



THE TENDENCY TOWARDS CENTRALIZATION EXPERIENCED IN THE
MANAGEMENT OF METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES IN TURKEY
TÜRKİYE'DE BÜYÜKŞEHİR BELEDİYELERİNİN YÖNETİMİNDE YAŞANAN
MERKEZİLEŞME EĞİLİMİ

Orhan Veli ALICI¹



1. Doç. Dr., Tarsus Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari
Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu
Yönetimi Bölümü, orhanvelialici@tarsus.edu.tr,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8670-3879>

Makale Türü Article Type
Araştırma Makalesi Research Article

Başvuru Tarihi Application Date
08.04.2021 04.08.2021

Yayına Kabul Tarihi Admission Date
23.06.2021 06.23.2021

DOI
<https://doi.org/10.30798/makuiibf.911949>

Abstract

Compared to the past, the subsidiarity principle has become more apparent with the implementation of the Metropolitan Municipality Law No. 5216 in 2004 and the Municipality Law No. 5393 in 2005. While the metropolitan municipalities were empowered with the development called the reform of local governments, the duties and authorities of the district municipalities in metropolitan cities were reduced. Due to the administrative power of the district municipalities, metropolitan municipalities almost became "new centers" at the local level. In case, the discourse of localization actually caused a new centralization movement in the local administration system of Turkey. Moreover, with the abolition of special provincial administrations, the duties and authorities of metropolitan municipalities expanded to rural areas. Therefore, the centralization process in local governments contained all of the city boundaries. In this article, the centralization tendency in the case of metropolitan municipalities that makes them "leaders of local governments" in metropolitan cities where a two-level metropolitan management system is applied will be examined.

Keywords: *Subsidiarity, Centralization, Localization, Metropolitan Municipality, Metropolitan District Municipality.*

Öz

Geçmişe kıyasla, hizmette yerellik ilkesi 2004 tarihli ve 5216 sayılı Büyükşehir Belediye Kanunu ile 2005 tarihli ve 5393 sayılı Belediye Kanunu'nun uygulanması ile birlikte daha görünür hâle geldi. Yerel yönetimlerde reform adı verilen gelişme ile büyükşehir belediyeleri güçlendirilirken, büyükşehirlerde ilçe belediyelerinin görev ve yetkileri azaltıldı. İlçe belediyelerinin idari gücü nedeniyle büyükşehir belediyeleri neredeyse yerel düzeyde yeni merkezler haline geldi. Bu durum da yerelleşme söylemi gerçekte Türkiye'nin yerel yönetim sisteminde yeni bir merkezleşme hareketine yol açtı. Dahası İl Özel İdareleri'nin kaldırılması ile birlikte büyükşehir belediyelerinin yetki ve görevleri kırsal alanlara doğru genişledi. Böylece yerel yönetimlerde merkezleşme süreci bütün şehir sınırlarını kapsadı. Bu çalışmada iki kademeli büyükşehir yönetim sisteminin uygulandığı büyükşehirlerdeki kendilerini "yerel yönetimlerin liderleri" haline getiren merkezleşme eğilimi incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Hizmette Yerellik, Merkezleşme, Yerelleşme, Büyükşehir Belediyesi, Büyükşehir İlçe Belediyesi.*

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Çalışmanın Amacı

Türkiye’de, kentsel alanlara yönelen göç hareketleri ve nüfus artışı neticesinde giderek büyüyen yerleşim yerleri için klasik belediye yönetim modelleri gereksinimlere yanıt verememiştir. Buna bağlı olarak da metropol kentlerde alt kademe belediyelerinin sınırlarını kapsayacak şekilde büyükşehir belediyeleri kurulmuştur. Ancak diğer ülkelerdeki metropoliten alan yönetimlerine nazaran Türkiye’deki büyükşehir belediyeleri yerelde yeni bir merkez haline gelmiştir. Bu çalışmada büyükşehir yönetim modelinin gelişimi ve dönüşümünün incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Araştırma Soruları

Bu çalışmada, büyükşehir belediyelerinin alt kademe belediyeler üzerinde etkili birer merkez haline getirilip getirilmediği, büyükşehir belediyelerinin sahip olduğu denetim yetkisinin idari ve mali özerklik ile örtüşüp örtüşmediği, yerel yönetimler reformu çerçevesinde yapılan değişiklikler ile yerelleşme söyleminin “yerelde merkezleşme” suretine bürünüp bürünmediği sorularına cevap aranmıştır. Bu sorulardan hareketle de yerelde daha etkin bir yönetim modeli için nasıl bir metropoliten alan yönetiminin uygulamaya konulması gerektiği değerlendirilmesine yanıt aranmıştır.

Literatür Araştırması

Türkiye’de büyükşehir belediyelerini konu alan çok sayıda araştırma bulunmakla birlikte büyükşehir belediyeleri ile ilçe belediyeleri arasındaki ilişkileri konu alan çalışma sayısı sınırlı düzeydedir. Öte yandan yerelleşme söylemi ve uygulamaları çerçevesinde metropollerde “lider mahalli idare” haline dönüştürülen ve ilçe belediyeleri üzerinde vesayet makamının sahip olduğu önemli yetkileri devralan büyükşehir belediyelerinin bu rolüne değinen az sayıda araştırma bulunmakla birlikte bu ilişkiyi esaslı bir şekilde irdeleyen ve güncel mevzuat değişiklikleri ile ele alan çalışma ise halihazırda bulunmamaktadır. Araştırma kapsamında tespit edilen az sayıdaki çalışmaların ise teorik düzeyde kaldığı, mevzuat hükümlerinden ziyade uygulamadaki sorunlara odaklanmadığı görülmüştür. Diğer taraftan Türkiye özelinde yerelde yaşanan merkezleşme eğilimine değinen yabancı dilde yazılmış bir çalışmaya da rastlanılmamıştır. Bu tespitlere istinaden çalışmanın amaç ve kapsamı ile araştırma soruları belirlenmiştir.

Yöntem

Araştırmanın evreni olarak Türkiye’deki büyükşehir belediyeleri ele alınmış ve söz konusu yönetim modelinin yasal dayanakları incelenmiştir. Büyükşehir ve alt kademe belediyelerinde 1984 yılından günümüze dek yaşanan gelişim ve dönüşüm çerçevesinde mevzuat ve yargı kararlarının yanı sıra Fransa’da 1884 yılında yürürlüğe konulan ve Türkiye’deki belediye ve büyükşehir yönetim modeline esin kaynağı olan Belediye Teşkilatı Hakkında Kanun da incelenerek yerelde yaşanan merkezleşme eğiliminin incelenmesi yoluna gidilmiştir.

Sonuç ve Değerlendirme

Türkiye’de 1984 yılında kabul edilen iki kademeli büyükşehir yönetim modeli zaman içinde diğer büyük kent merkezileri için de uygulanmıştır. Söz konusu sistemde büyükşehir belediyesine ilçe belediyeleri üzerinde birçok konuda denetim yetkisi tanınmış, ilçe belediyelerinin çeşitli kararlarını onama veya değiştirerek onama yetkisi de verilmiştir. 2004 yılında yerelleşme söylemi çerçevesinde büyükşehir yönetim modeli daha demokratik esaslara göre tekrar düzenlenmiş, merkezi idarenin vesayet yetkisi azaltılmıştır. Ancak merkezi idarenin söz konusu vesayet yetkilerinin bir kısmı ilçe belediyeleri üzerinde uygulanmak üzere büyükşehir belediyelerine devredilmiştir. Böylece büyükşehir belediyeleri yerelde etkili birer lider mahalli idare haline dönüştürülmüştür. Büyükşehir belediyeleri diğer gelişmiş ülkelere nazaran makro hizmetler dışında mikro nitelikli görevleri de ifa edecek şekilde dizayn edilmiştir. Alt kademede bulunan belediyeler ise vatandaşa en yakın yerel birimler olmalarına rağmen daha sınırlı konularda hizmet sunmakla yetkilendirilmişlerdir. 2014 yılındaki mahalli genel seçimlerle beraber büyükşehir belediyelerinin hizmet sahası il mülki sınırı haline getirilmiştir. Böylece yereldeki merkezileşme il düzeyine dek genişletilmiştir. Başka bir deyişle her ne kadar “yerelleşme” söylemi ileri sürülse de büyükşehir belediyeleri özelinde bu dönüşümün “merkezileşme” suretine büründüğü, başka bir deyişle büyükşehir belediyelerinin il genelinde “lider mahalli idare” haline getirilerek ilçe belediyeleri üzerinde bir “merkez” olma vasfının giderek pekiştirildiği görülmüştür. Zaman içerisinde merkezi yönetim ile yerel yönetimlerdeki siyasi iktidarın farklılaşması sebebiyle bazı yerel hizmetlerde de merkezileştirilme yoluna gidildiği görülmüştür. Bu çerçevede, Türkiye’de daha demokratik ve katılımcı bir kent yönetim modelinin tesis edilebilmesi için öncelikle büyükşehir belediyelerinin sadece makro hizmetler sunması, kentin bütününe ilgilendiren konularda eşgüdüm sağlayıcı kararlar alması, ilçe belediyelerinin ise daha yetkili hale getirilmesi, özellikle kırsal alan için uygulanan kentsel alan normlarının gözden geçirilmesi, kırsal alana özgü bir mevzuat hazırlanarak bu yerlere en yakın olan ilçe belediyelerinin yetkilendirilmesi gerektiği değerlendirilmiştir. Bu yöndeki reform çalışmalarının genel anlamda iki kademeli büyükşehir yönetim modeli ile subsidiarite ilkesinin temel felsefesine daha uygun olacağı değerlendirilmiştir.

1. INTRODUCTION

It can be said that the history of the institutional culture of local governments in Turkey does not date back so long compared with developed countries. Local units formed with the process of providing local common services in metropolitan city centers, and they were able to complete the institutionalization process quite late. After the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, the process of establishing a model for local governments began. With the Municipal Law numbered 1580 enacted in 1930, a more institutional and systemic municipalization process was put into practice.

Classical municipal administration models could not answer the increasing requirements with the rapid growth of cities because of migration and population growth. Therefore, the need for a new local government model emerged for metropolitan cities to provide their requirements. The solution was a two-staged metropolitan administration model which was put into practice with Law No. 3030 enacted in 1984. In addition, specific purpose metropolitan organizations were created for local common services. Then, with the New Public Management approach, significant systematic changes were made in Turkey in the direction of decentralization (Demirkaya, 2015). With the Metropolitan Municipality Law No. 5216 in 2004, the metropolitan municipalities were made more autonomous in terms of administration and finance. With the Law of 5216, while some significant authorities of the central government were assigned to local administrations, it also reduced the power of administrative tutelage on the local units. However, in terms of metropolitan municipalities, the decentralization transformed into a kind of centralization against metropolitan district municipalities. In other words, it can be argued that a new center other than the central government was established in local governments because some authorities of the center over local governments were delegated to the metropolitan municipalities to be applied to the district municipalities.

As a result of all the transformations by 2014, the special provincial administrations in metropolitan municipalities were abolished. Accordingly, the villages and towns in the rural areas were turned into neighborhoods and connected to the nearest district municipality. Thus, while the power and duties of metropolitan municipalities extended to the entire provincial area including all the districts, the district municipalities in rural area services were limited. As a consequence of these developments, a perception occurred that the authorization of the metropolitan municipalities tending from the center towards the local turned them into a new and effective center at the local level.

In this study, the law amendments on local governments in Turkey and the results which these changes cause are analyzed as data. Accordingly, the tendency towards centralization which is claimed to be for the benefit of metropolitan municipalities in Turkey is aimed to be studied. Based on this given information; it is questioned the hypothesis that a considerable tendency towards centralization in the management of metropolitan municipalities in Turkey was realized, and the authorities of the lower level metropolitan district municipalities were reduced from power and services. Hence, metropolitan

municipalities in Turkey were turned into “leaders of local governments”. On the other hand, it will be confirmed that some local services are centralized against the principle of subsidiarity by the central government, in case of cities are represented by different political parties from central governments. Consequently, various suggestions will be offered to local governments for providing local services by closest administrations with more participatory and democratic methods.

2. HISTORY OF MUNICIPALITIES IN TURKEY

The first municipality was established in the Ottoman period in Istanbul with the order of “Şehremaneti Nizamnamesi” on June 13, 1854. In 1857 the Istanbul Şehremaneti, with the “Daire-i Belediyenin Teşkiline ve Memurlarının Vezaifine Dair Nizamname” was divided into fourteen sub-municipalities (departments). With article 112 of the constitution (Kanun-i Esasi) in 1876, it was accepted that the establishment of municipal administrations in Istanbul and the other provinces to be managed by elected municipal councils (Yörükoğlu, 2009). Although the establishment of municipalities based on the Kanun-i Esasi, there needed for various laws to determine their duties, powers, and responsibilities. The Dersaadet Municipal Law dated October 5, 1877, specifically for Istanbul, and the Provincial Municipality Law for the other provinces were enacted on the same date. With the Dersaadet Law, the number of departments for Istanbul was increased from fourteen to twenty. In 1912, with a temporary article added to the Dersaadet Law, the twenty municipal departments were replaced by the municipal sections and the council, which was formed through an election, was replaced with a municipal committee. By assigning a manager to Şehremini (mayor), it was adapted the method of making appointments. (Özgür & Yavuzçehre, 2016).

In 1930 about 54 years later, Municipalities Law No. 1580 was approved by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Unlike the laws enacted before, the law no. 1580, without specifically dealing with Istanbul or the capital city, was general and applied in all settlements (Oktay, 2008). It is understood that in terms of the organs, duties, powers, and responsibilities of the municipalities including budget and other affairs Municipal Law No. 1580 was prepared by inspiring the French Law (Commentary on the Law of April 5, 1884) on Municipal Organization dated 5 April 1884 (Gözler, 2019).

In the 15th article of the Municipal Law dated 1930, the duties of municipalities were stated in 76 paragraphs: “Municipalities have the duties to ensure the regulations determined by laws and orders, and to ensure the health and well-being of the district and its citizens in order to maintain their order.” The municipal administration system, consisting of council, committee and mayor, is still being implemented; according to Law No. 1580, while the council meets three times a year, the function of the committee in the system is quite active. While the mayor was selected by and within the council until 1963, since then the election of the mayor by the electorate was adapted.

Urban areas have grown rapidly due to industrialization, migration and population growth. Municipalities could not satisfy the needs in growing cities, and thus, the search for new administration models for large cities began. However, in other cities and small settlements, the law was practiced for 75 years until 2005. Later, as in other countries, as a result of the New Public Management approach, changes based on efficiency and effectiveness and highlighting localization were required. Consequently, 5393 No. Municipalities Law was prepared and put into practice in Turkey (Jurak & Pinterič, 2012).

3. THE APPLICATION PROCESS OF THE METROPOLITAN ADMINISTRATION MODEL

Aforementioned, Municipality Law No. 1580 could not fulfill the needs of the municipalities due to the rise of population and urbanization. Searches for alternative administration systems were started especially for metropolitan cities, where urbanization and population were increasing rapidly. Correspondingly, the implementation of a two-staged metropolitan administration model, which was designed as a metropolitan municipality at a higher level that establishes coordination with plenty of district municipalities at the lower level in metropolitan areas was agreed upon in metropolitan cities; in 1984, this administration model was put into force in a limited area with a dense population, covering the provincial centers of Istanbul, Ankara and İzmir. On the other hand, with the establishment of the “General Directorate of Istanbul Water and Sewerage Administration” with the Law No. 2560 in 1981, which was formed under the Municipality of Istanbul in 1933 as the Istanbul Water Administration, there emerged special-purpose metropolitan organizations in the administrative system of metropolitan areas. In time, the application of water and sewerage services, which required specialization, with a separate legal entity and budget, was expanded to the other metropolitan municipalities by the central administration.

The metropolitan municipality administration model, which was put into practice in the city centers of Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir provinces with Law No. 3030, was applied in other metropolitan cities. In 2004, the Metropolitan Municipality Law No. 5216 was enacted with important changes. With the law, the meetings of the metropolitan city council were held every month, the functions of the municipal committee were reduced, and the approval procedure of the administrative chief was eliminated in confirming the city council decisions. Thus, the autonomy of metropolitan municipalities was tried to be established in an administrative sense compared to the past. However, some of the authorities of the central administration on municipalities were transferred to the metropolitan municipalities to be used on behalf of the district municipalities in the metropolitan cities. In other words, metropolitan municipalities, as it was in France, became a kind of local central administration as "leading local government" (Gözler, 2018), and this practice became widespread among local administrations.

In terms of the power of administrative tutelage on district municipalities, the zoning and budget decisions of the district municipalities are to be sent to the metropolitan municipal council after the decisions taken in their own councils. Here, the metropolitan council can accept the decisions regarding the budget and zoning or can change them, and then the subject is sent to the mayor of the metropolitan municipality for approval. Thus, the decisions belonging to the district municipalities are turned into the duty of the metropolitan municipality by being changed and then are implemented by the district municipalities. In other words, the decisions of the district municipalities, which are legal entities determined by law with administrative and financial autonomy, can be changed and approved by the metropolitan municipality. Also, the law authorized metropolitan municipalities to monitor district governments, and apparently, this process makes them the leaders of the local governments.

In 2012, in the metropolitan municipalities, town municipalities outside the city centers were abolished and their responsibilities were given to the metropolitan municipality. With Law No. 6360, which was adopted in 2012 and whose important articles came into force in 2014, the centralization at the local level was practiced to all provincial borders in the metropolitan municipalities, including the rural area.

4. A NEW UNDERSTANDING OF MUNICIPALISM: RURAL MUNICIPALISM

There are significant changes brought by Law No. 6360, which was applied with the local elections held in 2014. The number of metropolitan municipalities increased to thirty, and the legal personality of the special provincial administrations in the metropolitan municipalities was abrogated. Besides, the specific purpose of metropolitan organizations, the numbers of water and sewage administrations established in accordance with Law No. 2560, reached thirty. By amending Law No. 5216, Law No. 6360 extended the service area of both metropolitan municipalities and water and sewage administrations to provincial areas. Accordingly, the legal entities of the villages and townships in the rural areas were removed and these places were entitled as under the authority of the nearest district municipality as a neighborhood. However, it should be emphasized that most of the duties, authorities, and responsibilities of the special provincial administrations in the rural area were given to the metropolitan municipalities substantially. By the article in Law No. 6360, which is “the authority, duties and responsibilities determined by the Provincial Special Administration Law No. 5302 and other legislations, are used and fulfilled”, it can be said that the metropolitan municipalities undertook the functions of the special provincial administrations in the rural area.

With the changes aforementioned, it can be stated that by Law No. 6360 there emerged a new form of centralization in terms of both metropolitan municipality governments and water and sewage administrations. Therefore, the regulation was made in contradiction with the principle of subsidiarity, which is explained in article 14 of Law No. 5393 on behalf of the service in the form of “Municipal

services are offered to the citizens in the closest places and with the most appropriate methods” (Belli & Aydın, 2017). In other words, many town municipalities were abrogated and the areas in their responsibilities were given to the district municipalities, the authority of the municipalities in the rural area for essential local common services were ended. This means that the tendency of localization affected the authority to turn from the central administration to local governments, and through the metropolitan municipalities at the local level (Taşçier, 2018). Therefore, in Turkey metropolitan municipalities were consolidated with the power of administrative tutelage over the district municipalities and became new centers. After that, the concept of rural municipalism took part in academic literature.

5. THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE TUTALEGE POWER OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION OVER LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

When the Metropolitan Municipality Law numbered 5216 (2004) and the Municipal Law numbered 5393 (2005) is examined, it can be observed that the administrative and financial autonomy of the municipalities were gradually empowered. The administrative tutelage authority of the central administration was repealed especially in terms of the finalization of the council decisions and the cancellation and establishment of the main staff and the power of the administrative authority (governors) to approve the municipal decisions, while various authorities in many fields on the municipalities were minimized. These authorities were transferred to either mayors or local councils.

It should be underlined that while the central administration delegated some of its powers only to metropolitan municipalities, it continued to use the same powers on both metropolitan district municipalities and other municipalities. For instance, while the final decision-maker of the dismissal penalties of employees working for municipalities was the Ministry of Interior with the title of High Disciplinary Board, this practice was partially ended with a change in the “Regulation on Disciplinary Boards and Disciplinary Supervisors”. Thus, this authority of the Ministry of Interior was given only to the executive committees of metropolitan municipalities. Currently, the Ministry of Interior continues to use this authority for the non-metropolitan municipalities. This change supports the fact that metropolitan municipalities were seen as more autonomous than the other municipalities and even turned into an effective center by the central government.

However, as seen before, some defuncted authorities of the central administration were passed to the metropolitan municipalities to be used on their district municipalities. Thus, the metropolitan municipalities became a kind of “leaders of local governments” that can determine some issues of their district municipalities.

Although Law No. 5216 has been considered as a significant localization, it can be argued that the localization remained at a limited level. While the central administration left some of its authorities as a requirement of a democratic government, it did not defunct some of its important authorities. For

instance, the authority to appoint the chief of staff is given to the mayor by law, the appointment is still subject to the approval of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. The total numbers and the size of municipalities' staff, number and names of the organization to be established are determined by a regulation of the central government. Moreover, the municipalities should obtain permission from the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization even before the officers are recruited through the exam. That is to say, municipalities cannot employ officers without the approval of the Ministry. The Ministry has also the duty and authority to determine the standards of vehicles to be used by local administrations. Considering these examples, it can be understood that the administrative autonomy of municipalities given in Law No. 5216 remains at a limited level.

Furthermore, the secretary-general, who is the senior bureaucrat in the organization of the metropolitan municipalities, is appointed by the Minister of Environment and Urbanization upon the proposal of the mayor. This means that the metropolitan mayors do not have the authority to appoint their top-level officers. This is also applied to the general managers and executive members of the water and sewerage administrations, which are associated with metropolitan municipalities. In other words, metropolitan mayors cannot appoint the general manager and executive members of the water and sewerage administration. When the authority of the central government on such appointments is taken into consideration, it is understood that the control of the center over local governments continues.

It was understood that the central administration was not effective in terms of determining the personnel resources of the local government. A study conducted regarding the Regulation on Norms of Staff Principles and Standards of Municipalities and Affiliated Organizations and Local Administration Unions in 2007 found that metropolitan municipalities used approximately 32% of the staff and officers assigned from it and that the rate of using the administrative staff varies between 37% and 111% according to metropolitan municipalities. The problem with the regulation is that it does not take into account the number of districts and other aspects of the city apart from the population (Alıcı, 2017a).

Moreover, while Law No. 5216 the authority of urban transformation was given to district municipalities, the authority was later passed to metropolitan municipalities and then to the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. Similarly, the duty and authority of planning and coordination of urban public transportation services under the authority of the metropolitan municipalities and the Transportation Coordination Centers are restricted by the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure with the Circular Letter numbered 2020/3 dated 4.2.2020. The letter determined that the permitting authority for urban transformation is the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure.

Infrastructure and Transportation Coordination Centers were established in accordance with Articles 8th and 9th of the Metropolitan Municipality Law No. 5216 and the Regulation on the Metropolitan Municipalities Coordination Centers in the Official Journal numbered 26199 dated 15.06.2006. There have the majority of metropolitan municipalities in the executive committees of both

Centers and turn, all decisions were taken in favor of the municipalities. It can be said that Transport Coordination Centers (UKOMEs) were designed to be administered under the majority of the metropolitan municipality, because each consists of eleven members from the metropolitan municipality, nine from the central government and one metropolitan district municipality officer under the chairmanship of the metropolitan mayor or one of his/her officer. The majority of the metropolitan municipality was designed as it is composed of eleven from the metropolitan municipality, nine from the central government and one metropolitan district municipality official under the chairmanship of the UKOME metropolitan mayor or the officer. However, by the decree published in the Official Gazette No. 31044 dated 02.19.2020, the number of the representatives of the central government in Transport Coordination Centers were increased by 5 (representing five different central organizations) and in turn, the members of the center got the majority in the UKOMEs. Thus, the central administration was closely involved with decisions in the subjects of “decision making, implementation, enforcement at a high level in terms of transportation, traffic and public transportation, and the establishment and operation of the facilities required in accordance with the procedure in the relevant legislation”. It should be emphasized that the two centralization cases aforementioned were realized with circular letters and regulations, and it is clear that they also violated Law No. 5216.

Considering the examples, it can be argued that Turkey experienced a remarkable centralization, and the administrative autonomy in Turkey was violated. It is argued that the centralization process of some local government authorities and its subjection to the permission of central administration result from the political differentiation between the center and the local that occurred with the 2019 local elections.

6. THE PROBLEMATIQUE OF CENTRALIZATION OF METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

In the two-staged metropolitan administration model, the upper stage refers to the metropolitan municipality, which covers the service area of all district municipalities and performs the coordination task, and there are many district municipalities in the lower stage. In other words, the model is a local administration unit covering the entire provincial boundary to perform macro services within its field and to provide coordination between many local units at the lower level (ALICI, 2017a). However, this model was designed for the metropolitan municipalities in Turkey. To provide daily and severable services in the district area, metropolitan municipalities in Turkey face the problem of centralization and inconvenience. While district municipalities offer as limited services as possible, metropolitan municipalities, in contradiction with the principle of subsidiarity, were tasked and authorized to provide these services up to the remotest points by undertaking micro tasks as well as macro tasks. Apart from these tasks metropolitan municipalities were also charged with the authority to control the activities of the district municipalities on some issues in terms of accepting the decisions or changing them. Thus, a

centralization problem for metropolitan municipalities emerged. While the problem started with the first metropolitan municipality Law No. 3030 enacted in 1984, the problem has gradually expanded until today.

For the case of providing services, after the primary duties of metropolitan municipalities were included, compared to the past by Law No. 5216, metropolitan municipalities also had the authority to "make all kinds of activities and take initiatives in order to meet the local common needs of the residents". In the light of the utilities, it can be argued that metropolitan municipalities were formed as "service-intensive" administrations. However, this causes the rise of systematic problems because both metropolitan municipalities and their district municipalities were empowered to perform the same services in the same place. Having the same authority for providing the same services in the same area by the upper and lower level administrations is defined as "service conflict". Such conflict has also been thought objectionable to use resources effectively, economically, and efficiently. For instance, there is a service conflict between metropolitan municipalities and district municipalities in the areas of public security services, parks, cleaning and controlling, market places, slaughterhouse, zoning control and license, and social and cultural services (Alıcı, 2013).

As a matter of fact, the existing two-staged metropolitan administration model made metropolitan municipalities a new center by making them the leading local governments. The model however was extended to provincial boundaries without removing its problems (Alıcı, 2015). That is to say, without revising metropolitan municipalities in terms of their organizational structure and human resources, they are obliged to meet the needs of both urban and rural areas. Therefore, the quality of the services provided in the urban area declined and the lack of effective, economic and efficient service delivery in the rural area arose (Kızılboga & Alıcı, 2013). In the metropolitan cities such as Ankara, Konya, Van, Erzurum, and Mersin, the service area increased up to 30 times compared to before 2014, but the increase in their budgets did not reach even one time. For instance, while the old service area of Mersin metropolitan municipality is 650 km², the new service area has become 15,620 km² and the service area increased 24 times (Alıcı, 2017b). Konya Metropolitan Municipality, on the other hand, provided services on an area of 2,100 km², and became an area of 41,000 km², while its service area increased approximately 20 times (Usta et al., 2018). When these spatial increases are set aside, the number of people per km² is 117 for Mersin, 54 for Konya, 53 for Van and 30 for Erzurum. However, this number is 1,098 in Istanbul and 539 for Kocaeli.

If the application of metropolitan municipalities had limited to urban areas, not including rural areas, the number of people per km² would be increased. For instance, in Mersin, there would be 1.593 people per km², not 117, and in Konya 641 and 54 people per km² respectively. These examples are at the level to give an idea of what rural municipalities and metropolitan municipalities are.

As a matter of fact, with Law No. 6360, the two-staged metropolitan administration system was turned into an administrative system that will cover the provincial boundary along with the structural problems it contains. In other words, the changes by the Law such as disincorporating the legal entities of the municipalities of the town and villages and turning them into neighborhoods, passing the duties and powers regarding the provision of local common services to metropolitan municipalities were eroded the administrative and the financial autonomy of the metropolitan district municipalities and have turned the metropolitan municipalities into an effective center within the provincial administrative boundaries (Taşçılar, 2019). Therefore, under the discourse of “localization” it is understood that metropolitan municipalities at the local level are centralized (Öztürk, 2019). The centralization also included water and sewage administrations through the water and sewerage services. Therefore it can be argued that to cover the provincial boundaries a centralization process was also experienced for these services.

As a result, duties, powers and financial resources were gathered at a significant level in metropolitan municipalities. In the metropolitan areas, because there was not envisaged for a separate model for the district municipalities, especially in the rural areas, a monotype-centralized metropolitan administration was implemented for city centers and rural areas (Arikboğa, 2018). Such a monotype and centralized model, however, has gradually exacerbated the content and impact of systemically existing problems. The application of the model to the rural areas causes a substantial organizational conflict. For instance, the zoning legislation developed for urban areas is not possible for rural areas. On the other hand, collecting urban taxes in rural areas where low-income people live will also be against equity. It can therefore be argued that a standardized and centralized metropolitan administration including rural and urban areas causes a considerable organizational conflict against the rural area. For this reason, there should be developed specific norms for the areas other than urban ones.

In the light of the information aforementioned, it can be argued that, even though important arrangements were made in the direction of localization, central administration started the centralization process of local services on some matters. Besides, the central administration delegated some of its authorities to new centers, metropolitan municipalities. At present, a remarkable control of the central administration through the administrative tutelage on municipalities continues. In order to transform the local government system of Turkey through the subsidiarity principle, the district municipalities should be reformed as the closest units to the citizens by giving them more authority and responsibility for providing local services and the metropolitan municipality administrations as providing macro services and coordination in the whole city. Such a reformation will turn back the two-staged administration system from centralization to localization and will make the local government system more democratic.

7. CONCLUSION AND GENERAL ASSESSMENT

In Turkey, the migration to urban areas and population growth for the growing settlements led to the failure of the classic model of municipal administration for the provision of the local services, especially in the cities such as İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir called metropolitan ones. The failure caused the establishment of special-purpose metropolitan administrations, such as water and sewage units, in such cities. The provision of other municipal services was given to the lower-level district municipalities and the upper-level metropolitan municipality including all-district municipalities. This model is called a two-staged metropolitan administration model, adopted in 1984 and was applied to other metropolitan areas over time. However, the model authorized the metropolitan municipality over the district municipalities on many issues, such as approving or even affirming various decisions of the district municipalities by changing. The model aforementioned was used until 2004 and then it was reformed by Law No. 5216. By the Law, some authorities of the central government over local governments were reduced. The law turned metropolitan municipalities into new centers using coordination and organization of administrative tutelage over district municipalities. However, it can be seen that district municipalities were empowered to provide services on quite limited issues, despite being the closest service units to citizens.

Nevertheless, with Law No. 6360, adopted in 2012 and implemented in 2014, the two-level metropolitan management model was applied not only in the city center but also in the rural area. Thus, the metropolitan municipalities were authorized not only in the city center district municipalities but also in the sub-districts and villages in the rural areas. Against the discourse of “localization”, it can be argued that the structural transformation led to the formation of the metropolitan municipalities as a new “centralization”. In other words, the development that made the metropolitan municipalities “leaders of local governments” in the province and a new “center” on the district municipalities have continued.

Due to the differentiation of political power in the central government and local governments over time, it is observed that some local services were centralized. In other words, although significant steps were taken towards localization, it is clear that a partial centralization was made by the central administration on certain affairs. On the other hand, in terms of duties, authority, and financial resources, metropolitan municipalities, which were turned into a center as “leaders of local governments”, were empowered against district municipalities in both urban and rural areas. In order to establish a more democratic and participative urban administration model in Turkey, it is principally essential to give merely macro services and coordination duty about the issues regarding the whole city to metropolitan municipalities and to empower the district municipalities for the provision of local services. So, within this framework, the revision of the urban area norms applied especially for rural areas, the preparation of legislation specific to the rural area and the authorization of the district municipalities closest to these

places will generally be more suitable to the basic philosophy of the two-level model and subsidiarity principle.

REFERENCES

- Alici, O. V. (2017a). An evaluation on organizational structures and staff employments of metropolitan municipalities, *The Journal of International Social Research*, 10(51), 874-884.
- Alici, O. V. (2017b). The evaluation of service provided under the provincial property boundaries on the budget realizations of water and sewerage administrations: MESKI sample, *The Journal of International Social Research*, 10(52), 904-914.
- Alici, O. V. (2013). Legal foundations of issues between metropolitan municipalities and district municipalities, *The Legal Law Journal*, 11(131), 13-36.
- Alici, O. V. (2015). The Municipality of All City, *Toros University Journal of Economic Administrative and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 13-30.
- Alici, O. V. (2012). *Relations between metropolitan municipality and district municipalities: the case of Istanbul*, Istanbul: Beta Publications.
- Arikboğa, E. (2018). Decentralization and distribution of powers in the centralized metropolitan system, *Marmara University Journal of Political Science*, 6(1), 1-34.
- Belli, A. and Aydın, A. (2017). Law no. 6360 and Centralisation in Local, *International Journal of Social Science*, 55, 401-413.
- Commentary on the Law of April 5, 1884 on the Organization and Powers of Municipal Councils, (Commentaire de la Loi Du 5 Avril 1884 Sur l'Organisation et Les Attributions des Conseils Municipaux), [Online] at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k104013r/f20.image>, accessed February 11st, 2020
- Demirkaya, Y. (2015). Strategic planning in the Turkish Public Sector, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, Special Issue, 15-29.
- Gözler, K. (2019). French effect on the Turkish System of municipality: Is the Turkish Municipality Law of 3 April 1930 Received from French Law of 5 April 1884?, *The Journal of Contemporary Local Governments*, 28(1-2), 1-24.
- Gözler, K. (2018). *Local administrations law*, Bursa: Ekin Bookstore Publications.
- Jurak, A. P. and Pinterič, U. (2012). Assessment of municipalities' performances in Slovenia, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, No. 35 E/2012, 121-137.
- Kızılboga, R. and Alici, O. V. (2013). Rural area municipalism and provincial administrative boundary application in metropolitan municipalities in Turkey, *The Journal of Turkish Administrative*, 85(476), 353-381.
- Law on the Establishment of Metropolitan Municipality and Twenty Seven Districts in Fourteen Provinces and Amendments to Some Laws and Decree Laws, No. 6360. (2012). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (28489, on December 6, 2012).
- Metropolitan Municipality Law no. 5216. (2004). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (25531, on July 23, 2004).
- Municipalities Law no. 1580. (1930). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (1471, on April 14, 1930).
- Municipalities Law no. 5393. (2005). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (25874, on July 13, 2005).

- Oktaç, T. (2008). *Historical development of municipal institution*, In Bozlağan, R. and Demirkaya, R., (Eds.), *Local Governments in Turkey* (119-156). Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Özgür, H. and Yavuzçehre, P. S. (2016). Turkish metropolitan municipality system: 1982-2015, *Cankiri Karatekin University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 903-926.
- Öztürk, K. (2019). Decentralization-centralization dichotomy in local government reform: The Case of law no: 6360, *Journal of Law and Economics Research*, 11(2), 133-148.
- Regulation on Disciplinary Boards and Disciplinary Supervisors. (1982) *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (17848, on October 24, 1982).
- Regulation on Norm Staff Principles and Standards of Municipalities and Affiliated Organizations and Local Administration Associations. (2007). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (26442, on February 22, 2007).
- Regulation on the Metropolitan Municipalities Coordination Centers. (2006). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (26199, on June 15, 2006).
- Taşçier, A. M. (2018). Centralization-Localization tension in Neoliberalism: Special provincial administrations YIKOB examples and localization, *Gazi University Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(14), 650-662.
- Taşçier, A. M. (2019). Neoliberalism decentralization and Turkey, Ankara: Tekin Publications.
- The Adaption and the Amendment of the Legislative Decree on the Administration of Metropolitan Municipalities, Law no 3030. (1984). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey* (18453, on July 9, 1984).
- Usta, S., Akman, E. and Kocaoğlu, M. (2018). Effects of Law No. 6360 on Metropolitan Municipality System: The Case of Konya Metropolitan Municipality, *Turkish Journal of TESAM Academy*, Local Governments Special Issue, 217-249.
- Yörükoğlu, F. (2009). Development Process of Turkish Municipality, *Journal of Legislation*, 12(135), 1-18, [Online] at <https://www.mevzuatdergisi.com/2009/03a/02.htm>, accessed February 10 st, 2020.