

URBANIZATION IN TURKEY*

Doç. Dr. Cevat GERAY

I. INTRODUCTION

Turkey is a country in the process of development, and of a rapid population growth. Her economy is predominantly based on agriculture, and a great majority of her population is rural. Between 1927 and 1950, a great percentage of Turkish population remained rural. After 1950, urbanization has become accelerated, but the rural character of the population has not been reversed or changed substantially. In other words, urbanization has been a phenomenon of last twenty years. If the existing conditions will continue to prevail — and there is no doubt that they will — a greater migration flow from the villages to cities will be expected. Therefore, to cope with the social, economic and other problems created by rapid urban growth, due emphasis must be paid to studying the process of urbanization, its reasons and results, before taking necessary steps.

In this paper, an attempt has been made to define the urbanization process and the problems it brings in Turkey, and also search for measures necessary to channelize it into a more desirable direction.

In this paper, settlements with a population more than 10,000 are considered as «Urban». In other official sources. Only the centers of provinces and districts are considered as «urban», without regarding their population sizes.

(*) This article is based on a paper presented to the CENTO Symposium on «The Role of Local Government in National Development» held in Ankara, February 15-22, 1965. The author thanks to Müslim ÖZBALKAN for his assistance to revise the data in order to make the tables up-to-date.

II. POPULATION GROWTH AND URBANIZATION

The population of Turkey increased from 13.6 millions in 1927 to 31.4 millions in 1965. Out of the total population, only 2.2 millions used to live in cities. In 1965, urban population reached 9.4 millions. The rate of increase in urban population is greater than that of total population, as well as rural population. As it can be understood from TABLE I, index numbers for different census years indicate that, in 38 years total population increased by 230 % whereas urban population increased by 409 %. The index number for rural population is only 193 %.

TABLE : I

Increase in Population (Total, Rural and Urban)
(1927 — 1965)

Census Year	(a) Population		(b) Urban Population		(c) Rural Population		b/a %	c/a %
	(000)	1927=100	(000)	1927=100	(000)	1927=100		
1927	13,648	100	2,286	100	11,412	100	16.4	83.6
1935	16,158	118	2,688	120	13,470	118	16.6	83.4
1940	17,821	131	3,215	144	14,606	128	18.	82.
1945	18,790	138	3,475	155	15,315	133	18.3	81.7
1950	20,947	153	3,918	175	17,029	150	18.5	81.5
1955	24,065	176	5,414	238	18,651	163	22.1	77.9
1960	27,755	203	7,198	315	20,557	180	25.2	74.8
1965	31,391	230	9,343	409	22,048	193	29.7	70.3

Sources : Census data published so far by the State Institute of Statistics.

On the other hand, that part of the population living in urban areas increased from 16.4 % in 1927 to 29.7 % in 1965. In other words, rural population decreased from 83.6 % to 70.3 % within same period.

Another indication of the urbanization process would be the increase in the amount of people who migrated within the country. Although there is no accurate data indicating migration from the rural areas, but the number of the people who registered at the census in a province other than its birthplace is known. TABLE II containing this data is as follows :

TABLE : II

Internal Immigration (1950 — 1960)

Census Year	Number of Migrants	Increase Difference	Percentage in Total Population
1950	1,692,933	—	8.1
1955	2,507,954	815,021	10.5
1960	3,186,166	687,212	11.5
1965	4,018,770	832,604	11.8

Source: S. Öngör, «1950-1960 Devresinde Türkiyede İç Göçler», *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol: XVII, No: 3-4 (1962) p. 320.
State Institute of Statistics, 1965 Census d'ata.

A. SPEED OF URBANIZATION

After 1945, the urbanization process in Turkey accelerated. Between 1927 and 1965, the annual increase in urban population was about 4.32 % whereas total population increased annually by only 2.31 %. (See TABLE III)

TABLE : III

Annual Increase in Total and Urban Population
(1927 — 1960)

Periods Between Two Census	Annual Increase (%)	
	Total Population	Urban Population
1927 - 1935	1.67	2.5
1935 - 1940	2.06	3.96
1940 - 1945	1.09	1.55
1945 - 1950	2.74	2.57
1950 - 1955	2.97	7.44
1955 - 1960	3.06	6.23
1960 - 1965	2.62	5.99
Average Annual Increase	2.31	4.32

Sources: Census data published by State Institute of Statistics. (Annual Increase is calculated by dividing the increase between two census years by number of years between two census).

The above table indicated that urbanization reached its highest rate between 1950 and 1955. It is a fact that in 23 years between 1927 and 1950, the ratio of urban to total population increased from 16.4 to 18.5 %. The difference between the two is only 2.1 %. But within 15 years after 1950, this ratio reached to 29.7 %, with a difference of 11.1 %. (See also TABLE I)

B. DIRECTION OF URBANIZATION

In parallel to the increase in urban population, the number of cities increased to 199 in the year 1965 from 66 in 1927. This increase does not indicate any newly erected town, but the towns whose population exceeded a 10,000 limit. The year 1950 is also significant as regards to the increase in the number of cities. Between 1927 and 1950, only 42 units were added to the number of cities whereas between 1950 and 1965, 91 towns were added.

On the other hand, the average size of cities also increased from one census year to another. In 1927, average size of a Turkish city was 34,636. According to 1965 census, it is 49,950. This growth of the city size is related with the direction of the urbanization process. From Table IX (at the back of the paper) it is obvious that the part of the population living in cities of over 50,000 is growing in contrast to the decrease of the relative importance of cities between 10,000 and 50,000. In 1935 there were only 60 cities of less than 50,000, and they consisted of 8.5 % of the total population, and 51.2 % of urban population. In 1965, the number of these cities reached to 168 which constitutes 10.8 % of total population, but only 36 % of the urban population. In contrast, the share of the cities over 50,000 in total population grow from 7.9 % in 1935 to 19.0 % in 1965, and their share in urban population from 49.9 to 63.1 percent.

The growth of the cities over 100,000 is also significant. In 1927, there were only 2 such big cities whereas the number reached to 14 in 1965. These constituted 39 % of urban population in 1935, and 50.3 % in 1965. Their share in total population also increased during the same period from 6.4 to 15.0 percent.

Another indication of this tendency towards big cities could be reaffirmed by the fact that the great portion (65 %) of the population migrated within the country goes to the provinces where our big cities are located. Following is a table containing data on internal migration towards the biggest three cities of the country.

TABLE : IV
Internal Migration Towards Big Cities
(1950 — 1960)

Provinces where Big Cities Located	N e t I n c r e a s e							
	1950		1955		1960		1965	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
İstanbul	321,600	41.8	396,900	46.6	718,600	45.3	1,123,010	36.4
Ankara	169,300	22.	207,500	24.3	376,700	23.7	586,918	19.0
İzmir	80,500	10.5	75,400	8.8	156,000	9.8	295,754	9.6
Others	197,100	25.7	176,700	20.3	338,000	21.2	1,078,498	35.0
Total	768,500	100.	852,500	100.	1,587,300	100.	3,084,180	100.0

Sources : Data for 1950, 1955, 1960 and 1965 census published by the State Institute of Statistics. See also, Öngör, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-26.
E. TÜMERTEKİN, *Türkiyede İç Göçler (Internal Migrations in Turkey)*, İ. Ü. Coğrafya Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 1968.

C. URBANIZATION IN DIFFERENT REGIONS

In parallel to the disparities that exist, in terms of social and economic conditions, among the geographical regions of the country, great differences exist among regions as regards to the degree and speed of urbanization. Marmara, South Anatolia and the Aegean regions, which are the more developed areas of the country, are also the more urbanized regions, with an urban population ratio ranking between 34 and 52 percent. On the other hand, Eastern Anatolia and Black Sea regions are less urbanized, with an urban to total population ratio of 15.8 and 13.5 percent, respectively.

Distribution of the urban population among the regions are shown in Table V.

As it is clearly seen in the above table, a rapid urbanization occurred in Inner Anatolia between 1927 and 1965, due to the very rapid growth of Ankara, the capital. In fact, with an index number of 273, in this region, the urban to total population ratio increased from 11.1 to 30.4 percent. The Black Sea is next to Inner Anatolia in rapid urbanization, but still the least urbanized region in the country. Southern-East Anatolia is the most static region in terms of urbanization. Although it showed very little increase in the

TABLE : V
Urbanization by Regions
(1927 — 1965)

Regions	1927	1935	1940	1945	1950	1955	1960	1965	Index 1927=100
Marmara	36.3	34.9	35.1	36.2	36.5	41.8	43.3	52.3	144
Southern	19.2	19.1	20.1	21.7	21.7	25.8	31.6	34.0	177
Aegean	20.5	22.3	23.3	22.7	24.1	26.9	30.3	34.3	167
Inner	11.1	13.0	14.8	16.5	19.9	23.3	24.8	30.4	273
Southern-East	15.0	16.0	15.8	15.6	15.1	15.4	16.1	24.3	162
Eastern	7.6	6.3	9.3	8.8	8.5	10.1	13.4	15.8	207
Black Sea	5.7	6.7	7.2	7.2	7.1	9.1	11.4	13.5	236

Source : KELEŞ, R., *Türkiyede Şehirleşme Hareketleri (1927-1960)*, Ankara: 1961 (Mimeg.) p. 24.
State Institute of Statistics, 1965 Census Data.

degree of urbanization, the Marmara Region still is the most urbanized one.

Distribution of the urban population among regions is as follows :

TABLE : VI
Distribution of Urban Population Among Regions

(Ratio of Regional Urban Population to Total Urban Population «%»)

Regions	1927	1950	1960	1965
Marmara	42.1	34.8	32.5	32.7
Southern	10.1	11.6	13.1	12.1
Aegean	14.2	13.7	12.7	12.2
Inner	15.7	23.3	22.8	23.4
Southern-East	5.2	4.1	3.9	4.7
Eastern	4.6	5.2	5.8	5.8
Black Sea	8.1	8.3	9.2	9.1
Total	100.	100.	100.	100.0

Source : Same as TABLE V

Although the Marmara Region has lost some of its relative importance within the total urban population, still it has the greatest share in it. The Aegean and Southern-East Anatolia regions have also lost some of their relative importance, while the Eastern, Inner Anatolia and Black Sea regions have gained, among which Inner Anatolia is the one that has gained most.

As it was pointed earlier in this paper, the direction of urbanization has been towards big cities. The data included in the Table VII confirms this tendency.

TABLE : VII

**Distribution of the Population Inhabited in Big Cities
(Over 50,000) by Regions**

**Ratio of Inhabitants of the Big Cities to the Population of the Region
Concerned (%)**

Regions	1927	1950	1960	1965
Marmara	29.	28.5	35.	39.8
Southern	6.3	9.2	21.7	25.5
Aegean	10.	10.9	14.7	16.5
Inner	2.4	11.8	17.5	21.3
Southern-East	—	—	8.4	9.1
Eastern	—	2.2	7.8	8.4
Black Sea	—	—	3.4	4.6

Source : Same as TABLE V.

Table VII reveals the fact that the ratio of the population living in the big cities (over 50,000) to the population of the region has increased in all regions. This increase is the greatest in the inner region where the ratio has gone up to 21.3 from 2.4 percent. Another rapid increase has occurred in the Southern Region where this ratio has been four times bigger.

D. SOME CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing explanations, we may derive the following conclusions :

A. The urbanization process has become accelerated in Turkey, since 1945.

B. In spite of this acceleration in the process, the population of the country is still predominantly rural.

C. The direction of migration from rural areas is towards bigger urban centers with population 50,000 or more.

D. There are great differences in the degree and in the rapidity of urbanization among geographical regions of the country.

III. FACTORS AND CONDITIONS AFFECTING URBAN GROWTH

The factors leading to rural-urban migration may be examined under two main categories. One group of factors would be those comprising mostly economic conditions, very much related to the existing conditions that prevail in the agricultural sector as well as industrial development. A second category of factors would be general in nature, and concerned with the conditions other than economic, including development of transportation facilities, better services and other features which may be considered as «pull effects» of the cities. In this paper, we will mostly deal with the factors within the first category and will add a summary about the second category which might be relevant to any country.

A. EXISTING CONDITIONS IN THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

As it was mentioned elsewhere in this paper, the Turkish economy is predominantly based on agriculture. A great portion (71 %) of the economically active population (those 15 years old and over) are engaged in agriculture. To point to the importance of agriculture in the economy of the nation, among export items, agricultural products have the greatest share, 80 percent. To a great extent Turkish industry depends on agricultural products. Most of the raw and other materials (fuel included) used by manufacturing industries are agricultural, up to 75 percent. And also, agricultural products constitute a very important portion (70 %) of the value added by the manufacturing. Among the freight transported by railways and maritime lines agriculture has a share about 40 to 50 percent. In spite of its importance in the economy, the portion it receives from the national income is only about 37 percent. Therefore, per capita income in this sector is lower than non-agricultural sectors and the national average :

TABLE : VIII

Per Capita Income by Sectors (In Turkish Liras)

Years	Agriculture	Non-Agriculture	Average
1950	507.32	1,148.84	644.25
1955	581.93	1,383.46	1,175.44
1960	760.35	2,842.01	1,282.94
1965	820.00	2,101.59	2,185,00

Sources : Income and Population Data from the publications of the State Institute for Statistics.
KELEŞ, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

Table VIII reveals that per capita income in agriculture has been always lower than other sectors. This is one of the most important factors causing the rural people to migrate to urban areas. Therefore, in this paper, an attempt is made to summarize the conditions prevailing in the agricultural sector.

1. Agricultural productivity in Turkey is very low in comparison with other countries. Productivity per hectare is 0.83 ton in this country (according to FAO estimates based on 1948 figures) whereas world average is 1.3 tons per hectare.

2. The land which has been used for agriculture constitutes about 67 % of the total. According to studies made, this exceeds the amount of land which should be set aside for cultivation. Therefore, to stop the soil erosion, one fifth of the land cultivated must be turned back to original use. This means that the country has reached and exceeded her limit of the land which could be devoted for cultivation. To increase the production, productivity per unit of land available should be increased, since it is not possible to open new land for agriculture.

3. Distribution of land among the farm-families has been another factor restricting the increase of productivity besides its social repercussions. More than 27 % of the farm-families do not own the land on which they work. The ownership of land has been concentrated in a small group, 9.3 % of the families who own 51 % of the land, while the great majority of families, 62 % owns only 18.6 % of the land.

4. Fragmentation of land into small parcels has been another factor decreasing the efficiency of the farmer as well as productivity. It is a fact that 91 % of families have land fragmented into

4 or more pieces, while only 9 % have 3 or less pieces. The average is 6.4 pieces per family. This prevents rational use of the land as well as application of modern techniques and machinery. On the other hand, some portion of the land is wasted for open pathways. Farmers have to spend too much time going from one field to another.

5. Due to over-population in rural areas, disguised unemployment exists among farmers and a great amount of manpower is not properly used. According to recent estimates, this amounts to between 1 and 4 millions of active population.

On the other hand, there is seasonal unemployment during certain months, differing from one region to another. Since the climatic conditions permit the farmer to work in the field only for a limited duration, the average Turkish farmer who depends mostly on field crops, is idle for about 95 days a year. In order to make the farmer able to work as much as possible, diversification of cultivation must be introduced, and other activities like animal husbandry, poultry, and cottage industries must be developed when and where possible.

6. There is an increase in the number of machines used in agriculture, especially in the number of tractors as well as in the amount of land cultivated by tractors. But the total area cultivated by tractors is about only 14 % of the total land. Mechanization of farming causes the release of certain amount of manpower from agriculture. Supposing each tractor substitutes for approximately 7 agricultural workers, with the average increase of 4,240 tractors, it is estimated that about 30,000 workers are released every year.

As a consequent of the above factors, the average peasant lives on the subsistence level. Due to seasonal unemployment every year approximately 700,000 workers migrate to other areas for seasonal jobs. On the other hand, some workers leave agriculture. Recent data indicates that approximately half of the increase in the number of the population active in the non-agricultural sector comes from rural areas and the agricultural sector.

B. INDUSTRIALIZATION

In parallel to industrialization, the demand for manpower in industries and services has increased. It is a fact that the number of the industrial enterprises increased by 399 % between 1937 and

1960, and the number of workers in these places increased by 245 percent.

Nevertheless, as it is observed in other developing countries, the volume of employment created by new industrial undertakings has been less than the amount of the persons migrating from villages with a hope finding jobs in cities. In other words, urbanization is rather demographic, in Turkey.

C. NON—ECONOMIC FACTORS

There are other factors which are significant in the urbanization process elsewhere in the world. Therefore, no attempt has been made in this paper to repeat these known factors. It is a fact that better opportunities for jobs, education, cultural and economic activities, better municipal and public services, facilities for sports, recreation and entertainment constitute the pull power of cities. Better and cheaper transportation facilities bring the villager closer to and influenced by the city life.

Although there is a significant development in communication facilities, the contact of an average Turkish villager with city life and the outside world is rather poor. According to a survey made by the State Planning Organization, only two fifth of the villagers go away from their villages, while the majority spend their time in their villages. One third of all rural adults have not seen the nearest big city (over 50,000) in the region. Half of the rural population could not read newspapers, nor could listen when someone else reads to him. Only two thirds of the rural population is able to listen to radio.

The above mentioned survey also reveals that a great majority of villagers, three fourth, dream of «the city life that provides better opportunities for their children, promotes higher wages and maintain the necessary conditions for a happier living». Only 5 % of rural parents wish their children to become farmers. On the contrary, they prefer professions, like teachers and doctors, which are mostly urban occupations.

In addition to the other factors, improvement of communication and contacts of the individual with the outside world and city life will effect the rapidity of the urbanization process.

IV. EFFECTS OF URBANIZATION

For the purpose of this paper, the effects of urbanization are studied from two angles: (1) Development of rural communities, (2) Balanced development and urbanization.

a. Unbalanced urbanization which is directed towards big cities of the more developed regions in the country, first of all, creates a kind of erosion which sweeps not only the cream of intellectual capacity to the big cities and leave them lost in a chaos, but also causes capital and economic resources of the rural and backward areas to flow to and concentrate in certain urban centers.

Those villagers who leave the villages are usually man of capacity and initiative, and also the most active members of the rural communities where they are needed badly. In contrast to those who leave the village, those who stay at the village are mostly older and more conservative people, reluctant to adopt new ideas and techniques which are necessary for the development of the community as well as the improvement of agricultural production. Therefore, migration to cities prevents or at least retards the emergence of local leadership without which agricultural extension and community development is impossible to carry out.

b. The effects of urbanization can be studied from two point of views. (A) Problems of housing a rapidly increasing population, (B) Problems related to the expansion of municipal and public services.

1. As a result of rapid urban growth after 1949 the housing problem has become the most acute problem of our big cities. Since the municipal and governmental authorities were not ready to cope with the problem by implementing an efficient housing policy, under the pressure of a tremendous housing shortage and overcrowding, inhabitants have found their way by building «gecekondu»s (over night built houses or squatter houses) on sites owned by other private persons or mostly owned by public authorities.

It is estimated that 59 percent of the population of Ankara, the capital of the Turkish Republic, lives in large «gecekondu» areas consisting of substandard houses lacking most of the sanitary facilities. In Istanbul, the biggest city of the country, «gecekondu» dwellers constitute 45 percent of the inhabitants. The same ratio is 33 % for İzmir, the third biggest urban center.

«Gecekondu» areas not only create a problem of housing and renewal for the physical planners, but also deserve the attention of community and social workers as well as health officers and other professionals dealing with different aspects of human welfare, security and health. The extension of municipal services to these vast areas is another vital problem which is dealt with in the following paragraph.

2. In order to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population, municipalities have had to extend their services to the newly inhabited, but un-planned development areas including «gecekondu» districts as well as speculative buildings in the outskirts of cities. The result has been in most cases, unexpected financial burdens on the municipality or dissatisfaction with the services. A great portion of dwelling units in the big cities are not provided with running water, electricity and gas. Neither sewage disposal, nor sanitary services are carried out properly. Building roads and providing transportation to the areas out of municipal boundaries are some of the problems that municipalities have to solve.

What is said about municipal services is also relevant for the other public services rendered by the State. As an example, the school situation may be mentioned here. It is a fact that in some big cities, not only primary, but also secondary schools operate on a shift basis, in some cases, 4 shifts a day.

Land speculation has been another result of unbalanced urban growth as well as insufficient housing and land policy. Rapid population increase and urban development resulted in a tremendous demand for land and land prices went up accordingly. Since no measures have been taken in order to prevent speculation, and because of the very high land prices, areas outside of municipal boundaries have been subdivided into parcels and sold, while a great deal of land has remained vacant in the developed parts of cities.

D. CONCLUSIONS

Problems created by rapid urban growth can not be solved with sporadic and non-comprehensive measures, until and unless a national policy of urbanization has been developed so as to maintain a balanced urban development. At the end of the 15 year perspective of planned development, it is expected that the pro-

portion of the active population engaged in agriculture will decrease from 77 to 57 percent, and urbanization will continue accordingly. Neither it is possible, nor it is desirable to stop urbanization. But one thing that must be done, and in fact can be done, is to divert its direction towards certain ends which conform with the «balanced development» target of the National Development Plan. Therefore, problems of regions, cities and villages must be studied and taken into consideration within its broader context, and necessary step must be taken to channelize the population flow from rural areas towards big cities so that a balanced urbanization process can be realized. This can not be achieved by police powers, but through a long range urbanization and resettlement policy. By making the village a better place to enjoy living and working, and by creating small and medium sized cities, the direction of urbanization can be diverted.

To make the village a place which is more desirable for living and working, the First Five Year Development Plan, in addition to measures to be taken in agricultural and other sectors, provides for the «community development» method as a process through which local communities will be able to combine their efforts to improve their social, economic and cultural conditions with the technical and financial support of the government. Through organizations and organizational processes community development in rural areas aims at raising the standard of living and income of the people, by changing their attitudes, thinking and social values as to adopt new ideas and techniques. It is expected that agricultural production will be increased, unused manpower will be utilized in either communal or other labour intensive projects. It is hoped that community development will lessen the «push effects» of the village by improving conditions of living and working in rural communities. As pursuant to the First Five Year Development Plan and its annual programs, in 12 districts in different regions community development pilot projects which had been started by State Planning Organization, were transferred to the new Ministry of Village Affairs, and would be extended to all villages so as to cover the whole country by 1977. Pilot project activities have been ceased without any evaluation made. Nevertheless, it has been well understood that, to be effective, community development should be supported by basic reforms such as land reform and administrative reorganization.

On the other hand, more rational measures must be taken, in order to take services to the village in a more efficient way. Since

most of our villages were founded several centuries ago when emphasis was upon public security and health, their locations are not convenient with regard to modern technological and economic conditions. Therefore, the distance to each other and to the nearest administrative center is rather far for daily services. It is also a fact that, the great majority of villages (61 %) have a population less than 500. Therefore, it is not feasible economically to provide all villages with public services and facilities such as school, health center, road, electricity, running water, etc. With boarding elementary schools, health stations and other facilities, certain «rural center»s must be developed to serve for group of villages so as to maintain an amount of population feasible from the economic point of view. To serve a larger area comprising more than one rural center, «regional rural centers»s, having some industries and services based on agriculture must be developed. These regional rural centers may create new employment opportunities for villagers who do not sufficient land to work.

To hold the population now flowing directly to the bigger cities of the developed regions, «regional urban centers» (points of gravity, or of growth) must be created or developed on suitable locations in different parts of the country. Having necessary public and municipal services, facilities and institutions for health, education, sports, fine arts, industrial and commercial activities, these regional centers will not only allow the citizens in the backward regions to utilize these services, but also will create additional employment opportunities for non-skilled workers as well as professionals. These gravity centers may not only divert the direction of urbanization which takes place towards only big cities, but also stop and avoid the disadvantages of economic, social and intellectual erosion from rural and less developed regions of eastern Anatolia towards more urbanized and developed regions of the west. The policy developed by the State Planning Organization to eliminate regional disparities in the country will also contribute, to a great extent, in achieving the above mentioned goals of a balanced urbanization. Among other principles adopted by the Development Plan, it is provided that due consideration will be given to the principle of balanced interregional development, in the geographic distribution of investments. In the distribution of public investments, backward areas have been given priority in annual implementation programs. To attract the private sector to these areas, priority is recognized for projects which selected less developed regions of the country. Among other steps taken in this field, is the

Health Centers Program started in the less developed eastern provinces. The wages of the technical personnel who will work in these region have been increased by a Cabinet Decree. The Income Tax Law is amended in order to grant tax reductions to the firms who will make investments in these areas. On the other hand, the State Planning Organization should influence the distribution of investments by using the power of approval over larger projects, and over government investment budgets. «Organized Industrial Districts» can be another tool of implementation as it was introduced by the State Planning Organization in 1965 Annual Program. Regional planning activities started by the Ministry of Reconstruction and Resettlement in cooperation with State Planning Organization. Have been stopped at the stage of data gathering and analysis. For two regions draft regional plans have been completed and are under consideration by government authorities. Other projects have not reached plan preparation stage, yet. In order to build the necessary bridges between the national plan and regional development, regional planning activities should be extended as soon as possible to other regions as to cover the whole country.

In concluding, I will like to note once again that our success in dealing with urban problems, in addition to the reforms needed in city administration and municipal revenues, to a great extent, depends upon the degree of success we will make in implementing our regional policies and community development methods in coordination with a national population and settlement policy.

S O U R C E S

- AKSÖZ, İbrahim. «Türkiye Ziraatında Atıl İşgücü ve Bunun Değerlendirilmesi», **EYLEM Dergisi**, No: 8 (1964), pp. 35-48.
- AKTAN, Reşat. «Türkiyede Nüfus ve Gıda Yarışı», Reprinted from **Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, Vol: XV, No: 1 (1960).
- GERAY, Cevat. «Şehirleşme ve Nedenleri», **Büyük Şehirlerde Şehirleşme Sorunları Konferansı**, Türk Belediyecilik Derneği Yayımı, Ankara, 1968, pp. 35-41.
- KANBOLAT, Yahya. **Türkiye Ziraatında Bünye Değişikliği**, Türk İktisadi Gelişmesi Araştırma Projesi Raporlarından. S.B.F. Maliye Enstitüsü. Ankara: 1963.

- KAZGAN, Gülten. «Şehirlere Akın ve İktisadi Değişme» Reprinted from **İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası**, Vol: 19, No: 1-4 (1960)
- KELEŞ, Ruşen. **Türkiyede Şehirleşme Hareketleri (1927-1960)** Türk İktisadi Gelişmesi Araştırma Projesi, S.B.F. Maliye Enstitüsü, Ankara: 1961. (Mimog)
«Şehirleşmenin Maliyeti», **Büyük Şehirlerde Şehirleşme Sorunları Konferansı**, Türk Belediyecilik Derneği yayını, Ankara, 1968, pp. 42-51.
«Regional Disparities in Turkey», Reprinted from **7th Annual Seminar on Housing, Urban and Regional Planning**. Ankara: 1964.
- ÖNGÖR, Sami. «1950-1960 Devresinde Türkiyede İç Göçler» Reprinted from **Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, Vol: XVII, No: 3-4 (1962)
- SARÇ, C. Ömer. «Türkiye Ekonomisinde Bünye Tehavvülleri», **Yeni Türkiye**, Nebioğlu Yayınevi, İstanbul: 1959, pp. 209-224.
- TUNA, Orhan. «Türkiyede Sanayileşme Hareketlerinden Doğan İşçi-İşveren Münasebetleri» **Yeni Türkiye**, op. cit., pp. 289-311.
- TUNÇDİLEK N. AND TÜMERTEKİN, E. **Türkiye Nüfusu**, İstanbul: 1959.
- TÜMERTEKİN, Erol. «Türkiyede Toprak Reformu Hakkında Düşünceler: Ziraat Sahalarının Birleştirilmesi (Consolidation)», Reprinted from **İstanbul Üniversitesi Coğrafya Enstitüsü Dergisi**, Vol: 7, No. 13 (1963).
- TÜTENGİL, Cavit Orhan. **İçtimai ve İktisadi Bakımdan Türkiye'nin Karayolları**, İstanbul: 1961.
«Türkiyede Yola Bağlı İçtimai Değişmelerle İlgili Araştırmalar», Reprinted from **İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası**, Vol: XXI, No. I (1961).
«Köyden Şehre Göç Meselesi» İstanbul İktisat Fakültesi, Türkiye Köy ve Şehir Sosyolojisi Merkezi Yayını No. 4, İstanbul, 1963.
- YASA, İbrahim. «Gecekondu Topluluklarında İş-Güç Çeşitleri ve Ekonomik Düzen» Conference paper given at the 8th Annual Seminar on Housing, Urban and Regional Planning, 1964. (Mimeg.)
- YAVUZ, Fehmi. «Towns and Small Cities in Turkey: Their Place in Population Movements», in **7th Annual Seminar of Housing, Urban and Regional Planning**, Ankara: 1964, pp. 164-173.

«Planning the Development of Villages and Cities», in **Social Aspects of Economic Development**, 2nd Conference, 1963, İstanbul, Turkey. İstanbul: 1964, pp. 37-57.

«Unbalanced Development in Turkey» in **Prof. Dr. Y. Abadan'a Armağan**, Ankara, 1969, pp. 657-672.

ZAIM, Sabahattin.

Türkiyenin İktisadi ve Sosyal Gelişmesinde İşgücü ve Produktivite Meselelerinin Önemi ve Tesirleri. Yakın ve Ortadoğu Çalışma Enstitüsü, İstanbul: 1962.

TABLE : IX
URBAN AND RURAL SETTLEMENT UNITS BY SIZE

Size Groups	1 9 3 5			1 9 5 0			1 9 6 0			1 9 6 5		
	No. of Places	Population (000)	Ratio Over Total Pop.	No. of Places	Population (000)	Ratio Over Total Pop.	No. of Places	Population (000)	Ratio Over Total Pop.	No. of Places	Population (000)	Ratio Over Total Pop.
0-150*	7,804	756	4.7	3,749	414	1.9	2,630	287	1.1	2,436	265	0.8
151-500	20,315	5,897	36.5	20,130	6,186	29.5	19,552	6,159	22.2	18,592	5,934	18.9
501-2000**	6,697	5,239	32.4	10,187	8,255	39.4	12,826	10,729	38.7	13,877	11,747	37.4
2,001-10,000***	383	1,521	9.4	565	2,095	9.8	930	3,581	12.9	1,154	4,102	13.1
10,001-20,000****	43	577	3.5	65	888	4.2	67	941	3.4	93	1,204	3.8
20,001-50,000	30	821	5.	30	918	4.4	52	1,473	5.2	75	2,189	7.0
50,001-100,000	4	252	1.5	6	397	1.9	19	1,223	4.4	18	1,242	4.0
100,001 & over	3	1,035	6.4	5	1,721	8.2	9	3,362	12.1	14	4,708	15.0
Total (+)	35,279	16,158	99.4	34,737	20,947	99.3	36,061	27,755	100.0	36,245	31,391	100.0

Sources : Census data published by the State Institute of Statistics.

Notes : * Does not contain other settlements where village law is not applied.

** 2,000 is the minimum size required for the establishment of a municipality.

*** 10,000 is the limit used in this study as a criteria between rural and urban settlement units.

**** According to the Village Law, settlement units between 2 and 20,000 are called as «Kasaba» (small town), but not given an official status.

(+) Differences from actual figures are due mostly to approximation made, and partly to the unknown population which can not be included into any size group.