Employer	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs/ General Directorate of Organization and Support /Rural Women’s Department
• Main activities and responsibilities	- Planning of the annual training programs for rural women, - Advisory services of MARA targeting the rural women and their farming activities, - Preparation of Regional Programs targeting rural women, - Preparation of “Action Plan to Improve and Strengthen the Capacity and Role of Rural Women”.

•Date	May 2005 – December 2009
• Name of the Employer	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs/ Strategy Development Board
• Main activities and responsibilities	- Participation in EU Accession Negotiation regarding Agriculture and Rural Development Chapter, - Rural development programming of the Country with regard to national and international funds, - Coordination of the programming of Rural Development financed by EU pre-accession funds (IPA I, IPARD Programme, 2007-2013), - Secretariat of the IPARD Programme Monitoring Committee, - Preparation of National Rural Development Strategy (2007-2013) and National Rural Development Plan (2010-2013), - Designing of the agri-environment measure of the IPARD Programme - Determination of baseline, output, result and impact indicators for improving the competitiveness of the agricultural sector, the environment (agri-environmental issues) and the quality of life in rural areas, -Accreditation of IPARD Managing Authority
•Date	October 1998 – May 2005
• Name of the Employer	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs / Department of External Relations and EU Coordination
• Main activities and responsibilities	- Coordination and monitoring of the affairs of the Ministry with the international organizations (UN, FAO, IFAD, WB, OECD etc.) - Communication between the Ministry and other national organizations on EU and international agricultural subjects, - Coordination and organization of agricultural relations of the Country with international and EU institutions.
•Date	1996 - 1998
• Name of the Employer	Ministry of Education
• Position	Teacher
• Main activities and responsibilities	- Teaching English in preparatory school of a High School
•Date	March 1995 – November 1996
• Name of the Employer	Sa-San medical products limited company
• Position	Quality Assurance Manager
• Main activities and responsibilities	- Taking the precautions for providing quality assurance of the end products and raw materials - Guarantee the quality of raw materials and final products. - Procedures in importing of raw materials and assure the requirements for the high quality products.

TRAINING STATUS

26-27 May 2021 (Phase 1), 18-19 August 2021 (Phase II), 17-21 October 2021 (Phase III), Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia (CICA) Smart Agriculture Application and Development Online Seminars

05-09 April 2021, Module 1 trainings of the Project for the Strengthening the Institutional Capacity for Adaptation to Climate Change, EU Project, Online, Ankara/TÜRKİYE

15-22 March 2021, The Vulnerability and Risk Analysis meetings carried out under the Project for Strengthening the Adaptation Capacity for Climate Change managed by the UNDP, Online, Ankara/TÜRKİYE

26 February 2021, RACVIAC Centre for Security Cooperation, Chemical Weapons Convention Workshop, Chemical Security Audit for dual-use chemicals, online.

21-24 September 2020, RACVIAC Centre for Security Cooperation, C-WMD NETWORK- Table Top Exercise on dual use technologies and emergent technologies, Online

21-23 February 2020, Government Officers Training Program, taking responsibility as trainer on the subject “National Security and CBRN”, Antalya/TÜRKİYE.

02-05 September 2019, Responsible Chemical Distribution and Trade Conference, US Department of State’s Office for Chemical Security Program, Frankfurt/GERMANY.

18-21 June 2019, Tabletop Exercise on a strengthening Multi-Sector Coordination to Prevent Unconventional Threats and Enhancing Preparedness Capacity for CBRN incidents organized by US Department of State’s Office of Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR-CSP) in partnership with Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL) and the Department of Homeland Security’s Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Antalya /TÜRKİYE.

08-12 January 2018 and 06-09 February 2017, Training on International and EU Projects Development, Monitoring and Management, TÜRKİYE.

09-13 November 2015, Training on CBRN threats and incidents, Antalya/TÜRKİYE.

02-03 November 2017, Eskişehir University and **05-06 February 2018** Mersin University: Case Study Workshop, Development of Case Writing and Teaching Skills, TÜRKİYE.

04-22 May 2015: Research on interrelations in between Chinese and Turkish agricultural/environmental and rural situation, research, policies and strategies. Beijing Normal University (School of Environment), scholar of “Confucius Institute, Hanban”, CHINA.

13-17 June 2011: Course on Marketing Strategies for Local Food Producers, International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (CIHEAM), Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Zaragoza (IAMZ), Zaragoza/SPAIN.

20-29 May 2010: Training on Identifying, Planning and Preparing Small/Medium Scale Agricultural and Rural Investments (Rural Invest) projects, detailed project formulation and analysis, project monitoring and evaluation, FAO Course- Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

07-08 July 2008: TAIEX Seminar on Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of EU and Monitoring and Evaluation of IPARD Programme. Belgium/ BRUSSELS.

14-18 April 2008: CIHEAM Course on Agri-Environmental and Development Indicators as Tools for Sustainable Rural Management – Zaragoza/SPAIN.

21-25 May 2007 – Training on Programming of Rural Development in the EU, Principles, Methodology and Practice. Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

17-19 January 2007 - Project Cycle Management Training under the Twinning Project for Rural Development. Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

11-15 September 2006: Seminar on Common Agricultural Policy of EU participated by MEDA Countries. European Institute of Public Administration, European Centre for the Regions (EIPA, ECR) Barcelona/SPAIN.

30 May-03 June 2005: TAIEX Seminar on Rural Development Policy of EU with regard to pre-accession. Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

05 Jan- 04 April 2005: Attendance the MSc Taught Course named ‘Agriculture Policy Reforms in OECD and in the transition countries’ in UK. Research on EU Rural Development Policy and Special Accession Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development (SAPARD). Visit to Universities of Rural Development, meetings with the staff of Countryside Agency, DEFRA (Rural Development Service) in UK in order to share the Country experience on rural development programming. UNITED KINGDOM.

17- 20 June 2000: The challenge of rural developments in the EU accession countries. Third World Bank/FAO EU Accession Workshop. Sofia/BULGARIA.

PUBLICATIONS IN SEMINARS AND CONFERENCES

Dede I., Antep N., 2019, The Management of Agricultural Production Systems against CBRN Threats, Second International CBRN Congress Book, November 27-29 2019, pp. 238-242, Ankara/TÜRKİYE

Dede I., Onen E., 2019, How Does the European Union Governance Mechanism Work for Civil Security? Intergovernmental and International Coordination of Securing CBRN Materials, 13th International Public Administration Symposium, International Politics and Security Strategies-2019 (KAYSEM 13), Conference Book, pp. 604-610, April 18-20, 2019, Gaziantep/TÜRKİYE

Dede I., Guanghua X., Başarır E.P., 2018, How Does Public Administration Theory Display "Variations on a Theme"? 1st International Congress of Political, Economic and Financial Analysis - 2018 (PEFA'18) Conference Book, pp. 185-196, April 26-28, 2018, Nazilli, Aydın, TÜRKİYE

Ozlu R.R and Dede I., 2017, The Analysis of the Amount of Crop Losses and its Reasons in Adana Province during the Harvest by the Combine Harvesters and the Recommendations for Seed Usage, Poster Presentation, Field Crop Congress, 12-15 September 2017, Kahramanmaraş/TÜRKİYE

Dede I., Dong S., Başarır P., Yanxia L., 2016, Strategies on Pastures with Environmental Concerns - Case Study Türkiye and China, Eurosoil Conference, 16-21 October 2016, İstanbul/TÜRKİYE.

Warren-Smith I., Dede I., Başarır E.P., 2015, "Is the Role Designated for Women Living in Rural Areas Effective Enough in Türkiye?" Area Studies and International Relations: Intersecting Dimensions-14th METU Conference on International Relations, 17-19 June 2015, Middle East Technical University, Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

Dede I., Şerefoğlu C., Ozlu R.R., 2015, Water Framework Directive and Its Implementations In Europe, II. International Agriculture, Food and Gastronomy Congress, 8-12 April 2015, Antalya/TÜRKİYE.

Koç A., Dede I., Bayaner A., Kıymaz T., Yavuz F., Dellal İ., Dölekoğlu T., Başarır E.P., 2015, "The Transformation of Agricultural Policies in Türkiye and in the World", Eight Technical Congress on Agricultural Engineering, 12-16 January 2015, Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

Dede İ., Başarır E.P., OZLU R.R., 2015, "Critical and Analytical Thinking of Globalization, the Financial Crisis and the Internal Conflicts to Analyze the Future of the European Union", 10 April 2015 in Sakarya University, Sakarya/TÜRKİYE.

Başarır E.P. and Dede İ. 2015, "Critical and analytical thinking for searching the connections between the economic crisis, rise of neo-liberalism and the hedonistic consumerism", 1st International Symposium on Critical and Analytical Thinking, 10 April 2015 in Sakarya University, Sakarya/TÜRKİYE.

Dede İ. and Gündüz B., 2014, "The management of quality and safety of chemical fertilizers in Türkiye". The 9th International Soil Science Congress on the Soul of Soil and Civilization, October 14-16, 2014, Antalya/Türkiye.

Dede İ and Aksoy E., 2014, "The Evaluation of the Energy Crops Production in Türkiye as Biomass Source Taking as a Sample-The England Case". Fourth National Workshop on Energy Crops and Biofuels, pp. 139-149, 28-29 May 2014. Samsun/Türkiye.

Aksoy E., Dede İ., and Şerefoğlu C., 2013, The Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock As a Sample of Good Governance System, Second International Regional Development Conference, 16-17 May 2013, pp 606-618, Elazığ/TÜRKİYE

Dede İ. and Şerefoğlu C., 2012, Policy approaches to grassland in planning documents of Ministry of Food Agriculture and Livestock in Türkiye, New Approaches for grassland research in a context of climate and Socio-economic changes, Options Mediterranean's, Series A: Mediterranean Seminars 2012-Number 102, pp107-113, Samsun/TÜRKİYE.

Aksoy E., Dede İ., Akdağ K., Ekin A. Preparation of Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance Rural Development (IPARD) Programme of TÜRKİYE and Managing Authority. Turkish Agriculture Journal. September-October 2008.

Aksoy E., Dede İ., Uslu K. The Harmonization of Türkiye to EU rural development policies. Turkish Agriculture Journal. November- December 2005.

Dede İ. The strategies and institutional development of Türkiye within the context of Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) Programmes. European Community Research Center. Ankara University. Ankara 2008.

Seminar on EU Rural Development Policy, Ilknur DEDE. 04 May 2005. Conferences for Preparation to EU Negotiations on Agriculture. Conference XII. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs. Husnu Turker Conference Room, Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

PROJECTS MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE

- Designing and preparation of Seed Infrastructure Improvement Project to be financed by the EU IPA Funds, 2020
- Designing and preparation of the project on “Strengthening of rural women farmers by training and extension services” funded by Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), 2011.
- Designing and the preparation of the Project called “Environment and Countryside under IPARD, TR080201”, financed by the Pre-accession funds of European Union, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) in Türkiye, 2009
- Designing and the preparation of the Project called “Agri-Environment” financed by DLG Service for Sustainable Land and Water Management, Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, the Netherland Cadaster, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) in Türkiye, 2009.
- Counterpart of the Project Experts in the G2G project called “Definition of Rural Area’s” and the project “Rural Credits” financed by DLG Service for Sustainable Land and Water Management, Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, the Netherland Cadaster, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) in Türkiye, 2009.
- Counterpart of the Project Experts in the Technical Project called “Preparation of Rural Development Plan-IPARD Programme” financed by the Pre-accession funds of European Union, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) in Türkiye, 2007
- Working Group Leader in the Twinning Project called “Strengthening the Administrative Capacity for the effective Implementation of the Rural Development Plan TR/2004/IB/AG/01” financed by the Pre-accession funds of European Union, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) in Türkiye, 2006.
- Focal Point between FAO and Ministry in the Project called “Milk Sector Analysis in Türkiye” financed by FAO, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) in Türkiye, 2006.

LANGUAGES

English (Fluent), French (Fair)

B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

Bu alışmanın ana konusu, 1963 yılından itibaren yrrlęe giren Birinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı'ndan gnmze dek hazırlanan kalkınma planları zerinde nitel ierik analizi yapılarak devlet ve kurumsal işleyiş (polity), siyaset (politics) ve politika (policy) alanları aısından tarıma ynelik ok boyutlu ve btnleşik bir politika analizinin yapılmasıdır. Kalkınma planlarının ierik analizi tarım politikası ve ynetimini analiz etmek iin olduka faydalı olmasına raęmen, planların ierik analizi siyaset boyutunun araştırma sorularına fazla bir fikir verememiş olmasından dolayı alışmanın siyaset boyutunun bu eksiklięini gidermek iin, Meclis tutanaklarında yer alan tarımla sylemler de incelenmiştir. Araştırma metotlarının sonuları doęrultusunda Trk tarım politikasının dnşmne ve yeni tabloya ilişkin kamu politikası, siyaset ve kurumsal boyutlarında yorumlar yapılması amalanmaktadır.

Trk tarım politikaları, genel olarak  ana ervede deęişmiştir. Bunları; 1)Trk siyaseti, zellikle siyasi iktidar ve muhalefetin tarıma ynelik siyasetleri, 2) kamu ynetimi reformları ve 3) AB Ortak Tarım Politikası ve yapısal fonlara uyum olarak zetlemek mmkndr. Bu dnşm ervesinde Yeni Kamu Ynetiminin getirdięi iyi ynetişim reformları, planlama ve programlamanın ana erve olarak alınması, Trk tarım politikalarındaki deęişiklikler ve AB yapısal ve tarımsal fonlarının Trk tarımına yansıması, Trk tarımı ve byk bir ktle olan tarım reticilerini etkilemiştir. Trk tarımında veya siyasetinde politika znesinin byk bir blmn oluşturan kyller zerinde politika belirleyici aktrlerin yeri ve bu baęlamda, kamu politikası (policy), siyaset (politics) ve devlet/kurumsal yapı (polity) baęlamında srekliplikler/kopuşlar veya btnleşme/atallaşmanın aıklıęa kavuşturulmaya alışıldıęı tezin temel sorusu kyl sorunsalı ve tarımsal dnşm olmuştur. Bu ana ervede, tezin ierięinde aşıęıdaki sorulara cevap aranmıştır;

- Tarımsal Dönüşümün Türkiye örneği 1980'lerden sonra hangi karakterleri göstermiştir? Zorlayan faktörler ve itici güçler nelerdir? Politika yapıcılar kimlerdir? Tarım siyaseti değişmiş midir?
- Klasik literatürde deneysel olarak tanımlandığı şekliyle ekonomik kalkınmayı besleyen bir yapısal dönüşüm özelliği var mıdır?
- Çeşitli yazarların Türk tarımı için tanımladıkları “tarımın tasfiyesi-deagrarianization”, “köylüsüzleştirme-depeasantization”, “neoliberal politika gündemi”, “tarımın uluslararasılaştırılması ve Avrupalılaşması” terimleri doğrultusunda herhangi bir değişiklik var mıdır?
- Yeni bir durum inşa edilmişse, yeni durumun ana karakteri nedir? Kopuş veya süreklilik var mıdır?

Ayrıca hükümetlerin kendisi veya hükümetler arası gıda rejimlerinde tarımsal bir yaklaşımın (agrarian approach) varlığının ve tarım sorunsalının (agrarian and peasant question) yalnızca Dünya’da yaşanan krizlere anlık yanıt vermenin bir tezahürü olup olmadığına da bakılmıştır.

Öncelikle çalışmanın çatısında Türk tarımının ana yapısını karakterize etmesi sebebiyle 50’li ve 60’lı yıllarda yoğun olarak konuşulan “peasant-köylü” meselesiyle ilgili geniş bir literatür çalışması yapılmıştır. Çünkü Türk tarımının karakteristik özelliği küçük ölçekte, verimsiz ve geleneksel yöntemler kullanan, parçalı ve kendi emeği üzerinde geçimini sağlamaya çalışan köylü çiftçilerden oluşmasıdır. Bu özellikten yola çıkarak, Dünya’daki “köylü meselesi” üzerine yapılan çalışmalar ve oluşturulan argümanlara bakılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, literatür, dünyadaki köylü sorununun kabaca "kaybolma" ve "dayanıklılık-direnç" olmak üzere iki argüman etrafında sınıflandırıldığını göstermektedir. Kaybolma tezi, 1960'lardan sonra, özellikle neoliberal politikalar ve AB politikaları ile dünyanın hızlı sanayileşmesi, küreselleşmesi ve metalaşmasıyla egemen olmuştur. Bu değişime daha sonra Batı Avrupa’nın "köylülüğün kayboluşu-depeasantization" olarak adlandırılan tarımsal geçişlerde yoğun olarak görülen "modern kapitalist tarım" veya "tarım ticareti"nin gelişimi eşlik etmiştir (Araghi 1995, p.338-343; Marx, Lenin, 1964; Kautsky,1988; Banaji, 1990). Böylece, köylü ve işgal ettiği özel karakteristiği olan tarımsal faaliyet (agrarian economy) kaybolarak yerini tarımda meta üreticileri/kapitalist çiftlikler

sınıfı veya tarımsal ücretli işçiler sınıfı doldurmaktadır (Hobsbawn, 1992; Hobsbawn, 1994, p. 289-293; Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009; Kay, 2015).

Öte yandan, diğer bir yaklaşımda ise bu karakteristik “köylü üretim tarzı-peasant mode of production”, köylülerin kendilerini sürdürdükleri ve yeniden ürettikleri ve çağdaş küreselleşen dünya içinde hâlâ bir sosyal grup veya kültürel kimlik olarak algılanabilecekleri ayrı bir gelişme mantığına sahiptir (Chayanov,1966). Bu bağlamda Soper (2015), Chayanov'un köylünün direniş teorisini savunarak; *“Yok olduklarına dair kanıt ve onaylara rağmen, köylüler hala nüfusun önemli bir bölümünü oluşturmaktadır. Küreselleşmiş ekonomiye entegrasyon sürecindeki saldırılara karşı kendilerini koruyarak toplumlarının geleceğini şekillendirmede önemli bir rol oynamaktadır”* demektedir (Soper, 2015). Bu yaklaşım itibarıyla köylüler “sürekli olarak çevre koşullarına uyum sağlayan” bir grup olarak, gelenekçi tarım faaliyetleriyle ilişkilendirilebilecek kırsal bir tarım yaşam biçimini sürdürerek ve geçimlik-yarı geçimlik olarak var olmaya devam etmektedir (Hilmi & Burbi S, 2015; Morell, 2014,s. 90; Lamba, 2017; Brass, 2000; Soper, 2015). Bu bağlamda 1990'lardan sonra Latin Amerika, Rusya, Asya ve hatta Avrupa'nın bazı bölgelerindeki örnek olay incelemelerinin çoğu, yeniden köylüleşme olarak adlandırılan köylülüğün yeniden üretimini (repeasantization) göstermektedir.

Bu iki tez temelinde Araghi'nin (1995) yaklaşımının Türkiye koşullarında özel önemi vardır, çünkü; Araghi'ye göre “köylüsüzleştirme” kırsal kesimde tarihsel olarak belirli bir farklılaşma biçimi veya özel/karakteristik olarak tek çizgili bir süreç içinde ele alınamaz ve her ulus-devletin koşullarına göre değişmektedir (Araghi 1995, s.359; Vanhaute, 2010). Köylüsüzleştirmenin yalnızca sınıf ve emek stratejileriyle değil, aynı zamanda kırsal-kentsel etkileşimler ve bağlantılar süreci aracılığıyla kentleşme ve göç stratejileriyle de ilişkilendirilmesi gerekmektedir((Vanhaute, 2010; Akram-Lodhi A.H., 2008). Bu bağlamda, devletin rolünü de ön plana çıkaran kırsal kalkınma politikalarının “kırsal alanların boşalması-deruralization” engellemek amacıyla, kırsal haneler için tarımın ötesinde yeni kalkınma fırsatları ve yeni faaliyetleri de beraberinde getireceği önerilmektedir. Böylece çiftlik dışı veya çeşitlendirilmiş çiftçilik faaliyetleri olarak adlandırılan kırsal turizm ve rekreasyonel faaliyetler vasıtasıyla köylülüğün

yeniden üretiminin (repeasantization) mümkün kılınacağı savunulmaktadır (Chiengthong, 2010; Öztürk, 2018).

Literatür araştırmasının sonuçları itibariyle değişik düşünce okulları tarafından tanılandırılan (Foster G.M., 1965; Redfield R., 1956; Wolf E.R., 1966; Migdal J.S., 1974; Heynig, 1982; Lenin, 1964; Kautsky K., 1988; Hobsbawn E., 1992) köylü teriminin Türkiye şartlarında nasıl tarif edilebileceği çalışmanın sorunsalı temelinde önemli bir husustur. Çünkü "köylü" meselesinin her ülkenin şartları itibariyle değişik algılanabileceği ve “suigeneris” yapısı bu çalışmanın ana çerçevesidir. Ayrıca Türkiye’nin kendine özgü karakteristik özelliği olan “köylü” ve “tarım” yapısının olması gerçeğinin göz ardı edilmemesi lazımdır. Türkiye’deki tarımsal yapı içeriğinde köylüyü her ne kadar tanılandırmak zor olsa bile çalışma temelinde bir tanımlama yapılmaktadır. Köylerde yaşayan, geleneksel üretim tekniklerini kullanarak kendi arazisinde veya kiraladığı arazide tarımla (başta bitkisel üretim veya hayvancılık) uğraşan kesim veya toprakla iştilal eden yetiştiriciler olarak köylü tanımlanmıştır. Bu çerçevede, özellikle 1960 yılından 2000’li yıllara kadar istatistik bilgiler ışığında, Türk tarım yapısı üzerinde yorumlar yapılmıştır. Bu tanımlamayla ilintili şekilde, Türk köylüsü, çok küçük ölçekli ve dağınık toprak üzerinde ekonomik verimliliği düşük ve geleneksel metotları kullanan geçimlik tarım yapan kesim olarak, verimliliklerinin artırılması ve yoğun tarıma geçebilecek kapasiteyi sağlamaları amacıyla, girdi, makine ve kredi destekleriyle güçlendirilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Türkiye’nin köylü gerçeğine ve köylerde yaşayan bu hâkim kitlenin tanınması yanında, Türkiye’nin “ekonomik kalkınma modeli” seçiminde yine başka bir şekilde hâkim olan “karşılaştırmalı çalışma-comparative study” teorisinin de üzerinde konuşmak gereklidir. Bu teze göre; tarım sektörünün iki önemli ve ilişkili özelliği, az gelişmiş bir ülke tanımlanmasında yer almaktadır. Birincisi, tüm az gelişmiş ekonomilerde tarım, milli gelirde % 40-60 gibi çok önemli bir paya sahiptir ve ikincisi, toplam işgücünün yaklaşık % 50-80’i gibi yüksek payları da alarak istihdam sağlamaktadır. Ayrıca, küçük ölçekli arazi veya topraksız tarım, ücretsiz emek ve çok düşük üretkenlik düzeylerine sahip uzak ve kırsal alanlarda tarımsal iştilal daha yüksek rakamlarda seyretmektedir (Johnston ve Mellor, 1961, s.566-572; Byerlee ve diğerleri, 2009, s.16; Marume ve diğerleri, 2016). Bu bağlamda, Dünya’da gelişmiş

lkeler iin ampirik bir dzenlilik Őeklinde seyreden bilimsel bir argman savunulmakta olup; geliŐmiŐ bir lkenin tarımda yapısal dnŐm yani tarımın istihdam ve ekonomideki payının azalması ile gerekleŐebileceęi ve bu tarımdan tasfiye kitlesinin bir Őekilde dnŐme uęrayacaęı ngrlmektedir (Johnston ve Mellor, 1961, pp.566-572; Byerlee ve dięerleri, 2009, pp.15). Yapısal dnŐmde tarımın rol dŐnldęnde, bir byme sreci olarak “ekonomik kalkınma”, emeęin tarım sektrnden sanayi sektrne (gıda sanayi) veya kırsal turizm, el sanatları veya niŐ pazarlar gibi tarım dıŐı faaliyetlere taŐınması anlamına gelmektedir (Byerlee ve dięerleri, 2009, s.16). Trkiye’de, kalkınma planlarının ilk yıllarından itibaren uygulanan “ekonomik kalkınma” modelinin altında yatan mantık aslında, “az geliŐmiŐlik” gstergesi olan bu durumdan kurtulmak ve tarımdaki verimsiz nfusu, tarım dıŐı faaliyetlere kaydırarak (deagrarianization), aslında kyllę srdrmek fakat kyl tarafından yapılan verimsiz tarımın byk lekli ve verimli iŐletmelerce yapılmasını saęlamaktır. Bu erevede zellikle 1980 ncesi kalkınma planlarında; nfusun byk kısmını oluŐturan kylnn tarımsal faaliyetlerine ynelik mdahaleler yanında kyly tarım-dıŐı faaliyetlere ynlendirilmeyi amalayan politikalar seilmiŐtir. Dięer taraftan ise tarımın ekonomik yerinin nemi sebebiyle verimli tarımın yapılmasını tercih eden ve tarımı zellikle gıda sanayisine ham madde temin eden bir sektr olarak kabul eden politikalar yer almıŐtır.

Planların kyl sorunsalı temelinde analizinde; 1980 ncesi hazırlanan planların “ky imar” ve “kyl sorunu” sylemine byk nem verdięi grlmŐtir. Ayrıca o yıllarda ister iktidarda ister muhalefette olsun politikacıların meclis konuŐmalarında “kyl” ifadesini kullanması, o dnemdeki planların ve politikacıların tarımı kapitalist ereveden uzak tuttuęunun bir gstergesi olabilir. Ayrıca “kamu iktisadi teŐebbsleri”, devletin retimdeki rol ve sosyal adaleti saęlayıcı tedbirler zerinde durulmuŐtur. 1980 sonrasında zellikle Yedinci BeŐ Yıllık Kalkınma Planı (1996-2000) sonrasında “neoliberal” gndemin benimsenmesiyle; politika yapıcılar tarafından hibir zaman aıka reddedilmese de, “kyl” teriminden genellikle kaınıldıęı, kyller iin “aile iftlikleri” veya “kk reticiler” olarak yeni terimler kullanıldıęı dikkat ekmektedir. Ayrıca ierik analizinde “ky” terimin yerini “kırsal alan” ifadesi ve “ky kalkınma” yerine “kırsal kalkınma” kullanıldıęı dikkat ekmektedir. Bunun aıklamasını “kreselleŐme”, “modernizasyon” ve tarımın

“uluslararasılaştırılması” boyutunda kaybolma teziyle özdeşleştirilmesi mümkün görülmektedir. Fakat, bu tezin istatistiklerle desteklenmesi bağlamında, halen Türk tarımının “köylü” özelliğini koruduğunu görmek mümkündür, çünkü son zamanlarda, çağdaş küçük çiftçileri ekonomik ölçeklerine göre “köylü” olarak nitelendirme eğilimi ile paralel olarak beş ve iki hektarın altında araziye sahip çiftliklerin (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009, s. 4; Basaj, 2007; s.79) Türk tarımının “köylü-peasant” statüsünde büyük çoğunluğunu oluşturduğu göze çarpmaktadır (Ozturk vd., 2018). Türkiye, AB üyelik sürecinin hızlandığı 2000’ler sonrasında, AB’nin ekonomik ve yüksek verimli tarımsal yapısını kucaklayan, rekabetçi ve optimal ölçekte tarım işletmelerinin baskın olduğu tarım sektörü oluşması için rekabetçi olmayan ve günün şartlarına uymayan küçük üreticilerin tarımdan çekilmesine (depeasantization) yönelik politika ve siyaseti tercih etmiş olsa bile belki de “direniş” tezi Türkiye’nin özel yapısı kapsamında doğruluğunu ispatlamış denilebilir.

Diğer taraftan dünyada son dönemde yaşanan, iklim krizi, Kovid-19 ve Ukrayna ile Rusya arasındaki gerginlik, tarım sorununu, gıda güvensizliği ve açlık endişeleri nedeniyle yeniden köylüleşmeyi (repeasantization) ve tarımı (agrarian approach) hatırlatmaktadır. Yerel üreticiler olan köylüler, yaklaşmakta olan tarım-gıda krizine karşı direnç oluşturmak için iyi bir çözüm olacaktır. Aslında Onuncu Kalkınma Planı (2014-2018), AB’nin tarımda reçetesinin eskisi gibi uygulanmayacağı ibareleri ve tarımı ulusal öncelikli tedbirlerle ön plana getirmesiyle göze çarpmaktadır. Bu dönem planlaması artık ithalatı önlemeye ve üretimi artırmaya yönelik tedbirleri içeren, “yerli ve milli” söylemlerin ağırlıkta olduğu bir sürece girmiştir. Ayrıca Türkiye ekonomisi ve kalkınma planlarının söylemlerinde nicel hedeflerden nitel hedeflere doğru ilerlemenin göstergeleri bulunmaktadır.

Bu tez çalışması içeriğinde ayrıca çok boyutlu politika analizinin bir parçası olan devlet ve yönetim (polity) bağlamında tarım politikalarının kamu yönetimi reformları ile değişimine de bakılarak araştırma sorunsalı çerçevesinde yanıt verilmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu sebeple, Kamu Yönetimi Reformu, devlet ve yönetim konusunda literatür araştırması yapılmış daha sonra, Kalkınma Planlarının içerik analizi yapılmıştır.

Akademik bir disiplin olarak kamu yönetimi, ilk olarak devletin istikrarlı unsurlarına ve görünümüne atıfla özellikle bürokrasi ve hiyerarşi gibi resmi örgütsel yapılara güçlü bir şekilde odaklanarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Daha sonra, devlet “kürekçi-rowing” rolünden ziyade “yönlendirme-steering” rolüyle tasvir edilerek, devletin yönetimden (governing) yönetişime (governance) geçmesi tanımlanmıştır (Rhodes R.A.W., 1997, s. 5; Peters B.G., 2011, s. 10; Pierre J., 2009, s.1; Pierre J. ve Peters B.G., 2000,s.25-26; Peters B.G., 2014, s. 301-306). İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra başlayan liberal eğilimler ve 1980'lerin ortalarındaki reformlar sonucunda değişen modellerden, Yeni Kamu Yönetimi (Considine & Lewis, 2003; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993:19-20) adı verilen piyasa temelli, stratejik yönetimi ve planlamayı kucaklayan kamu yönetimi biçimi ortaya çıkmış, Avrupa’da ve diğer ülkelerde uygulanmaya başlanmıştır. Diğer taraftan devletin rolünün “yönlendirme” olarak vuku bulması için “ağ yönetişimi-network management” ile yukarıdan aşağıya (top to bottom) değil, yerelde ekonomik, sosyal veya çevresel ağların ve tüm paydaşların sürece dâhil edildiği aşağıdan yukarıya (bottom-up) yaklaşım modelleri kabul görmüştür (Considine & Lewis, 2003; Pierre. & Peters, 2000, Rhodes, 1997; Rhodes, 2008; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007: 42-43). Kamu yönetiminde yaşanan bu değişimler, küreselleşme ve dünyadaki uluslararası gelişmelere bağlı olarak devletin meşruiyet sorunlarına ve yönetim sorunlarına ilişkin neoliberal politikalara bir yanıt olarak ve refah devletinin eleştirisi olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca kamu yönetimi bağlamında 70’li yıllarda sosyal adalet ve sosyal eşitliği savunan “Yeni kamu işletmeciliği” kavramı da tartışılmış, fakat liberal devlet seçimleri karşısında güçlü olamadığını söylemek gerekmektedir.

Yapılan içerik analizi kalkınma planlarının, sektörlere yönelik politikaların belirlenmesinin yanı sıra idari reformları da içerdiğini göstermektedir. Çünkü beş yıllık kalkınma planları, Türk kamu yönetimi açısından kamu yönetiminin daha işlevsel bir yapıya kavuşturulmasının bir aracı olarak idari alanda önemli yapısal değişikliklere olanak sağlamıştır. Kalkınma planlarının Türkiye'deki kurumsal ve yönetsel değişim için önemli motivasyon ve rehberlik kaynakları olduğunu söylemek gerekir. Siyasi güçler, ülke içinde hangi alanlarda politika belirleyecekleri veya hangi politika unsurlarını sürdürülebilir kılmaları gerektiğine dair ipuçları bulabilecekleri gibi, politikalarını yaparken de bu planlara başvurabilmektedirler. Türkiye'deki kalkınma planlarının evrensel olarak kabul edilen idari reformlardan bağımsız

tutulmaması gerekmektedir. Bu bağlamda kalkınma planları, orta ve uzun vadede izlenecek idari reform veya yeniden yapılanma yaklaşımına yönelik politikaları belirleyen belgelerdir. Bu kapsamda ayrıca Tarım Bakanlığı'na yönelik yeniden yapılanma önlemlerinin planlar aracılığıyla belirlendiğini söylemek gerekir.

İdari reform ve yönetim bağlamında 1980 öncesi planlarda, devlet işletmelerinin işleyişinin ve kamu hizmetlerinin daha etkin yürütülmesine yönelik kurumsal düzenlemeler ve öneriler yer almaktadır. Üçüncü Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı, uzun vadeli stratejiler geliştirmeyi, kamu yönetimini ve kamu iktisadi teşebbüslerini daha etkin, verimli ve dinamik hale getirmeyi, sosyal adalet ve demokrasinin daha kuvvetli hayata geçirilmesini sağlayacak hukuk ve adalet reformu da dâhil olmak üzere bir dizi reformu hayata geçirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca 1980 öncesi planlarda, Kamu iktisadi teşebbüslerinin kamu girişimciliği açısından önemi ve refah devletinin kamu politikaları ve sosyal adalet unsurları dikkat çekmektedir. Beşinci Plan ise, 1980 darbesinden sonra kabul edilen yeni anayasal düzen içinde kamu yönetimi reformunu liberalleşme temelinde üstlenmektedir. Altıncı ve Yedinci kalkınma planları, kurumsal reformları liberalleşme temelinde "yeniden yapılandırma" ve "özelleştirme" yoluyla gerçekleştirmeye yönelik tedbirleri öngörmektedir. Sekizinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı'ndan sonra yeni kamu yönetimi ve yönetim yansıması ile Stratejik Planların, Performans Programlarının ve kamu kurumlarının performans odaklı bütçe çalışmalarının uygulanması, Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planında en üst düzeye ulaşmış, 5018 sayılı Kanunun (Kamu Mali Yönetimi ve Kontrol Kanunu, RG, 24.12. 2003, 25326) kabulü ile Stratejik Planlama zorunlu hale getirilmiştir. Bakanlığın tarımla ilgili politika ve önceliklerini belirleyen Stratejik Planlar hazırlanmaya başlanmıştır. Onuncu ve On birinci kalkınma planlarında aynı şekilde “yeni kamu yönetimi” ve “yönetişim” yaklaşımı özellikle “iyi yönetim” vurgulanmış, stratejik planlama ve performans odaklı bütçe benimsenmiştir. On Birinci Kalkınma Planı, idare açısından önemli bir dönüm noktası olarak, “hukuk devleti, demokratikleşme ve iyi yönetim” gelişme eksenini ile adalet ve güvenlik hizmetleri, idari yapılanma, kamuda stratejik yönetim ve e-devlet uygulamalarını ön plana çıkarması manasında önemli yer tutmaktadır. On Birinci Kalkınma Planı'nın kamu yönetimi açısından en önemli özelliğinin yeni hükümet sistemi olduğu söylenebilir. Nitekim Planda, 2017 yılında referandumla kabul edilen ve 2018 yılı itibari ile etkin ve resmi olarak uygulanmaya

başlanan Cumhurbaşkanlığı Hükümet Sistemi çerçevesinde insan merkezli bir kalkınma yaklaşımının hedeflendiği ifade edilmiştir. Demokratik hukuk devletinin Planın ana eksenlerinden biri olduğu belirtilmiştir.

Yönetişim yaklaşımı ve Yeni Kamu Yönetimi, kamu ve özel sektör arasındaki sınırları ortadan kaldırmış, özellikle küreselleşme, uluslararasılaşma ve Avrupalılaşma gibi süreçler sonucunda yönetme eylemini gerçekleştiren aktörler artmıştır. Kamu hizmetleri sadece devlete bağlı değil, sosyal ve ekonomik aktörlerin, özel sektör ve sivil toplumun oluşturduğu ağlar ve vatandaşlar tarafından ortaklaşa ve çoğaltılarak yürütülebilmektedir. Tarım politikasından sorumlu kamu yönetimi; işbirliği öngören, koordinasyon ve etkileşimi sağlayan aktörlerden biri haline gelmiştir. Bu yaklaşım, AB tarafından finanse edilen Kırsal Kalkınma Programı'nın (IPARD Programı) uygulanmasında görülmektedir.

Yeni Kamu Yönetimi ve Yönetişim, devleti küçültme ve piyasa koşullarını hâkim kılma ve pratikte bürokrasiyi küçültme anlayışı üzerine kurulmuş olsa da, Türkiye örneğinde kamu yönetimi ve politikasının etkinliğinde bir azalma olmadığını da söylemek mümkündür. Aksine, neoliberal dönüşüm sürecini sağlamak için kamu otoritesi, karar alma ve uygulama süreçlerini koordine etmek, çok parçalı devleti işletmek için eskisinden daha güçlü bir yürütme sistemi, daha güçlü bir idari yapı haline gelmiştir. On Birinci Kalkınma Planı demokratik, katılımcı ve hesap verebilir bir sivil toplum bilincini ve örgütlenmesini güçlendirmeyi ve sivil toplum kuruluşlarının karar alma süreçlerine aktif katılımını sağlamayı amaçlamıştır. Bu hedef çerçevesinde çeşitli kamu politikalarına ilişkin karar alma ve mevzuat hazırlama süreçlerinde sivil toplum kuruluşlarının rolüne yönelik idari ve ekonomik düzenlemelerin yapılacağı ifade edilmektedir. Sivil toplum kuruluşlarının kamu politikaları ve karar alma süreçlerindeki rolüne ilk kez bir kalkınma planında söylem olarak bu kadar önem verildiği, hatta özel eksen altında yer aldığı görülmüştür. On birinci Kalkınma Planı, kamu hizmetlerinde kurumsal kapasitenin ve e-devlet uygulamalarının geliştirilmesinde siyasa boyuta ilişkin gelişme sürecine damgasını vurmuştur. Plan, yeni Cumhurbaşkanlığı Hükümet Sistemi çerçevesinde, hem kamu yönetiminin hem de cumhurbaşkanlığı teşkilat yapısının kurumsal, ekonomik ve insani kapasitelerinin güçlendirilmesine özel önem vermiştir. Ayrıca Plan, e-Devlet

Kapısı'nın geliştirilmesini ve siber güvenlik yönetimi ile ilgili faaliyetlerin geliştirilmesini önermiştir.

Siyaset-bürokrasi ilişkileri bağlamında çatallaşma ya da bütünleşme özelliklerini planların da gösterdiğine dair bulgulara rastlanılmaktadır. Örneğin, özellikle 1980 öncesi planlarda siyaset ve bürokrasinin entegrasyonunun temellerinin olduğunu görüyoruz, örneğin köy-kent projesi, halk sektörü, sosyal adalet vurgusu, yerel kalkınma stratejileri, kooperatifçiliğin destelenmesi veya toprak reformu gibi politikalar üzerine hem siyasi iktidarın hem de muhalefetin söylemlerini Meclis tutanaklarında görmek mümkündür. Öte yandan, 2000'ler sonrasında AK Parti Hükümetlerinin kalkınma planlarında hedeflenen tarımda liberalleşme politikalarının tamamen benimsemesini siyaset/yönetim ayrımı mı yoksa entegrasyonu mu sorusuna cevap vermek zordur. Zira AKP iktidarında uygulanan Sekizinci Kalkınma Planı (2001-2005), bir önceki siyasi iktidar döneminde hazırlanmış olmasına rağmen, neoliberal politikaların kayıtsız şartsız uygulanmasını ve tarımda serbest ekonomiye geçişi öngören Dünya Bankası tarafından desteklenen “Tarım Reformu Uygulama Projesi’ni (ARIP)” politika olarak seçmiştir. Avrupa Birliği'nin üyelik için dayattığı “neoliberal gündem” içeren plan, AK Parti iktidarı tarafından sıkı sıkıya bağlı kalınarak uygulanmış ve bu sürecin sonucunda AB üyelik müzakereleri 3 Ekim 2005'te başlatılmıştır.

Öte yandan, AB üyelik sürecinin aslında DPT tarafından kendi politikasını güçlendirmek için kullanıldığını da söylemek mümkündür. Zira o dönemlerde DPT'nin üst düzey bürokratları siyasi otoriteye ait tercihlerde görev almış, hatta bürokratlar milletvekili veya bakan olarak siyasi arenada yer almışlardır. Bu durumda Kalkınma Planlarının zaman zaman tarım siyasetinde belirleyici olabileceğini söylememek yanlış bir ifade olacaktır.

Öte yandan, özellikle AB üyeliğini hedefleyen Sekizinci ve Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planları, çıkarılacak zorunlu yasaların ödev olarak dayatılması, keskin ve tartışmasız hedefler belirlenmesi, planların ve planları hazırlayan bürokratların ne kadar etkili olduğunu göstermesi açısından anlamlıdır. Bu dönem için siyasetin bürokrasinin çizdiği yolda ilerlediği söylenebilir. Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı'nda artık AB üyeliği

mutlak hedef olarak belirtilmektedir. Ayrıca bu plan diğer planlardan farklı olarak, AB bütçe dönemi ile uyumlu bir şekilde beş yıllık yerine yedi yıllık dönem için hazırlanmıştır. Planın hazırlanmasında kamu, özel sektör, üniversite ve sivil toplum kuruluşlarının temsilcilerinin katılımıyla oluşturulan Özel İhtisas Komisyonları son derece önemli bir işleve sahiptir. Fakat planın tüm paydaşların dâhil olduğu Özel İhtisas Komisyonları aracılığıyla toplumsal mutabakatla hazırlandığı belirtilmesine rağmen, Plan'da yer alan politikaların sert bir şekilde eleştirilmesinin önüne geçilememiştir. Özellikle ARIP projesi, Doğrudan Gelir Desteği, AB üyeliği için çıkarılan kanun ve yönetmelikler (Organik Tarım Kanunu, Tohumculuk Kanunu, Lisanslı Depoculuk Kanunu ve Tarım Kanunu gibi), AB Kırsal Kalkınma Programı (IPARD Programı), yeni kurulan Tarım ve Kırsal Kalkınmayı Destekleme Kurumu basında ve muhalefet partileri tarafından çok ciddi şekilde eleştirilmiştir. Ayrıca dönemin Tarım ve Köyişleri Bakanı Mehdi EKER'e TBMM'de çok sert eleştiriler gelmiş, yanlış politikalarına ilişkin çok sayıda yazılı/sözlü soru ve gensoru önergeleri Meclis'te tartışılmıştır. Ayrıca muhalefetin siyasi tartışmaları ve akademik makaleler, bu politikaların köylülüğü yok ettiği (depeasantization), tarımı yok ettiğini (deagrarianization) tartışmış, ülkenin artık bir tarım ülkesi olmadığı iddialarıyla dönemin liberal politikalarını ve siyasi iktidarı defalarca eleştirmiştir. Bu durum, Kalkınma Planlarında aslında toplumun refah seviyesinin artırılması ve ekonomik gelişmenin sağlanması amacını hedefleyen ve katılımcı bir ortamda hazırlanan tarım politikasının (policy) bu politikaları uygulayan Tarım Bakanlığının dolayısıyla devletin (polity) ve Meclis'te eleştirilerini esirgemeyen siyasetin (politics) gerilim (çatallaşma) ya da bütünleşme arasında salınması olarak algılanabilir. Özetle, Birinci Kalkınma Planı'ndan bu yana tarıma ekonomik ve sosyal açıdan önemli bir yer verilmiş olmakla beraber, siyasi partilerin popülist ve oy odaklı yaklaşımlarında da tarımla uğraşan köylü yer almaktadır. Zira tarım, ülke ekonomisi ve istihdamında büyük bir paya sahip olması yanında özellikle kırsal kesimde nüfusun ana istihdam kaynağıdır. Türkiye'nin kalkınma planlarının ve tarım politikalarının ülkenin ekonomik kalkınması ile bağlantılı bir yol izlediği söylenebilir. Ancak gelişme, yeri geldiğinde belli bir plan dâhilinde bütüncül olarak yapılmaya çalışılsa da, zaman zaman hükümetleri dönemin şartlarına uygun toprak politikaları ve popülist yaklaşımlar üretmeye yöneltmiştir. Tarım bu bağlamda siyasetin aracı olarak, tarımsal kredilerin gecikme faizlerinin affedilmesi, taksitlerin yeniden düzenlenmesi, tarım

sigortası ödemelerinde kolaylık sağlanması, TMO alımlarında fiyatların yüksek belirlenmesi gibi uygulamalarla popülist yaklaşımların sergilendiği bir alan olmuştur. Tarımdaki köylülük, küçük ve düşük verimli çiftlikler ve girdi maliyetlerinin pahalı olması enflasyonun yüksek seyrettiği veya kuraklık dönemlerinde muhalefetin ve medyanın ağır eleştirileri ile Hükümetleri zorlayan durumlar ortaya çıkarmıştır.

1980 sonrası hazırlanan planlar, planın hazırlandığı dönemin siyasi gücünün politika tercihlerinde etkili olduğu yönünde bir eğilim gösterebilir. Bu bağlamda kurumsal düzenlemeler ve yeni kurumsal mekanizma ile ilgili değişiklikler ve yeni yapılanmalar görülebilmektedir. Örneğin, Beşinci Kalkınma Planı'nda bir öncelik olan "Tarım Satış Kooperatiflerinin rasyonel bir şekilde yeniden düzenlenmesi", o günün siyasi konjonktürü ve meclis tartışmaları sonucunda ortaya çıktığı izlenimini vermektedir. Beş yıllık kalkınma planlarında hiç şüphesiz tekrarlanmış olan kamu yönetimi, Türk siyasetinin odak noktasında ve muhalefetin mevcut iktidara yönelik eleştirileri açısından her zaman kullanılmaktadır. Tarım Bakanlığı ve Bakan sık sık eleştirilmiştir; Meclis'te bütçe görüşmelerinde bakanlığın yeniden düzenlenmesi ele alınmıştır. Sekizinci Kalkınma Planı'ndan başlayarak küreselleşme süreci ve AB uyum politikaları kapsamında tarımda hızlı bir dönüşüm için kurumsal düzenlemelerin yapılması gerektiği açıkça belirtilmektedir. Küreselleşmenin ve liberal politikaların yansıması Tarım ve Köyişleri Bakanlığı ile Kamu İktisadi Teşebbüslerinin yeniden yapılandırılması olarak görülmektedir. Son üç kalkınma planında da Kurumların performans bütçelemesi yapılarak stratejik planlama yaklaşımı vurgulanmıştır. Tarım Bakanlığı Stratejik Planı 2008 yılından beri hazırlanmaktadır. Planlamaların bu doğrultuda stratejik planlamaya yöneldiği ifade edilebilir. Öte yandan, Türkiye'deki kalkınma planlarını politika döngüsü (policy cycle) üzerinden değerlendirilmesi ve bu döngüyü: durum değerlendirmesi, bilgi toplama, strateji ve hedeflerin belirlenmesi, plan çıktılarının programlanması, uygulanması ve değerlendirilmesi ve başarının ölçülmesi bağlamında stratejik yönetimle ilişkilendirdiği öne çıkmaktadır.

Siyasi konjonktür açısından değerlendirildiğinde, 12 Eylül 1980 askeri darbesinden sonra hazırlanan Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı; darbe öncesi dönemde çeşitli tartışma ve çatışmaların kaynağı olduğu düşünülen işçi hareketlerinin ve siyasi kutuplaşmanın kontrol edilmesini öngörmüştür. Bu bağlamda tarımsal üretici örgütlerinin siyasi

partilerle faaliyetlerini engelleyen yasa tasarısı sırasında Meclis'te yapılan söylemler dikkat çekmektedir.

Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı, tarımda önemli bir yere sahip olan kırsal kesimdeki kadın çiftçilere yönelik çalışmaları ele alırken toplumsal cinsiyet konularına da değinmiş, Kırsalda kadına yönelik eylem planlarının hazırlanması ve kadın çiftçilerin sorunlarının giderilmesini de öngörmüştür. Fakat Türkiye gerçeği, kadının ücretsiz aile işçisi olarak “köylü” sorunsalı içinde bile yer almadığına dikkat çekmektedir.

On Birinci Kalkınma Planı'nda hem kentsel hem de kırsal alanda iş ve istihdam yaratarak veya geliştirerek sosyo-ekonomik yaşamın güçlendirilmesi ve sosyo-ekonomik yapıların sürdürülebilir kılınmasında toplumun aktif katılımının sağlanmasına önem verilmiş ve e-yönetişim yaklaşımına dikkat çekilmiştir.

Tarım sektörünün tüm stratejilerinin devlet otoritesinin tek bir komuta merkezinden yapıldığını, dolayısıyla ortaya çıkan planın siyasi otoritenin sürekli denetimi altında disiplinli bir şekilde yürütüldüğünü söyleyebiliriz. Türkiye'de Başbakanlığa ve daha sonra Cumhurbaşkanlığına bağlı bir teşkilat olarak ortaya çıkan Planlama Makamının tüm rasyonellik iddialarına rağmen ilk andan itibaren siyasi unsurlar taşıdığını söylemek mümkündür. Kamu kurumları içinde önemli bir otorite olan DPT, 1960 yılında yapılan askeri müdahaleden sonra kurulmuştur. 1961 Anayasası'nın 41. maddesi “Ekonomik, sosyal ve kültürel kalkınmayı demokratik yollarla gerçekleştirmek; kalkınma planlarını yapmak devletin görevidir” şeklinde düzenlemesi ile DPT'yi anayasal ve demokratik yapının bir parçası haline getirmiştir. DPT'nin kurulması Türk planlama tarihinde bir dönüm noktası olmuş ve planlı kalkınmaya dayalı bir ekonomik model benimsenmiştir. Ayrıca DPT, Başbakanlığa bağlanarak güçlü bir otorite haline gelmiş ve anayasal bir kurum olarak DPT'nin yasal güvencesi siyasete karşı vesayet vermiştir. Öte yandan, DPT'nin kurulması, 50'lerin Demokrat Partisi'nin (DP) plansız kalkınma ve ekonomik faaliyetlerine karşı bir tepki olarak ortaya çıktığını söylemek pekte yanlış değildir. Bu siyasi tercihi Birinci Kalkınma Planı'nın ilk cümleleri şu ifadelerle ele almıştır:

Türkiye demokratik düzen içerisinde planlı bir kalkınma dönemine girmiştir. Plan ve programlar çerçevesinde kalkınma arzusunu

gerçekleştirme çabası bu ülkenin tarihinde yeni bir olay değildir. Cumhuriyet yıllarında hazırlanan planlar önemli ve başarılı sonuçlar alınmasına yardımcı olmuştur. Bugün Türk toplumunda büyük bir gelişme arzusu vardır. Plansız davranışların acı verici sonuçları, planlamayı vazgeçilmez bir gelişme yolu olarak benimsemiştir. Bunun en bariz göstergesi planlamanın ve planlamaya ilişkin organizasyonun Anayasal yapıda yer almasıdır. (Birinci Kalkınma Planı).

Fakat böyle bir siyasi ivme ile kurulan Planlama kuruluşunun hazırladığı planların çok boyutlu politika analizinin “siyaset-politics” bağlamında içerik analizi ile incelenmesinin yapıldığı bu çalışma sonucunda “siyaset” bağlantılı kodlamalara yönelik zayıf bağlantılar ortaya çıkmıştır. Planlar siyasi çerçeveye yönelik doğrudan bir ibare içermemekle beraber, Meclis tutanaklarındaki söylemlerin gözden geçirilmesi ile planların altlarında yatan ve örtülü olan siyaset gün yüzüne çıkmıştır.

Türkiye'deki Kalkınma Planları, kalkınmanın olması gereken hedefleri yani ekonomik sorunların giderilmesi, halkın refahının artırılması, ekonomik, sosyal ve kültürel yapının üst düzeyde oluşturulması, gelişmişlik düzeyinin yükseltilmesi gibi rasyonel hedefleri çok iyi tanımlamaktadır. Bu doğrultuda tarım sektörünün yapısı, öncelikleri ve uygulanacak politikalar da istatistiki bilgilerin paralelinde, bilimsel ve sistematik yaklaşımla belirlenmektedir. Ayrıca planların hazırlanması aşamasında konu bazında uzmanlaşmış kamu, üniversite, sivil toplum kuruluşları ve araştırma merkezlerinden temsilcilerin yer aldığı Özel İhtisas Komisyonları oluşturulmakta ve konuya yönelik raporlar hazırlanmaktadır. Tarıma sektörüne yönelik birden fazla komisyonlar oluşmakta, bu komisyonlar, arazi yönetimi, kırsal kalkınma, kooperatifçilik veya tarımsal verimlilik konularında çalışmalar yapmaktadır. Hatta birinci ve ikinci kalkınma planlarının benimsediği teorik ekonomik modellerin analizinin konu olduğu, o zamanki planlama dönemine ait makaleler bile bulunmaktadır (Eastham, 1964; Fry, 1971; Synder 1968). Planların sistematik, objektif ve bilimsel bir “kamu politikası” ile devletin ulusal kaynaklarının rasyonel kullanımı için kapsamlı bir planlama yapması gerektiği anlayışıyla, planı hazırlayan kamu kuruluşu olarak DPT ve şimdiki Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı’nın gücünü bilgi ve uzmanlığından aldığı açıktır. Çünkü planların çok kapsamlı, bilimsel yaklaşımlara ve istatistiksel temellere dayanan özellikler içerdiğini görmemek elde değildir. Diğer taraftan kamu yönetimi teorileri doğrultusunda siyaset ve kamu politikası ilişkileri hakkında şunu söylemek faydalı olabilir. Planlama kendi içinde uzmanlık gerektiren kamu politikası döngüsünün

(policy cycle) parçası olup, kamu sisteminin rasyonellik ilkesine dayanmaktadır. Planlamanın bu özelliğine rağmen, anayasal çerçevede ve yasalar gereği kurulan kamu örgütü (polity) ile siyaset alanı arasında çatallaşmalar veya birleşmeler (uzlaşmalar) görülebilmektedir. Özellikle tarımın sosyo-ekonomik açıdan farklılaşmış karakteri ve önemi (sayısal büyüklüğü ve ülke genelinde coğrafi olarak dağınık ve çarpık yapısı) göz önüne alındığında, tarıma yönelik rasyonel, bilimsel ve gerçek temellere dayandırılması gereken devlet (polity) tarafından hazırlanmış, politika (policy) aracı planların siyasete (politics) konu olması belki de kaçınılmazdır. Meşruiyetini seçimlerden alan siyaset, hedeflere karar verirken zaman zaman kamu yönetimine muhtaç hale gelebilmektedir; çünkü uygulanmak istenen politikaların başarısı bürokratların politikacılarla daha etkin ve daha yakın işbirliği yapmalarını gerektirmektedir. Politikacılar kararlarını uygulamak için bürokratlara ihtiyaç duymaktadırlar. Bürokratların müdahil olmaması durumunda, politikacıların ortaya koydukları hükümet programları ya da hazırladıkları kanunlar sadece kâğıt üzerinde bir liste olabilmektedir (Bayırbağ 2013; Bayırbağ ve Göksel, 2018). Bu durumun pratik uygulamasını, 1980 öncesinde politikacıların Meclis konuşmalarında tarımla ilgili konularda planlara atıfta bulundukları politikacı/kamu yönetimi uzlaşması örnekleriyle görebiliriz. Bu sebeple; özellikle 1980'li yıllara kadar hazırlanan planların; hem siyasi iktidarın kendisini meşrulaştırması hem de muhalefetin siyasi iktidarı eleştirileri bağlamında ana kaynak olarak alınmasını, karar ve tercihleri belirlemedeki üstün etkinliği ve çok daha geniş bir yetki alanına sahip olması olarak okunması doğru bir yaklaşımdır. Planlar, o dönemlerde TBMM'de özellikle tarım bütçesi müzakereleri sırasında siyasilerin konuşmalarında meşruiyetlerini kanıtlamak veya eleştirilerini teyit etmek üzere referans alınmışlardır. Diğer taraftan TBMM söylemlerinde, 1980 sonrası “neoliberal ideoloji” tanımı ile paket halinde sunulan yapısal uyum reformlarının “müdahaleci devlet” ve “devletçiliğe” dayalı söylemlere damgasını vurması ve devletçiliğin ortadan kaldırılmasından sonra devletçiliğin idari bir biçimi olarak planlama politikasının temelsiz olduğunun belirtilmesi ile politikacı/kamu yönetimi çatallaşmasının örneklerinden bahsedebiliriz. Ayrıca liberal politikalara sıkı sıkıya bağlı politikalar izleyen ANAP ve AK Parti hükümetleri döneminde bile planlamanın meşruiyeti zaman zaman eleştirilmiştir. Özellikle, AB ile müzakerelerin başlaması sonrasında DPT'nin ekonomi üzerindeki etkisi azaltılarak klasik planlama fonksiyonu Hazine aracılığıyla uluslararası sisteme entegre edilmiştir

(Yılmaz ve Güler, 2016, s.306). Bunun yansımasını empirik olarak 2011 yılında DPT'nin kapatılarak Kalkınma Bakanlığı'na dönüştürülmesi ile Başbakan altında bir kurum olması bağının ve siyasi vesayetinin çözülmesiyle görmekteyiz. Bu düzenleme, tarım politikalarının yapımında devlet ve siyasetin birbirinden ayrılması anlamına gelebilmektedir.

Ülkenin planlama anlamında kendi içinde ve çevresiyle yaşadığı kırılmalar, ekonomik, sosyal ve politik tepkiler her zaman olmuştur. Öte yandan, planlamanın ne anlama geldiğini belirlemek çok zordur. Ayrıca planlamanın siyasi bir kararın sonucu mu yoksa kamu sisteminin bir aracı mı olduğu sorusuna cevap vermek de zordur. Türkiye'de Başbakanlığa bağlı güçlü, merkezi bir yapı olan DPT'nin kaldırılması ve takip eden dönemde Kalkınma Bakanlığı'nın kurulması, ardından Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı'nın merkezi bir yapıda kurulması gibi gelgitler yaşanmıştır. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Hükümet Sistemi, planlamanın siyasi doğasına ilişkin dönüşümlere işaret edebilmektedir. Bu bağlamda Türkiye'deki siyasi güçler ve muhalefet, meşruiyetlerini kanıtlamak ve tarım toplumunun yönetiminde/denetiminde söz sahibi olmak gibi durumlarda kalkınma planlarına yönelmektedirler. Planların politika oluşturmanın yanı sıra siyasi amaçlar için de bir araç olarak kullanıldığını söylemek gerçekçi bir yaklaşımdır. Planlar, Türkiye'nin "devletçi-merkezi yönetim" geleneğinin yaşatılması için de iyi bir yöntem olmuştur.

Politik boyut için birkaç söz daha söylemek gerekirse, Türkiye'nin neoliberalizminin empirik örneği, devletin politikaları şekillendirmede önemli bir aktör olmaya devam ettiğini göstermektedir. Bu bağlamda 1980'lerden itibaren uygulanan liberalleşme politikalarına rağmen Türk siyasetinin her zaman devlet merkezli olduğu söylenebilir. Özellikle AB'ye üyelik müzakerelerinin başlamasından sonra farklı ekonomik, sosyal ve çevresel aktörler ortaya çıkmış olsa da, politika döngüsünde asla olması gerektiği gibi ses çıkaramadıkları tartışma konusudur. Devlet, çıkar gruplarının taleplerine karşı her zaman düşman olmuştur ve geleneksel olarak yukarıdan aşağıya bir yönetim tarzına sahiptir. Son planlar tüm sektörlerde ağ yönetişimi ve çoğulcu yaklaşım için çok sayıda önlem öngörse de, yönetişim mekanizması eksiktir, liberalleşme toplum merkezli bir yönetime yol açmamıştır; bunun yerine ekonomik, sosyal ve çevresel aktörlerle paternalist ilişkilerin ve popülist yaklaşımın bol olduğu parti merkezli bir

yönetim biçimine yol açmıştır. Parti merkezli yönetim uygulamaları tarım sektöründe devlet teşvikleri, kredi ödemeleri, yatırımlar vb. konularda zaman zaman yaşanmıştır.

Ayrıca tarımın ve tarım arazilerinin siyasi amaçlarla ne kadar acımasız bir şekilde kullanıldığını parlamento tutanaklarında görmek şaşırtıcı değildir. Nitekim tarım arazileri istatistikleri, 1980 yılına kadar uygulanan tarım dostu ve üretim odaklı politikaların daha sonra nasıl bozulduğunu açıkça göstermektedir. Ayrıca bu konu Meclis'teki muhalefet milletvekilleri tarafından defalarca tekrarlanmıştır. İstatistiksel bir araştırma sonucunda görülmektedir ki; 1980'ler öncesi tarım reformlarının iyi bir sonucu olan 25 milyon hektarlık üretim alanı, siyasi iktidarların kentleşme ve konut inşaatına yönelik popülist ilgisi ve tarım reformu ile başlayan neoliberal gündem nedeniyle 2000 yılından itibaren hızla küçülmeye başlamıştır. Bu uygulamalar ve topraksızlaştırma politikası ile tarım arazileri 2011 yılından sonra 21 milyon hektara düşmüştür. Aslında tarım arazilerindeki söz konusu daralmaya yönelik Kalkınma Planları içeriğinde açıklamalar görmekle birlikte, bu küçülmenin nedeninin siyasi boyutlarla ilişkilendirilmemiş olması anlamlıdır. Tarım arazilerinin azalmasının sebebi olarak kalkınma planlarında siyaset boyutuyla ilgili en ufak ilinti yapılmamakla beraber, kuraklık, şehirleşme veya yanlış arazi kullanımı gibi bilimsel ve akılcı nedenlerle ilişkilendirilmesinin politika yapıcı bürokratların seçimi olduğunu ve yine yönetim(polity)/siyaset(politics) çatallaşması veya bütünleşmesi manasında okunabileceğini söylemek mümkündür.

Kırsal kalkınma konusunda eylemlere 1980 öncesi planlarda yer verilmiş olsa da, planlarda “köy-kent” ve “köy kalkınması” yaklaşımları diğer kuruluşlarla işbirliği içinde çeşitli illerde uygulama alanları bulmuştur. Bu proje ile bazı köylere ulaştırılamayan sosyal ve kültürel hizmetlerin toplanarak diğer köylere getirilmesi hedeflenmiştir. İlk dört planda "kalkınmada öncelikli bölgeler" konusuna büyük önem verilmiş ve Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi'nin (GAP) hayata geçirilmesi hedeflenmiştir. Fakat, 1980 sonrasında özellikle 2000'li yıllardan itibaren tarımın yeniden yapılandırılması (ARİP) ile kalkınma planlarında kullanılan “köy” ifadesi yerine “kırsal alan” tercih edilmiş olması AB entegrasyon süreci olarak algılanabileceği gibi, “köylülük-peasantization” sorunsalı temelinde de irdelenmesi gerekebilir. Aslında, AB Ortak Tarım Politikası'na (OTP) uyum için hazırlanan IPARD Programı, kırsal

faaliyetlerin çeşitlendirilmesi ve tarım dışı (çiftlik) temelli uygulamalar ile tarımdan çekilme (deagrarianization) şeklinde okunsa bile, küçük ölçekli çiftçilere (peasants) sunduğu imkanlar ile “re-peasantization” tercihi olabilmektedir. Burada ayrıca kırsalda büyük çoğunluğu tarımda ücretsiz çalışan kadınların durumu da önemlidir. Çünkü Türk tarımının bir diğer karakteristik özelliği ise özellikle çok küçük ölçekli tarımda, aile çiftliklerinde, kadın emeği yoğun olmasıdır. Bu bağlamda 2007 yılları sonrasında uygulanmış olan IPARD Programı ve kırsal kalkınma planlarında kadın çiftçi başvuruları öncelikli olmuştur. Ayrıca kadınların üretimi ve emeğinin “kadın kooperatifleri” vasıtasıyla geliştirilmesi seçimleri özellikle Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı sonrasındaki planlarda yer almıştır. Tarımda çalışan kadının ücretsiz aile işçisi konumundan çıkarılması, tarım sektöründe güçlenmesi için tarımsal yayım ve eğitim tercihleri planlara dâhil edilmiştir. Kalkınma planlarının bu tercihlerinde her ne kadar söylem olarak, köylülük ve tarım (peasant and agrarian approach) kullanılsa bile, bu uygulamaların bu manada okunması çok yanlış değildir. Ayrıca Meclis söylemlerinde de 2011 yıllarından sonra “küçük üreticilerin” hem muhalefet hem de iktidar siyasetçileri tarafından gündeme getirilmesi “köylü” meselesinin yeniden üretilmesi manasına gelebilir. Burada dikkat çeken konu ise belki de 2008 yıllarında yaşanan kuraklık ve ekonomik daralma sonunda ortaya çıkan gıda krizi ile başlayan ve 2010 yılları sonrasında iklim değişikliği, kuraklık ve açlık kaygısıyla, gıda üretiminin devamlılığına büyük etkisi olan küresel krizlerin oluşturduğu “gıda güvenliği” ve “beslenme” faktörlerinin itici gücüdür. Nitekim Kovid-19 pandemisi ve Ukrayna ve Rusya arasında yaşanan gerginlik ile ulusların gıda egemenliğini sağlaması gerekliliği ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu bağlamda Onuncu ve On birinci Kalkınma Planlarında “milli ve yerli” gibi söylemlerin hem siyaset/kamu yönetimi/politika çatallaşmasının hem de bütünleşmesinin örnekleri olabileceğini söylemek mümkündür. Ayrıca gıda güvenliğini ve sürdürülebilirliği sağlamak sebebiyle küresel çapta başlatılan AB “Yeşil mutabakat-Green Deal” ve Birleşmiş Milletlerin “Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Hedefleri-SDG” belki de tarıma dönüşün Dünya genelinde kabul edilmesi şeklinde okunabilir. Ayrıca Kovid-19 ve Ukrayna-Rusya gerginliği sürecinde küresel kurallar dayatan Dünya Ticaret Örgütü (WTO) bile küçük üreticilere ve tarımsal üretime bağıntılı desteklere yeşil ışık yakmıştır.

Tarım bağlamında önemi yüksek bir diğer yaklaşım ise tarımın bilimsel değerlendirilmesiyle yani tarım ve gıda işletmelerinin fırsatları yakalama veya verimli olarak hayatta kalabilme becerisini ölçmek için “yapısal verimlilik veya emek verimliliği” ve “işçi başına brüt katma değer” gibi sayısal göstergelerinin kullanılarak nicelik olarak değerlendirilmesidir. Bu sayısal değerlendirme ışığında Türkiye’de tarım sektöründe istihdam edilen kişi başına brüt katma değer, Avrupa Ülkeleri ile karşılaştırıldığında, Türk tarımının verimliliğinin ve dolayısıyla “yapısal etkinliğinin” Avrupa ortalamasının altında olduğu ve verimli tarım yapılmadığı her zaman planlarda ve Meclis söylemlerinde yer alan objektif bir değerlendirme olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Türk tarımının çoğu Avrupa ülkesine kıyasla bu düşük yapısal verimliliği, her zaman eleştirilmekte ve sektörün dünyadaki rekabet gücü ve gelişme potansiyeli olarak en önemli açmazı olarak gösterilmektedir. Ayrıca tarımın ihracattaki önemli payı sebebiyle küresel olarak uygulanan kalite (food safety) ve sağlıkla (sanitary) ilişkili ticaret kurallarının ancak verimlilik ve üretim kapasitesi yüksek belli optimal ölçüde üreticiler tarafından sağlanabileceği gerçeğinin kabul edilmesi zorunluluğu ile kalkınma planlarında özellikle Gümrük Birliği entegrasyonun tamamlandığı 1995 yılından sonra, salt bilimsel politikaların uygulanması amacıyla kalkınma planlarının içeriğinde küçük üreticiler aleyhine (depeasantization) olabilecek yaklaşımlar görülmektedir. Bu doğrultuda örneğin IPARD Programı’nda belirlenen arazi büyüklüğü veya hayvan sayısı altındaki üreticiler destek kapsamına alınmamaktadır. Bu durumun tarımın “uluslararasılaştırılması” veya “Avrupalılaştırılması” şeklinde uluslararası siyasetin (international politics) bir aracı haline dönüştürülmesi olarak okunması yanlış bir yaklaşım değildir. Nitekim tarım dünyadaki bütün ülkelerde stratejik bir sektör olarak benimsenmektedir.

Özetle; hemen hemen tüm planlar, kaynakların yanlış kullanılması ve teknolojik gelişmelerin takip edilememesinin sektörün gelişimini geciktirdiğini ele almıştır. Özellikle geleneksel alışkanlıkların kolay kolay terk edilememesi sektörün teknolojik gelişimini engellemiştir. Tarım alanındaki düzensiz yönetim, pazarlama sisteminin yetersizliği, girdi fiyatlarının yüksekliği, üretim maliyetlerinin yüksekliği ve küçük ölçekli ve dağınık çiftlikler tarımsal kalkınmanın önünde engel olmuştur. Özellikle Meclis tutanaklarında hükümetlerin ve muhalefetin planlara atıfta bulunduğunu, eylemlerini veya eleştirilerini planları referans alarak yaptıkları görülmektedir.

Dolayısıyla, temelinde tamamen teknik, sistematik, bağımsız ve akılcı hazırlanan planların siyasetin kendisi olabileceği sonucuna varmak yanlış bir varsayım olmayabilir. Öte yandan kalkınma planlarının içeriğinde yer alan siyasi bulguların analizi sonucunda, bu planların hiçbirinin siyasi gerekçelerle hazırlanmadığı, tarım sektörünün detaylı analizleri ile oluşturulduğu fikri de ortaya çıkmıştır.

Çalışmanın ana sorunsalı temelinde özetlemeye çalışıldığında, 1960 yılında başlayan planlı dönemden itibaren Türkiye özelinde var olan, küçük ölçekli, dağınık ve parçalı arazi üzerinde geleneksel yöntemlerle tarım yapan şimdilerde küçük üreticiler (small holders) veya aile çiftlikleri (family farms) olarak sadece söylemi değişen köylünün (peasants) tarım reformlarına (agricultural reform) rağmen yapısını bozmadan bugüne değin geldiğinin bulguları hem istatistik verilerde hem de Meclis söylemlerinde görülmektedir. Bir diğer deyişle; küreselleşme, neoliberalleşme, AB ile üyelik müzakereleri altında Ortak Tarım Politikasına uyum çalışmaları gibi birçok kapitalist çerçevede okunabilecek reform uygulamalarına rağmen, Ülkeye özgü tarım özelliklerinin yapısal değişikliğe karşı direnç gösterdiğini süreklilik (continuity) anlamında yorumlayabiliriz. Ancak, bu kütleye karşı uygulanan tarım yaklaşımlarının (agrarian approach) veya tarımsal reformların (agricultural reforms) tercihlerinin kopuşlar ve geri dönüşler altında idare (polity)/siyaset (politics) çatallaşması veya bütünleşmesi şeklinde yorumlanmasının çok kolay olmadığını söylemek zorunluluğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Türkiye için belki önemli bir potansiyel olarak ele alınabilecek bir husus halen bir şekilde varlığını sürdürebilmiş, bu özel küçük üreticilerin krizlere ve kapital odaklı keskin politikalara karşı dayanıklılığı ve direncinin değerlendirilmesidir. Böylece gelecekte artık Dünyanın yaşayacağı kesin olan gıda güvensizliği ve açlık krizine karşı yerelde ve ulusal seviyede beslenme ihtiyacını karşılamak üzere, Türkiye'nin "suigeneris" tarımının daha fazla önem verilerek politika yapıcıların gündemine gelebileceğinin bulgularını görmemek elde değildir. Bu çerçevede gelecekte karşımıza kriz olarak çıkması muhtemel gıda krizinin aşılmasında yeni terimlerle tanımlanması muhtemel fakat üretim karakteristiği aynı olacak köylü üretim tarzının yeniden tanınacağını söylemek mümkündür.

C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : DEDE
Adı / Name : İlknur
Bölümü / Department : Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi / Political Science and Public Administration

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English):

TÜRK TARIM POLİTİKALARININ 1980 SONRASINDAKİ İÇ VE DIŞ DİNAMİKLERİN YÖNLENDİRDİĞİ
REFORMLARIN ETKİSİYLE DÖNÜŞÜMÜ
**THE TRANSFORMATION OF TURKISH AGRICULTURAL POLICIES BY THE EFFECTS OF REFORMS DRIVEN
BY INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DYNAMICS AFTER 1980**

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☐ Doktora / PhD ☒

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒
2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two years. * ☐
3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. * ☐

** Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. /
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library
together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date

(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)