

## MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF URBANISATION IN TURKEY AND THE PROBLEMS IT MAY CAUSE FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

*Dr. Çetin ÖZEK*

Associate Professor at the Faculty of Law of Istanbul

It is a clear reality that Turkey is in a fast urbanism process. Urbanisation seems to be a common phenomenon for the whole world. But concerning the special rate of speed that Turkey achieved during the recent years is also a reality. It is certainly not enough to find out that urbanisation exists as a phenomenon. If we stay solely at finding out of this phenomenon, there will be no importance and advantage in only finding of the facts. The important thing is to make healthy diagnosis of the characteristics of this phenomenon, to observe the social problems that it causes and to incline on to the remedies for solving these problems.

In fact, for us the juris the phenomenon of urbanisation taken abstractly is quite an unfamiliar subject too. But when we take the subject from the point of view of criminal justice we are no more with a subject which is unfamiliar and outside the area of our knowledge. But we must admit that when we analyze the problem of criminal justice which urbanization leads to, we still must consider concept of "urbanization" and its characteristics in Turkey. In reality, a problem must be determined with the characteristics of the social phenomenon that leads to it. In other words, the way that the phenomenon evolves and takes shape, changes the characteristics of the problems it causes and specializes the solutions. For this reason it seemed necessary to consider the principal characteristics of urbanisation. Naturally the way which this problem will be taken will be from the point of view of the problems concerning the criminal justice.

## I. THE CONCEPT AND THE KINDS OF "URBANIZATION"

Our subject is not "urbanism" in the general and abstract sense. But in order to determine the phenomenon of urbanism in Turkey we have to look very briefly at this subject. At the symposium the subjects to be discussed will be around the relationship between "urbanization" and "criminal justice", so we have to determine first the meaning of this concept.

### 1. Historical evolution :

Urban concept have changed along the history. Urban, accepted as an inhabitation center of human beings in large groups goes back 500.000 years. Those cities did not include the functional integration in todays meaning but only meant continuous living areas. With the taming of wild animals and with the beginning of agriculture on large portions of land this primitive inhabitation model have come up. It is known that these primitive inhabitations were rural in nature. Cities loosing their rural nature have probably came up during the "metal age" with the authority of those who were still living in the stone age. Those who lost, became villagers and those who won established new inhabitation centers outside the rural areas. These cities had the function of control over villagers as politic centers. These cities were independent in political sense and they did differ from the cities of feudal area, a "city state" was considered. With time, these cities changed politically as well as functionally. Production exceeding the consuming needs of the Palace and the temple led to a production for markets. In this way commercial cities developed and became dominant over other cities. This development wiped off the "free city states" and led to a system of centrally bound authority. But especially after the fall of Roman Empire central authorities have weakened leading to the city type of feudal era. When Islamic religion created a new type of state and city in the east, rural civilization appeared in the west. Those migrating from "pre urban culture" banished the European urban order. City states can not be seen during this period, but agri-

cultural unions over wide areas and caste's can be seen. Transition from agricultural inhabitation to urban order have taken place with the development of commerce and craftsmanship and with the appearance of bourgeoisie. Cities of various types have appeared in Western countries, their outstanding features were that the inhabitants being citizens and free.

Those cities within the brief explanation given on the evolution of cities do not carry the meaning nor the character of modern cities. Their policy, economy, function were not similar to the cities of today. City appears to be a modern structure as it functionally integrates with the society and is an administrative part within the whole of the State. Cities of the past looked more like the rural inhabitation centers of today. In areas with intensive agricultural activity cities had feudal characteristics with administrative and political authority. Functions were towards the fulfillment of primitive and limited needs. Modern city is the outcome of a transition from feudalism to industrial era. Development of commerce have led to urbanisation as well as to an alteration in the character of cities. Administrative needs have increased, bureaucracy appeared, classes have reached a new formation. Industrialization have altered the structure of the whole society as well as its culture, way of inhabitation and the administrative and service needs. Urban organizations, classes and relations between classes, way of life have taken a different character compared to older cities. Cities have left their "autonomous and fortified" characters and became "administrative units" considered together with the state. Classes with different characteristics keep their own culture within the city. A high workshare, increasing specialization and functional integration within the social structure are the main characteristics of city.

## 2. Urban concept and definition :

Until now we have tried to outline roughly the development of "city" and modern urban structure. We must also explain what "urban" means. From sociologic view "urban" is a concept known and used by everyone. This may lead us to think that definition of urban can easily be made. Actually one of the most difficult sub-

jects of sociology is the definition of urban, and the choosing of the main traces to be included in this definition.

“Urban” like many other sociological concepts has an abstract character. In spite of this circumstances creating the city, inhabitation, social structure, foundations and urban fluency carry a concrete characteristic. The thing which brings up a city which has an abstract meaning is the functional integration of the elements<sup>1</sup>. City is not the outcome of only one function. Many functions are found in a certain harmony and integration. Certain functions may not be present in some cities but still the presence and the integration of many functions are needed for all the cities. Functions change according to time and place. For example Venice have kept its structural characteristics but its not the Venice of 1550's from functional point of view. These make it difficult to point out the constant characteristics of cities, thus leading to a definition. Because of this city have been defined with the help of different elements each taken primarily.

*Legal definition* : Those areas stated as cities by the highest authority of the state. This is a simple and insufficient definition having no sociological value. An explanation in this way will be the ‘expost facto’ definition of the subject. An area could carry a city characteristic but would not have a legal character the vice versa could also be true.

*Statistical definition* : American Population Bureau accepts areas with population above 2.500 as cities. In Turkey areas exceeding a population of 10.000 are accepted as cities. This definition and classification may be important from statistical point of view. But sociologically it has a very little value. Pointing out the city according to the population will not enable us to study the developments in the social structures and the criteria of population accepted will differ from country to country.

A definition of this type also loses its sociological value since it does not consider the way of inhabitation. There can be rural

1) **Freedman - Hawley - Landecker - Lenski - Miner**, Principles of Sociology, New York 1962, 360 - 361.

areas inhabiting large populations in such areas the population constant would be much higher than most of the cities. Especially in old cities and in East Europe large masses have inhabited in rural areas, they are not accepted as urbanized. Population is widely spread over large landscapes.

*Definition of density* : With the given causes taken into consideration, under some circumstances cities have been defined according to the population density of the inhabited area. Actually the population density of rural areas and cities in certain countries does not change. While some rural areas are dense in population some cities are scarcely populated. For example the city part of London and New-York is not inhabited while the suburbs of New-York and Richmond have a high density of population. Urban density also alters due to structural causes.

*Mixed definitions* : The insufficiency of criterias depending on one element in defining a city have created a necessity of using more than one elements in a definition.

One of these definitions still depends on a certain population density. According to the studies of Wilcox made in New York's Tompkin's Country; areas with a population rate below 100 person per square miles are called "country", areas with a rate between 100-1000 are called "villages" and areas above 1000 are "city". According to Wilcox although these population criterias are calculated according to American inhabitation, differences in other areas will not have any importance. Actually Wilcox believes that the numerical criterias can be completed with the figures showing the employment types of those inhabited in the area. If the only employment in a certain area is agriculture than there is the necessity of calling such an area rural. In cities the normal struggle should be agriculture. When the problem is taken from this point of view population density is not a criteria for city but is the outcome of employment.

Sombart defines the city as a sociological phenomenon as an area so wide where no one knows what the other is doing. Sorokin and Zimmerman points out that one of the main elements of city is the limited character of personal relations.

Modern sociologists generally study the city from personal relations point of view. According to Maunier geographical elements in a city have importance only in the way the population is inhabited. City, mainly in an area where human relations is gathered under a certain system, the area has a secondary importance. City represents a certain "life style" of those inhabited in the area<sup>2</sup>. Both the social structure and the life style differs in urban areas and rural areas. The comparison between social structure and life style will bring up an urban concept.

### 3. Comparison of urban area and rural area :

From sociological point of view a certain definition of city will be incomplete and will usually leave out some important elements. Because of this a comparison between rural and urban areas as a negative way of definition will lead to a more rational solution as the differences between two areas are set out clearly.

Different criterias are put forth in determining the differentiating specialities between rural and urban areas. Eight rules put forth by Sorokin and Zimmerman are accepted as being the most correct and clear<sup>3</sup>.

- 1 — Employment types of inhabited areas,
- 2 — Surrounding,
- 3 — The width of population,
- 4 — The density of population,
- 5 — Heterogenous or homogenous character of the population,
- 6 — Social differentiation and classification,
- 7 — Fluidity and changability,
- 8 — System of influencing one another.

When a comparison is made between urban and rural areas depending on the above rules; below conclusions can be reached :

- 
- 2) **Bergel**, Urban Sociology, New York 1958, 63 - **Freedman**, 359 - 360.
  - 3) **Bergel**, 145.

1 — There exists a differentiation of human function between rural and urban areas. The majority of urban population is functionally dependent. The complex character of industrialization, economic organizations and wide commerce tends to bring together the various functions, also leads the personal inclination to be limited by the rules of a whole. Urban people are within some different "secondary groups" and are limited with the limits of these groups. There is a necessity for the contradictions created by the city to be in harmony and create a whole.

In rural areas the only and principal struggle of the area carries a personal character and covers the whole social system<sup>4</sup>.

2 — City means organized way of life for a wide population inhabited in an area. The way of inhabitation makes it necessary for the people to set up a way of life suitable to the cities organization<sup>7</sup> Especially big cities are not simple communities where a certain amount of population is inhabited. There is the matter of union for the different social surroundings of the different groups within the society. On the contrary rural areas are independent and heterogenous societies where people are sovereign to their endeavours. Circumstances which bound the people within the organization in cities are not as effective in villages.

3 — Population in cities have a heterogenous character. This heterogeneity is the normal outcome of the cities many variable functions and the complex worksharing. In the same way this heterogeneity is also the outcome of the relation between different inhabitation areas. The fluency from different areas to certain cities naturally leads to heterogeneity. While people in cities function in close relation within the organization, they are not aware of each other in personal relations and they live in a structure which lacks harmony. Compared to old cities this heterogeneity is a wide phenomenon in new cities. On the contrary in rural areas a homogeneity in the community symbolized by the land and a unity of population around common interests can be seen. Social and

---

4) **Maclver, R. M.**, - **C. Page**, Society. An Introduction Analysis, London 1961, 310 - 312 - **Loomis and Beegle**, Rural Sociology, 1963, 53.

functional integration is stronger in rural areas. The land and the unity of struggle relates the unity of the mass and the social and cultural association. Only one "social group" is created in rural areas, and a similarity of functions culture, value criteria can be seen within this group<sup>5</sup>.

4 — In cities, the wide functions of the family gained in feudal societies, disappears. The family is not the center of struggle or the employment, wide functions disappear slowly. Family and home cease to be employment areas. Family groups are not the basic units in the division of labor. In rural areas even though the old "family ties" and "relative integrity" notions are not kept, still the family exists as a small community depending on division of labor which puts the needs in order. Family in rural areas still maintain its educational, spiritual and productive character. Families employed on agriculture are self-sufficient, autonomous and independent economic units<sup>6</sup>.

5 — In cities personal face to face relations cease. The residents of the same city can live without noticing or knowing each other. With the help of today's mass media even collective works can be achieved without the need of people getting in touch. Even though persons are tied to the common objectives of the society the process around this objective takes place with the help of impersonal agents more than the relations of people. "Even in primitive secondary groups face to face relations are not present. The members of this group have importance only in the way of social organization, but it is possible to see no personal relations<sup>7</sup>. In rural areas the struggle depends on personal relations.

6 — A high population accumulation and a dense population can be seen in urban areas. Related to this the habitation areas in cities gets wider. In rural areas a low population density is the cause of the independency of the persons and the family groups he belongs to which are isolated. This isolation does not lead to individualization. In rural areas individuals are united closely to the

5) **Freedman**, 499 - **Maclver - Page**, 313.

6) **Freedman**, 449 - **Gittler**, *Review of Sociology*, New York, 175.

7) **Freedman**, 449.



group they belong to. On the contrary population density and the scarcity of face to face relations in cities causes a lack of unity and the complex struggles plus the rage to earn money leads to individualization<sup>8</sup>.

7 — Large population in cities also causes specialization, institutionalization and beurocratic enlargement. In large cities those rules of usage and custom which maintains order in rural areas disappear. Large city organization and the solution to complex services, problems this organization causes leads to the establishment of new institutions, to the enlargement of beurocracy in these institutions and to specialization. Small problems in rural areas which are usually solved by mutual understanding and the help of elders leave their place to big and complex problems in cities. Solution of these problems makes specialization beurocracy and institutions necessary. Even advocacy and health service have reached a beurocratic structure having their customary individual character<sup>9</sup>.

8 — Social structure of urban areas are inclined to a fast alteration. Specialization and speculatif competition in urban life have made the alteration possibilities more clear. A continuous movement is present in cities. This creates a lack of confidance concerning the future. Within this complex movement individuals have a better and various chances for living. Employment compared to rural areas are various and less constant. Chance, coincidance, cunningness and new possibilities makes it suitable for people to work in new and different areas. This leads to individualization as well as egoizm and is also the cause of social changes.

9 — At last "stratification" in cities is various and higher compared to rural areas. This social stratification is much different than those of past decades. It can be seen that studies concerning social stratification and the criterias used are different<sup>10</sup>. This difference is also due to the differences in the structure of the cities studied. Even though it can be seen that cities are stratified as

---

8) Gittler, 197 - Maciver - Page, 326.

9) Ogburn - Nimkoff, Sociology, Boston 1964, 297, 317 - Maciver - Page, 324.

10) Gittler, 171 - Bergel, 169 - 171 - Ogburn - Nimkoff, 431.

“white collar classes”, “bureaucrats”, “blue collar workers” and “others” such as unemployed etc. In rural areas land owners and workers are united more than stratified within a common struggle. In rural life stratification takes place from prestige view point. For example an old family with a large piece of land will have a certain prestige in that group.

#### 4. Urbanization concept :

Urbanization in general is understood as a population increase in a certain habitation area and is believed that just this increase of population causes urbanization. It is certain that population increase is a definite cause in urbanization but is not the only one. In other words population accumulation in a certain area will not determine the urban character of that area. From this point of view to state the fact that an increase in population besides normal birth increase is not enough for urbanization will be a certain point. Another fact is that “urbanism” and “urbanization” states different phenomenon. Some use these two for the same meaning. In reality urbanism means a way of life, elements of city life. On the other hand urbanization is the result of the change in the social structure in a certain habitation area. Urbanization is an “alteration process”. This process takes place with the changes of the abnormal population increase brings. “Urbanization” has a dynamic meaning, when “urbanism” has a static meaning. Relation between “urbanization” and “urbanism” is from the point of the specialities of the “urban way of life” being determined in the urbanizing area.

As we have stated, an abnormal population increase is an element of urbanization but it will not express urbanization by itself. Under such circumstances what are the factors of urbanization?

The dominant position of city in society and the appearance of the characters showing such a dominance can not be accepted as urbanization, since city is normally dominant in rural or urban habitation types. Cities will always show their superiority by being the center of economy, policy, transportation and marketing. From this view the dominance of cities will not explain urbanization.

Urbanization, actually is the creation of new factors and the finding of new solutions due to an "abnormal population increase" in a certain habitation area. Within the urbanization process the transfer of rural areas and the outcome of new elements can be seen. From this point the important thing is the dominancy of urban style living. Above we tried to explain the rural-urban structure differences. Urbanization takes place by the creation of a urban way of life parallel to a population increase. The main contradiction between rural and urban areas is not only from population point. The differentiation between these areas is "social structure differentiation". From this point urbanization brings a transition from a social structure to another structure type<sup>11</sup>. Actually urbanization means "modernization, civilization". During urbanization ecologic centralization dissapears and social relations are effected. From this view within the alteration process a new modus vivendi is of question for masses. Living organization changes in the habitation area<sup>12</sup>.

Change in "way of life style" during urbanization have such meanings :

a) Urbanization, causes a change in the struggle composition of that habitation area. From this view urbanization is the process of transformation of rural areas to urban areas. Fluidity from rural areas to certain centers causes a change of struggle of those who transform as well as a change in the outstanding struggle type of the new habitation area from agriculture to industry and gradually to big commerce' Change in the outstanding struggle of the city also changes the secondary struggle types depending on the first one. For example industrialization makes craftsmanship the primary struggle of the area, while it enlarges the type of tradesman<sup>13</sup>.

b) Urbanization causes the formation of numerous "secondary groups" in the same habitation area. Common concepts in physical, social and moral subjects dissapear among the habitants. City means contradictions within a certain harmony<sup>14</sup>.

11) **Maciver - Page**, 310.

12) **Freedman**, 360.

13) **Maciver - Page**, 317, 322 - **Ogburn - Nimkoff**, 317.

14) **Maclver - Page**, 313 - 314.

c) "Social stratification" of the habitation area changes. The change and enlargement in the struggle type of the area causes a new stratification in the area. Specialization and the growth of large sale markets naturally brings a new type of person. The "all-round man" of rural area becomes "paper expert", "white collar man", "blue collar workers", the skilled artison, worker, beurocrats and etc. This economic differentiation of the urban community is the source of social groupings, both "vertical", involving occupational divisions on the same social level and horizontal, or in terms of social status<sup>15</sup>. But these divisions should not be confused with the immobile class or caste divisions. The "possibility of mobility" in cities makes it possible for transition among classes.

d) Urbanization of rural areas makes "urban type" organizations necessary, pursuant to the change. From another view point urbanization is understood as a change in political organization. Even though the "city state" of ancient times are not present, the social structure development of urbanization, growth of population and area, increase in, needs, makes a perfect and organized political establishment necessary.

e) Specialization, the development of non-agricultural function in cities is the "functional definition" of urbanization. In accordance with this change city becomes the service center of the area. This causes technical development, easy transportation, increase of mass-media and recreation in the city. Because of this urbanization takes place in areas where transportation is possible. Cities in order to cover up the needs of the area, are established near river and continental routes and grow with the help of transportation.

Urbanization in the mentioned way takes place with the functioning of two processes. Population increase in a habitation area with a certain cause puts the crowding process in function. But a crowding in a habitation area is not enough for urbanization. Besides this the area must change its social structure and become urban; this brings up "structural change process" Actually crow-

---

15) **Maciver - Page**, 322 - **Bergel**, 169 - 197.

ding certainly leads to certain alterations. The causes of crowding certifies the speed and limit of alteration process. Crowding due to the cause of industrialization makes the alteration and change of social structure fast. In population increase not depending on industrialization the social structure alteration speed is lower than the speed of population increase. But even though the social structure will change and the problems due to the change will come out. From this point it can not be said that when population increase does not depend on industrialization social structure will stay the same. Structural change will certainly take place but will be late.

Urbanization should not be understood as the creation of a new city. The flow to present cities which causes a certain increase in population and in functions is also urbanization. Urbanization in this way means a flow to cities from rural areas and a change in the urban-rural population ratio. Actually a present city gaining a population attracting character also brings up certain alterations as in a new city formation.

When the stated facts are taken into consideration urbanization can be classified under three headings.

a) Formation of completely new city type areas of habitation,

b) The changing in the characteristics of rural areas and its obtaining city characteristics,

c) The enlargement of a present city and its development as a metropol. In other words the formation of "urban area union" especially seen in the 20th century.

## II. THE PHENOMENON OF URBANISATION IN TURKEY

The existence of the phenomenon of urbanization in Turkey cannot be denied. In spite of the contrary opinions<sup>16</sup> there exists

16) **Tanoğlu**, *Nüfus ve Yerleşme*, İstanbul 1969, 191. For the criticism of this opinion referated - **Keleş**, *Şehirleşmede Denge Sorunu*, *Mimarlık*, No. 11, 1966, 27.

the necessity of examining the urbanization in Turkey from the point of view of population growth and the habitation areas of the population.

When the problem is examined considering Turkey and this point of view, it is possible to make some determinations :

**1. The urbanization of Turkey is slow in comparison to the Western countries :**

To indicate the speed of the phenomenon of urbanization in Turkey is not contradictory to the fact that urbanism in Turkey has not reached the level of the west. In spite of the speedy urbanization phenomenon in Turkey the urbanization rate is behind of many countries. Actually in 1960 when 24.6% of the whole population were urban citizens this rate was<sup>17</sup> :

85 %	in	England
80 %	in	Australia
70 %	in	U.S.A.
55 %	in	Italy
55 %	in	Japan
45 %	in	Mexico
35 %	in	Brazil

Our country is at the same level with Tunisia, Algeria and Egypt. Countries such as Pakistan, India and Nigeria indicate a less developed urbanism<sup>18</sup>. Being urbanized is the result of a certain development and structure. In countries which are at an advanced level of production, and industrialized, the urbanization rate is much above the countries which are below this level. As the elements that we determined to be the criteria of urbanisation develops, the population growth at areas of habitation and the urbanization will definitely increase. As a matter of fact in countries such as U.S.A., France, England and Italy which has obtained

17) Türkiye'de Genel Yerleşme Sorunu, Mimarlık, No. 7, 1965, 8.

18) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, Konut, Gecekondu, İstanbul 1973, 7 - 8.

these characteristics the rate of urbanisation does not fall below 55%.

In reality, urbanization depending on industrialization is also the measure of the civilization in a country. 150 years ago the agricultural population in all the countries around the world were equal, today there exist great differences and this difference points out to different development levels. In 1820 the agricultural population in America was 73%, in 1965 it was 7%. This ratio difference means that urbanization, is a change in sectors and thereby a functional change in cities. When there is no economic and technical development in a country, no transition takes place to the extreme last sector group. Changes between sectors is healthy when there is a balance between the population of the sector and the personal national income. Third sector of our era is the productive struggle, parallel to this an increase is expected in the personal income.

## 2. There is a fact urbanization in Turkey :

Compared to the urbanization in developed countries, Turkey is rather slow, but still a fast urbanization can be seen.

Actually, there have been two main problems especially developing countries have faced within the last 25-30 years, these are fast increase of population and fast urbanization. In most of these countries yearly rate of population expansion lies between 2 or 3 percent, and the rate of population living in cities rises 6 or 7 percent every year. Between the years of 1940 and 1960 world population have increased with a rate of 31% from 2.2 billion to 3 billion and the urban population have increased 74%. It is believed that the urban population of the world would be 1.8 billion in 1980, in 1960 this amount was 990 million<sup>19</sup>. The reality is that within this urban population increase, undeveloped countries have a higher rate. Between the period of 1940 and 1960 the urban population of developed countries have increased 50 percent when undeveloped countries have exceeded a rate of 120 percent<sup>20</sup>.

19) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 5.

20) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 5.

Turkey gets a large share from this increase.

The criteria generally accepted for urbanisation is based on the rate of population exceeding a given amount at an inhabited area. For Turkey generally, areas which are populated over 10.000 are accepted as urbanised. From this calculation the rate of urbanisation of a country is found by the ratio of urban population to rural population. It must be known that in order to identify a place as urbanised the needed population differs from nation to nation, because of this an international constant ratio can not be put forth.

Inhabited areas in Turkey which are urbanised are expected to have at least 10.000 population. From this point of view the urbanization phenomenon in Turkey and its development can be put forth as shown below :

*a) Village-City ratio is changing*

At a given period of time the population ratio seen between villages and cities change. The figures in the chart below shows clearly the increase of urban areas :

Years of census	10 000 - 20.000	20.000 - 50.000	50.000 - 100.000	Above
1935	43	30	4	3
1940	57	31	6	3
1945	62	30	6	4
1950	65	30	6	5
1955	72	38	11	6
1960	69	52	18	9
1965	86	74	18	14
1970	137	85	25	34

Comparison between the number of inhabited areas by population groups and the sum of the population shows the changing village-city ratio.

Between the years of 1935 and 1965 :



Years of census	1 - 10.000		10.000 and above	
	number of inhabitation centers	population	number of inhabitation centers	population
1935	35.199	14.115.669	80	2.684.197
1940	34.360	14.543.016	97	2.214.551
1945	34.420	15.272.437	102	3.488.137
1950	34.661	16.949.811	106	3.923.392
1955	35.282	18.639.638	127	5.425.125
1960	36.013	20.675.794	148	6.999.026
1965	36.059	22.048.415	192	9.333.006
1970	36.352	22.870.425	264	12.734.751

At the present time the majority of the population in Turkey is gathered below the 2.000 population line. In the year of 1970 a population of 17.727.068 was inhabited in 34.860 areas which had a population below 2000. Centers which have a population of 10.000 are greatly located in areas which bears a population above 100.000. Although, when a comparison is made the ratio in the number of centers which have population above 10.000 and the percent of the population is increasing rapidly. Actually when an approximate percentage is found with the figures shown above a 4% of increase is found in the number of centers having a population below 40.000 and those centers which have population above 10.000 increases with a rate of 240 percent.

Similarly in 1935 inhabited areas having population above 20.000 were only 0,22% of the total number of inhabited areas, this percent was 0,72 in 1970.

According to the population; 67.7% of the total population in the 1960 census and 61.3% in the 1970 census made up the village population. In 1935 85% of the total population were living in villages.

This shows, within village-city relations, there is an increase in the number of centers called cities and also an increase in the percent of population living in cities.

b) *Urbanisation rate is escalating every year with an increasing speed*

The increase in the percent of city population shows that there is an urbanization reality in Turkey since 1927, and especially this increase have been high since 1950.

When the rate in 1927 is taken as 100, the increase in the rate of city population till 1965 can be shown below<sup>21</sup> :

Years	1927 as 100	urban population %
1927	100	16.4
1935	120	16.6
1940	144	18.0
1945	154	18.3
1950	174	18.5
1955	238	22.1
1960	315	25.3
1965	397	28.3
1970	503	35.4

The increase of city population have shown a high rate between the years of 1950 and 1955. Between these years the yearly rate of increase of city population was 7.4. This figure have dropped to 6.4 between 1955 and 1960 and to 5.4 between 1960 and 1965<sup>22</sup>.

Figures given above shows that city population have increased only 2.1% between 1927-1960, but between 1950 and 1960 this ratio reached 6.1% and within the last ten years this ratio have increased 6 times as fast. Estimations done by the Ministry of Construction and Inhabitation shows that urban population will reach approximately 50% of the total population in the year of 1985<sup>23</sup>.

21) **Keleş**, Şehirleşmede Denge Sorunu, 27. The mentioned numbers are given different. Eg. ref. - **Cillov**, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme Temayülünde Yeni Gelişmeler, Mimarlık, No. 11, 37.

22) **Keleş**, Şehirleşmede Denge Sorunu, 27.

23) Türkiye'nin ülke yerleşme plânlaması hakkında Mimarlık Odası görüşü, Mimarlık, No. 11, 170 - **Özdeş**, Şehirleşme ve Toplum Mikyası, Mimarlık, 11, 25.

When the years between 1927 and 1965 are taken as a whole urbanisation can be seen clearly. Turkey's population have increased from 13.648.270 in 1927 to 31.391.207 in 1965. Within this same period city population have increased from 3.301.046 to 10.808.869, and village population have increased from 10.347.224 to 20.582.338. These figures shows the reality that city population within a period of 38 years increased 227.44 percent. At the same period the total population increased 130 percent and the village population increased only 98.92 percent. The yearly increase rate within this period is<sup>24</sup>:

Yearly population increase 34.21‰  
 Yearly village population increase 26.03‰  
 Yearly urban population increase 59.85‰.

### 3. Urbanization is the result of internal - migrations besides normal birth increase :

The comparison between the rate of urbanisation and the normal increase of population, based on rate of birth in Turkey, shows that the population increase in cities are not the result of normal birth increase. This is natural since the birth rate in villages are higher than in cities. For example the increase of population based on birth in Turkey was 44.5‰ in a thousand between the years of 1955-1960. 49.2 percent of this increase was in villages and 35.4 percent was in towns and the rest 23.8 percent were in cities<sup>25</sup>.

When the yearly population increase reached 27.5‰ between 1950 and 1955, city population increased 55‰, village population increased app. 22‰. Since rate of birth is much higher in villages than in cities, proportionally the increase should be much more in villages. Finding an opposite result shows that the increase in urban population is based on internal migrations rather than birth

24) **Yörükhan, T. - Yörükhan, A.**, Şehirleşme, Gecekondu ve Konut Politikası, Ankara 1963, 3 - **Kazgan, G.**, Şehirlere Akın ve İktisadî Değişme, İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, 1958, on. 1 - 4, 377.

25) **Fişek, N.**, Türkiye'de Nüfus Araştırmaları, Türkiye Demografyası, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, No. 13, 1968, 13.

increase. As a matter of fact urbanisation speed, in cities where rate of birth is below the countries rate, is high; when in some cities where rate of birth is above the countries standard urbanisation speed is low. As an example figures below can be given<sup>26</sup> :

When Turkey's standard for urbanisation and birth rate is taken as 1000 :

City	Index of birth rate	Index of urbanization speed
Istanbul	502	3199
Ankara	864	1519
İzmir	771	2175
Aydın	861	1072
Bursa	823	1247
Kırklareli	817	1178
Isparta	923	1203
Eskişehir	908	1458
Sivas	1220	607
Maraş	1266	652
Bingöl	1362	0
Hakkâri	1463	0
Muş	1514	226
Ağrı	1404	398

These figures clearly show that there exists no relation between the rate of birth and urbanization speed. Even at places where birth rate is below country's standard the speed of urbanization is high.

Generally studies are made on the phenomenon of urbanization, but the real cause of this phenomenon which is internal migrations is ignored. However considering the cause of urbanisation and the problems which will come up with urbanization, the structure of internal migrations are very important. In Turkey generally migrations from villages to cities can be seen. The characteristics

26) **Kazgan**, 377. Also ref. **Darkot, B.**, Türkiye'de Nüfus Artışı ve Şehirleşme, Mimarlık No. 11, 31 etc.

of such migrations such as the continuity the seasonal nature and it being professional or not also shows the nature of the urbanisation. In addition the variable nature of starting and ending points of migrations also shows the causes of urbanisation. In areas where causes for migration are present, if a city is not found which in its nature "attracts" the migrator this will cause a long distance migration which will take place in one phase. On the contrary if there exists a city in the mentioned area which "attracts" then migrations takes place within short distances but in several phases. Migrations to cities usually takes place from villages, and those who migrate are agriculture workers; peasants with no land and some big land owners. Especially in areas where large land owning is present, peasants with no land migrate. Land owners usually migrate to central cities of the area. A high rate of peasant migration to large cities can be seen from areas such as Mardin where the rate of peasants with no land is 40%, from Diyarbakır where this percent is 46, from Siirt where it is 42% and from Urfa where it is 53%<sup>27</sup>.

Because of migrations some inhabited areas in the first phase gets denser in population, later this density causes a social structure change which leads to a new urbanisation or an alteration in characteristics of the city. The first phase takes place faster than the second one.

The speed of urbanization and the figures which clearly proves that it does not altogether depends on rate of birth shows that there exists an internal migration in Turkey. Whether this migrations is temporary or seasonal or lasting and professional it reflects a certain fluidity of population. The said migrations have increased in a certain amount after 1960.

Between 1960 and 1965 the State Planning Organization have estimated a migration of 880.000 people from villages to cities. It is accepted that twice as much have migrated between 1965 and 1970. The route of these migrations have mostly been to cities having a population above 500.000. Actually the total population

---

27) Ref. in gen. **Tekeli, İ.**, Ekonomik Büyümenin Bölgeler Arasında Farklılaşması ile İlgili Önermeler, Şehircilik Enstitüsü Dergisi, No. 7, 1973, 7. See also ref. **Keleş**, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 26.

of Turkey's three big cities Ankara Istanbul and Izmir being 31.1% of the countrys whole population also shows the direction of internal migrations<sup>28</sup>.

Even if it won't show the greatness of migrations, it would be of some help to mention those who live outside of their birthplaces. According to the 1960 census 3.178.722 of the whole population were living outside of their birthplace. This figure was 4.018.770 for 1965. When calculated it shows that 11% of total population in 1960 and 13% of total population in 1965 were living outside of their birthplaces. Even if these percentages partially includes the population created by those who are at a place for a permanent time it still shows the change created by migrations.

### III. CAUSES OF URBANIZATION

Urbanisation, generally depends on different causes and characteristics in every country. But still the phenomenon of urbanization can be explained with abstract and basic rules. There is a mechanism which starts but the effects within this mechanism differs from country to country.

#### 1. Causes of urbanization as a rule :

One thing we must realize is that; what ever the rate of birth increase in an area is, this alone can not create an urbanization reality. From this supposition we can say urbanization is actually the outcome of internal migrations. That is whay the causes of internal migrations attracts attention, and is also believed that the cause of internal migrations is the reason of urbanization.

Internal migrations takes place on every side of the world but in a different scale and with different causes. But whatever the causes, migrations takes place in relation to a "attraction-repul-

28) Yeni Strateji ve Kalkınma Plâni, Üçüncü Beş Yıl, 1973 - 1977, Ankara 1971, 112 - See also : 1965 Nüfus Sayımı Neticeleri, 27 - 31, 1960 nüfus sayısı neticeleri, 34 - 38.

sion" mechanism. Broadly speaking migration is the movement of population to a certain inhabited center from other inhabited areas, causing an increase in the population ratio of the migrated center. In this way the ratio between population and birth increase changes, which also causes a change in the demographic and economic structure of the said area. Migrations leads to an increase of population at a certain area while a decrease on both the population and the population increase ratio of the area from where the migrations starts<sup>28a</sup>. Migrations can be seen from rural areas to other rural areas, from rural areas to cities and from cities to other cities, but the most important and the one mostly seen in developing countries is the migration from "rural areas to urban areas".

Migration being a change in the residence of groups of population mustly have some causes. Within the "attraction - repulsion" formula, negative effects upon the way of living in a certain habitation area repels the people out of this area, and another area attracts these people. In the history of urbanization the effects leading to a "attraction and repulsion" have been various, today this broadly depends on economy. From economic point of view the need for a better standard of life and the incapacity of agricultural areas to meet these needs and the possibilities that can be found in cities are seen as the mechanism of "attraction - repulsion" function<sup>29</sup>. Especially after the 1900's economic and technologic development have made the cities more interesting. The same mechanism we have stated above also works in the case of international migrations. The causes of repulsion and attraction differs in every country. Migrations are seen especially in those countries where a transition from small manufactures and reproductions to big industry takes place. Progress\* in capitalist reproduction and the building of large industrial centers leads the villagers to loose some property while new employment possibilities for a better living comes out. Capitalism in agriculture and technologic advances leaves the agriculture workers as "free labour" and the developing industry attracts these workers. In countries where industrializa-

---

28a) **Maciver - Page**, 313 - 316 - **Bergel**, 219.

29) **Ogburn - Nimkoff**, 345.

tion does not show the necessary development this causes a disorderly migration mostly due to repulsion which ends up in an unhealthy and disorderly urbanisation. These unhealthy urbanizations brings up new and different problems which are unbalanced to the economic development of the country and are more difficult to solve.

## 2. The repelling causes of urbanization in Turkey :

The migration of the population living in Turkey's rural agricultural areas depends on the conditions of those areas which forces a migration. This mainly is the cause of the migrations in Turkey. It is possible to put forth these repelling conditions broadly in this way<sup>30</sup>.

Increase of population in Turkey have especially been over 27.5 percent after 1950 to this date. The large part of the population lives in villages, so generally the increase of population also shows the increase of active population in villages. The increase due to birth is also higher in villages compared to cities. According to studies done yearly 250.000 persons joins the active workforce. It is possible according to estimations that 175.000 of the figure above lives in villages<sup>31</sup>.

Besides the increase of population in villages since 1945, also mechanisation of agriculture have led to an increase of free workforce. According to estimations the amount of active population in villages adds up to approximately 213.000 persons yearly. Since between 1950 and 1955 this number reached 941.000 or 1.067.500, those figures from the census based on professions shows that only 665.000 of the above number works on agriculture<sup>32</sup>.

The causes of the flow of this increasing free active population to the cities can be stated in this order :

30) For gen. information on these causes ref. **Tanoğlu**, 192 - **Kazgan**, 380 - **Keleş**, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 37 - **Çapar, M.**, Şehirleşme Hareketleri Açısından Kalkınma ve Plânlı Sorunlarımız, Mimarlık, No. 69 - 1, 1969, s. 19.

31) **Kazgan**, 381.

32) For these reasarches ref. **Kazgan**, 381 - 382.



a) *Scarcity of output in agriculture* : We can state the fact that 75% of those who work on agriculture adds only 31.2% to the national income. The share of agriculture to national income have dropped between the years of 1962-1971 from 37.4% to 30% which includes the shares of fishers, cattle breeders and foresters<sup>33</sup>. If we think that agriculture is being done at portions of land which is above the useful percent this causes unproductivity and an increase in the amount of free active population which ends up to disguised unemployment and progressively to migrations<sup>34</sup>.

b) *Unequality in the distribution of land* : A large portion of the population working on agriculture owns either a very small portion of land or none at all. In other words the problem lies in the inequality of ownership and too much partition of the land. In 1952 62.1% of the agricultural families owned 501 and more decars of land<sup>35</sup>.

Partition of agricultural land can also be seen from the 1950 agricultural census; 70% of the families working on agriculture owned four or more than four land pieces<sup>36</sup>. These inequalities which leads to less production and income causes the free active population to flow to the cities.

c) *Mechanization in agriculture* : Mechanization in agriculture means machines taking the place of manpower. Studies show us that each machine extracts 5 man out of agriculture<sup>37</sup>. Research done in 1952 on agricultural mechanization shows that 5% of those who have migrated to cities because of unemployment have migrated in result of mechanization process<sup>38</sup>. It can be estimated strongly that since 1952 mechanization is escalating which causes an increase of migrations.

33) Türkiye Millî Geliri, Kaynak ve Yöntemler, 1962 - 1971, Ankara 1972, 96.

34) Kazgan, 385.

35) Kazgan, 383.

36) Keleş, Şehir ve Bölge Plânlaması Bakımından Şehirleşme Hareketleri, Ankara 1961, 23.

37) Keleş, Türkiye'de Köylü Nüfus, 24.

38) Keleş, Türkiye'de Köylü Nüfus, 24.

The causes above always show the insufficient living conditions an disguised unemployment. Even though the causes are different the escape from agricultural areas is usually based on the effects of idle workforce. A study shows that the idle workforce in agriculture sector reached 4.5 to 5 million in 1963<sup>39</sup>.

In the first five year development plan the amount of population within the agriculture sector who does not have to work have been estimated<sup>40</sup> : 8% of the agricultural active population is disguised unemployed. In the second five year plan this percentage have been estimated to be as shown below<sup>41</sup> :

1967	9.9 %
1968	8.6 %
1969	6.9 %
1970	4.8 %
1971	3.1 %
1972	1.1 %

It is estimated in the development plan that employment capacity will grow and unemployment in the agricultural section will disappear. But the fact that the lessening of unemployment in the agricultural section depending on migrations from villages to urban areas is also accepted. The above percents of approximate disguised unemployed have not turned out to be true because the needed amount of employment in the agricultural sector have not been maintained. For example the expected decrease to 4.8% in 1970 have only been to 6.9%<sup>42</sup>.

The population in the agricultural section which is not needed, does also change according to seasons. In the five year plan the

39) **Türkay**, Gizli İşsizlik, Ankara 1968, 78 - **Aksöz, İ.**, Türkiye Ziraatında Atıl İşgücü ve Bunun Değerlendirilmesi, **İktisadi Kalkınmanın Zirai Cephesi**, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Konferans Heyeti, İstanbul 1965, 279 - 280.

40) Program, Birinci Beş Yıl 1963 - 1967, Ankara 1963, 445.

41) 1970 Yılı Programı, İkinci Beş Yıl, Kalkınma Plânı 1968 - 1972, Ankara 1970, 13.

42) 1970 Yılı Programı, 446.

population unneeded in the agricultural section have been estimated; based on seasons and the years 1955 and 1960 the figures below shows two months having the lowest and highest averages<sup>43</sup>.

Years	July	January
1955	400.000	7.400.000
1960	800.000	8.300.000

The increase and decrease of employment capacity during specific times of seasons shows for some<sup>44</sup> not the reality of disguised unemployment but a vacancy of workforce. This notion which accepts 255 days in agriculture, believes that the movement of workers employed on various products in different seasons closes the gap in the workforce capacity.

The truth is whether because of disguised unemployment or just unemployment or whether because of workforce flow due to limited amount of working days in agricultural section, unproductivity and low income in this section becomes the main cause of migration from these agricultural areas to cities. This can be stated as the main element of urbanization in Turkey. When the attracting effects from the point of view of urbanization are also seen, it will be understood that urbanization in Turkey takes place because of the effects of economic life in villages more than the attracting of economic development in cities<sup>45</sup>.

### 3. Attracting causes leading to urbanization in Turkey :

There are different causes such as more comfortable living, better chances of education and cities being the center of entertainment effecting the attraction of villagers to cities. But all of these social and psychological causes are secondary in nature. Main cause can be found in the economic structure. The economic cause of

43) 1967 Yılı Programı, 445.

44) **Türkay, O.**, 80 etc.

45) **Çapar, M.**, 19.

cities attraction can be stated by the fact that cities have a larger capacity of employment compared to villages. The scarcity of employment in villages increases the repulsion and puts the employment possibilities in cities to an attracting position. The reason for the conservative villager who has close ties with his land and his birthplace to migrate to cities is always the attraction of the possibilities compared to villages. The possibilities that cities bear carries a relative value. The abundance of possibilities in cities does not always show any economic or social development. Even if there is no progress in a country, the poorness of agricultural areas and the villagers losing goods will make the cities relatively attractive. In this case the main cause is repulsion more than attraction. A healthy urbanisation can be seen when city employment possibilities rise in accordance to industrialisation and economic development.

According to the 1970 program of the State Plan Organization a fast increase in employment possibilities outside the agricultural section speeds up the flow to cities. In 1969 from 282.000 increase in workforce supply outside the agricultural section, 166.000 have been from the migrations to cities from villages. In 1970 from the increase of 307.000 60% is expected to be the workforce flowing from villages<sup>46</sup>.

When the yearly possible employment increase percentages are studied according to different sectors, between years 1967/1968 and 1968/1969 a decrease of employment percentage in agriculture can be seen contrary to an increase of employment percentage in industry, construction and general services<sup>47</sup>.

All these shortly explained circumstances show that city attraction is based on the preferability of the employment possibilities compared to villages, even if the employments in cities pay less than in villages.

The growing employment possibilities in cities depends on various reasons. According to Turkey's standards these reasons can be put forth such as :

46) 1970 Yılı Programı, 440.

47) 1970 Yılı Programı, 446.

a) *Industrialization* : is actually the most healthy way to be seen in urbanization. Industrialization, which means a large capital accumulation invested, reproduction by factories and division of labour at the highest degree, creates a "milieu technique - technical structure" instead of "milieu naturel - natural structure" of fore industry era. This alteration is not an abstract one. Technical structure means alterations such as; a new system of social relations, the exclusion of the family from being a productive unit, production being done for large masses, creation of need for consumption and a high standard model of living<sup>48</sup>.

Formation of industrial areas attracts our attention from the point that they form social fluidity, increase population and employment possibilities. Industrialization is achieved according to the productivity of productions. From this view specific areas of the country will attract other.

Industrialization secures some advantages to the area, forming a new life style thus increasing the welfare. The attractability increases as the process goes on from agriculture to manufacture, manufacture to small industry and from small industry to heavy industry. Whatever the structural differences between industrialized areas they all carry the common element of attraction for rural areas<sup>49</sup>. In spite of the unequalities that may arise in the end due to the increase in speed and capacity of production urban life represents a better attractive way of life compared to rural life. Industrialization, besides the economic richness, makes the area attractive by the creation of new social changes. New public services and possibilities of subordinate subsistence develops in the industrializing area.

Those areas which urbanize by way of industrialization also change their functional species and becomes a city of industrial kind. The meaning of this is that industry will be basic functional quality of that city. Such cities are the most organized and they shelter workers above the national percentage, specialized people

48) Güreli, Şehirleşme ve Suç, İst. Huk. Fak. Mec., C. XXXII, No. 2 - 4, 1967, Ayrı Bası, s. 3.

49) Bergel, 153 - 155.

and businessmen. These cities have a culture of their own and social relations which the culture brings forth. Industrialized area becomes the center of culture, education, politics and entertainment. Industrialization disturbs the balance between "capital" and "the producer of consumption goods", when the producer asks for more capital the capital looks for more producer. In this way the "social role" changes in the society. Capital and production reaching different levels brings a need for creation of more consuming markets thus urging the consuming needs. The new consuming needs makes the industrial area the center of many non industrial jobs<sup>50</sup>.

Industrialization is accepted as a healthy way of urbanisation from the fact that it creates employment possibilities parallel to the national development speed and because it is based on a plan of productivity and changes the functional characteristics of the area.

When we take a look at urbanization in Turkey we can see that it is neither the outcome of "industrialization" nor the outcome of economic development. Because of this, unhealthy and hard solved problems comes along with urbanization.

Actually, between the years of 1950-1970 when the agricultural population decreased from 84% to 65% the productive industries population increased from 8% to 12%. Compared to the urbanization rate industrialization is very slow, the small amount of "organized industry" also plays a role in the low speed. According to 1964 industry and Employment census the amount of large managements do not exceed 18.7% of the whole. Furthermore the distribution of managements over the nation is irregular, for example 40% of big managements are found in Istanbul. Eventhough there was a 2024 TL of increase for each persons income in the industrial section between the years 1960-1965 when the increase in the agricultural section was only 159 TL.<sup>51</sup>

The low speed of industrialization compared to urbanization obstructs the section of the workforce flow to cities by the industries. Due to this cause those who migrate to cities are being em-

50) **Ogburn - Nimkoff**, 497.

51) **Keleş**, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 38 - 39.

ployed in temporary and nonspecialized jobs instead of industrial employments. Mostly low income jobs attracts the increasing population. When two highly urbanizing cities are considered it is seen that big part of the active population is working in jobs outside the industry. For example 40.4% of Istanbul's population works in industry and 56.3% works in other jobs; 25% of Ankara's population works in industry and 70.7% are employed in other jobs<sup>52</sup>.

In addition to these the unemployment percenatge in big cities also show that urbanisation does not depend on a certain employment capacity growth. Unemployment percentage confirmed in 8 cities shows 73.800 of unemployeds in these cities. According to this research done in 1966 it is understood that 12% of the uneducateds, 10% of the elementary school-high school and career school educateds and finally 2% of university educateds are unemployeds<sup>53</sup>. These figures shows only the real unemployeds not the "disguised unemployeds".

Because urbanization does not take place parallel to the needs created by industrialization, it is not possible to employ all those who come from villages to cities. Between 1965-1971 workforce offer increased from 13.044.000 to 15.436.000. Within the same period demand increased from 12.016 to 13.426.000. Because demand did not increase parallel to workforce offer, excess workforce increased from 1.028.000 to 2.010.000. Even foreign demand is taken into consideration in 1971 excess workforce is 1.589.500 (1971 Program p. 596).

Between 1965 and 1971 workforce offer increases approximately 399.000 yearly. National productive employment increases approximately 235.000 yearly. This shows that every year from the 10 new persons joining the workforce only 6 finds a productive employment in the country and the other 4 is left out as excess. Even though the excess workforce does not come out as unemployment, it causes an increase in the employment of semiproductive or marginal struggles. When the 415.000 persons registered in the

---

52) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 39.

53) 1970 Yılı Programı, 447.

unknown section in the 1965 census is accepted as employed in marginal struggles, real workforce excess in urban areas is 440.000 and 1.600.000 in rural areas. In 1971 besides the figure of the unknowns, the workforce excess have reached 1.600.000. In this way the excess workforce ratio was 7.9% in 1965 and reached 10.3% in 1971.

When urbanization depends on industrialization it is possible for the public services to create new employment possibilities, beside those created by the industrial services. But in Turkey those who migrate from rural areas to cities work in such fields which are not even accepted in public services and are noncontinuous and do not depend on specialization.

From all these we can derive the following results :

aa) Urbanization in Turkey is not an outcome of employment needs created by industrialization.

bb) In spite of everything cities are more attracting than villages due to more employment possibilities. But those who come to cities are mostly employed in low income jobs.

cc) Unplanned industrialization causing an accumulation in specific areas leads the population flow to those specific areas.

dd) We will see later on that urbanisation which does not depends on industrialization brings out results and problems based on these results. Results can be shown such as : unchange in the functional quality of the urbanizing area, services not being able to meet the needs of urbanization. These results express an irregular and unhealthy urbanization.

ee) From the causes derived, it is understood that urbanization in Turkey is not the outcome of a real economic development but on the contrary it is the result of a repulsion created by the density of economic boredom.

*b) Transition from closed economy to market economy-means transportation :*

Compared to developed countries even though it is low the increase in the productivity of workforce in agriculture have resulted



a transition from closed village economy to production for markets. Transition to market economy creates a wide workforce need in the cities. Change in the economic structure causes a flow to cities creating an increase in definite services. These services require more workforce. As we have stated before this is the cause of the active population being employed in services rather than industrial jobs. For example the flow to cities makes the construction of new homes necessary, thus a workforce need is created in construction field. In 1968-1969 10.9% of the active population in cities were employed in construction<sup>54</sup>. Workforce need for various services increases parallel to the growth in densely populated areas. This attracts more and more population to such cities. Because of these in cities especially dense in industrialization, such as Istanbul, a high workforce need is seen due to population increase.

The increase of possibilities in transportation or "the conductive agent" also helps and speeds up the transition to market economy. Actually this transition requires the construction of certain transportation routes and the increase of transportation means. When these requirements are fulfilled urbanization speed increases due to easiness of migrations. The increase of goods being traded between the city and village takes place proportionally with the increase of transportation means. Easy transportation creates new trade centers. This helps the migrants to settle at one place than transfer to another thus a gradual, wide and permanent migration takes place. Transportation helps the creation of new centers which are the outcome of market economy. These centers require new services and these services require more workforce, transportation also aids the flow of this workforce. From this point of view transportation is a help in two ways; in the increase of services, workforce demand and in the meeting of this demand. These aids effects the outcome of inhabitation. In this way transportation becomes a main factor gradually<sup>55</sup>. Even at this stage the ratio of the transportation sector in national income was 6.6% in 1971<sup>56</sup> and the number

54) 1970 Yılı Programı, 447.

55) **Tütengil, C.O.**, Türkiye'deki Yerleşme Düzeninde Tabiat ve Ulaştırma, Mimarlık, 11, s. 41.

56) Türkiye'de Millî Gelir, 94.

of trucks and busses increased from 187% to 274% from 1953 to 1965<sup>57</sup>.

c) *High income possibilities in cities* : Parallel to wide employment possibilities in the cities, income rates are also high. Even though industry is not well developed those employments outside the industry maintain high incomes. Unequal distribution of land, scarce output, mechanization which leads to unemployment and disguised unemployment are the causes that have decreased the income in agricultural sector.

In this condition for a villager who does not have enough land the worst city life becomes more attractive than the life and the possibilities in villages.

This reality will become more clear when certain points are explained.

Especially between 1950-1955 when migrations were dense, if we take the active population and national income created by current prices into consideration; we can see that the share of a worker in agricultural field to national income increases 58% in five years, this increase was 148% outside the agricultural sector<sup>58</sup>. This shows the main cause of the migrations to cities. When we make the same calculations for 1960-1965 because of the active population increase in cities we can see that the share of the agriculture worker to national income increased 16% in five years but this figure was 21% outside the agricultural sector<sup>59</sup>. In this way even though the difference between agricultural and non agricultural sectors diminish the accumulation of population in cities does not increase the income in villages. Though the accumulation mentioned above shows us the decrease in non agricultural sectors due to unemployment and disguised unemployment.

Similarly in 1965 according to current prices gross national income was 2.392 TL. per person. Actually this amount was 9.273 TL for those employed in agricultural sector. This is normal since the

57) Keleş, R., Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 38 - Boratav, K., Gelir Dağılımı, İstanbul 1969, 187.

58) Türkiye'de Millî Gelir, 70.

59) Kazgan, 390.

agricultural population was 71.7% of the whole population the share of this sector in the countries gross income was 30.9% which dropped to approximately 27.3% in 1971<sup>60</sup>. Parallel to this the income increase in agriculture was 159 TL. between 1960-1965, this increase was 1.557 TL. in non agricultural sector<sup>61</sup>.

Even if it does not give a definite result according to 1965 census the amount of the population whose actual employment is agriculture was 9.961.966 but within the same week of the census the amount of those who actually worked on agriculture was 9.729.004.

#### IV. CHARACTERISTICS AND PROBLEMS OF URBANIZATION IN TURKEY

##### 1. Urbanization in the form of accumulation in certain areas :

When we think of urbanization in Turkey as a whole with the speed of urbanization, form of urbanization and problems of urbanization, the only thing we could say is that there exists an "irregular urbanization". If we have to use some other words these could be "unbalanced", "unhealthy", "not being the outcome of economic development" and "problem creating".

Urbanization in Turkey appears to make no functional change, it does not help development, and it does not make any cultural or social alterations<sup>62</sup>. With these main characteristics "...a balanced state of inhabitation until now, due to the structural differences of areas and development conditions and characteristics..." have not been achieved. Because of this "in order to set forth an investment policy that will maintain a balanced development, a long term plan for industrialization and the policy of general inhabitation must be made to go along..."<sup>63</sup>.

60) Türkiye'de Milli Gelir, 97.

61) Türkiye'de Milli Gelir, 95.

62) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 38 - 1967 Yılı Programı, 9 - 1970 Yılı Programı, 121.

63) Yeni Strateji ve Kalkınma Plânı, 112.

The unbalanced urbanization in Turkey is not the outcome of the highrate of urbanization, since there always can be a balanced urbanization with a high rate. Unbalanced urbanization takes place when there is no economic relation or integration between the attraction of cities and the repulsion of villages. Balance between the attraction and repulsion does not let urbanization to be a distention at a particular area but spreads it all over the country. This depends on urbanization being the outcome of economic development, the city needing the workforce coming from villages and to the presence of an industrialization based on productivity. A planned development maintains the order of urbanization as well as a growing need for workforce. In Turkey because "urban growth" is more than "economic growth" a sort of "false urbanisation" takes place<sup>64</sup>. Urbanization becomes the outcome of an anxiety to maintain living, not the outcome of a need. Repulsion from rural life being the leading cause shows that the urbanization maintained so forth is not the outcome of the economic development.

Urbanization in Turkey as will be seen, is just some areas getting more crowded and spread out. We have stated that urbanization is a certain alteration consisting of "compositional change in employment", "appearance of city type organizations" and "specialization and division of labour at a high rate". In Turkey non of these occurs but urbanization comes out to be the product of population increase<sup>65</sup>. Urbanization in this way shows unbalanced population accumulation and flow. Services required by these population changes can not be met, this also shows an unhealthy urbanization. In Turkey the demographic characteristic of urbanization plays a big role also. Even if those who come to cities earn more, cities can not absorb all the workforce coming from villages. In this way disguised unemployment and seasonal unemployment in villages turns to unemployment in cities. The truth is that urbanization which is not based on economy will not show a parallel areal structural development nor will it lead to a functional and economic integration between rural and urban areas<sup>66</sup>.

64) Çapar, M., 18 - Geray, C., Köy Yerleşmeleri ve Toplum Kalkınması, Mimarlık, 11, 70.

65) Çapar, 20.

66) Beygo, 2 - 3.

With the characteristics stated so far we can see that the urbanization in Turkey is a "non industrialized country urbanization" which carries elements each forming a problem<sup>67</sup>.

- a) No increase in the workforce of industry sector,
- b) There exists a population increase more than the employment possibilities created in cities,
- c) Areas which urbanize are not only industrial centers, but commercial and political centers as well,
- d) An urbanization conscience is not formed and the unchange in functions makes it difficult for people to be urbanized.

The specialities explained, leads us to study urbanization in Turkey from the point of "urban development" and "lack of functional change".

### *B. The demographic irregularities of the urbanization in Turkey.*

We stated the main factor in Turkey's urbanization as the demographic characteristics due to the cause of urbanization not being parallel to economic development. Urbanization appearing as a demographic reality not based on economy causes the migrations leading to urbanisation to create unbalance between areas.

#### **1. Urbanisation in the form of accumulation in certain areas :**

In migrations leading to urbanisation the population migrating comes from an area and accumulates in a certain area. Therefore such an urbanization is not wide concerning the migration resources and new inhabitation centers.

- a) *Migration resources* : When the causes of migration leading to urbanization are considered, it will be those areas with most repelling causes to be the source of migrations. From this point of view the migration centers of Turkey are eastern sections, south

67) Keleş, Şehir ve Bölge Plânlaması.

eastern Anatolia, and Black Sea area. Migrations to west is not only seen from eastern villages but also from cities which are actually big villages. Insufficient agricultural land, lack of productive variety and productiveness made Rize and Ordu the most population exporting cities.

If a big city exists in an area which faces the necessities of migration, then migrations takes place to these cities. Under adverse conditions western regions attracts the migrators. For example Diyarbakır, Gaziantep and Kahramanmaraş attracts migrators from the same area<sup>68</sup>.

Areas which have the most inadequate urban organizations are the eastern Anatolia, west black sea region, middle and western mediterannean areas. We can see the most number of centers having population above 10.000 in these areas. The number of inhabitation centers having population less than 2.000 is the highest in Turkey. These centers have not changed in any aspects, and also after 1960 the ability to hold population and the numerical development possibilities have reached the limit<sup>69</sup>. In fact the number centers inhabiting less than 2.000 have increased from 34.816 to 34.905 between the years of 1935-1965. The population of some centers have increased from 11.894.521 to 17.946.092 within the same years. Between those years the whole population had increased 105%, while the population of the centers mentioned above showed an increase of 50%<sup>70</sup>.

The same numerical pause can be seen in cities with population between 10.000 and 20.000. The ratio of such cities within the general population dropped from 3.9% in 1927 to 3.2% in 1960<sup>71</sup>. The decrease in the percentage of small centers within the general population and the number of these centers not increasing shows us that such centers does not attract population on the contrary they send out migrators balancing the normal population increase. When the yearly population increase reached 27.5 between the years 1950 and 1955 city population had increased 55% and vil-

68) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 27.

69) Beygo, S., 8 - Keleş, Şehirleşmede Denge Sorunu.

70) Beygo, 6.

71) Keleş, Şehir ve Bölge Plânlaması.

lage population had increased 22%; this also shows a big runaway from small centers. When the high birth rate in villages is considered the greatness of population flow will again be understood<sup>72</sup>. Urbanization based on repulsion works against small habitation centers and undeveloped areas.

b) *Disorder and inequality in urbanization* : Normal results of "rapid urbanization" which is accepted without any further arguments are; urbanization does not take place according to the countries needs and it is not as wide as it should be. With the problems of demographic structure we can also see that there exists a disorderly and unequal urbanization when each city and area is considered.

aa) *Disorder and inequality from the cities point of view* : Urban population rate have increased from 16.4% to 28.3% between 1927 and 1965. This increase is not the same for every city. The increase especially seen in cities having population above 50,000 shows us that urbanization takes place in such cities. As an example the number of cities which had population above 50,000 increased from 7 in 1945 to 30 in 1965. The urbanization rate of cities having a population between 50,000 and 100,000 was 12.6% in 1965, this rate was 53.2% for cities above 100,000. Figures above also shows us that urbanization is seen especially in 14 cities above 100,000 of population. The number of cities above 100,000 were 3 in 1945, in 1965 this number was 14<sup>73</sup>.

When cities such as Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Adana and Bursa which shows the highest urbanization rate are considered; the urbanization rate can be seen as follows between the year of 1950-1965 :

Years	rate of urbanization in five cities	urbanization rate in general
1950 - 1955	6.8 %	41 %
1955 - 1960	4.9 %	33 %
1960 - 1965	4.7 %	36 %

72) Kazgan, 377.

73) Keleş, Şehirleşmede Denge Sorunu, 28 - 29 - Cillov, 38.

Above figures shows us that the five cities mentioned own approximately 40% of the total urbanisation rate.

When a comparison is made in 1965 between these five cities their share in the yearly urban population increase is :

İstanbul	14.9 %	(19.8 % in 1955, 11.6 % in 1960)
Ankara	7.8 %	(11.3 % in 1955, 4.4 % in 1960)
İzmir	1.7 %	(42.2 % in 1955, 5.0 % in 1960)
Adana	3.1 %	( 3.5 % in 1955, 3.7 % in 1960)
Bursa	3.1 %	( 1.7 % in 1955, 1.5 % in 1960)

Even the figures above show the inequality and disorder between the rapidly urbanizing five cities.

The accumulation of urbanization in one or two large cities proves that the increase in cities with 50.000 population does not show a development or an orderliness, because the large share within the total belongs to certain centers. Unbalance in favor of big cities is obvious. Urbanization in this way causes the small and average cities to recede and the large cities to get larger. For example cities with a population between 25 and 30 thousand were 13.3% of the whole population in 1945 and 13.1% in 1965. The population percentage in cities with population between 10.000 and 25.000 was 48.7% in 1945 which dropped to 32.8% in 1965. So if we think of the cities which have population above 50.000 as a whole we find that the urban population percentage was 4.5% in 1940 an 65.3% in 1963. Even though the percentage have increased due to the accumulation of population in certain areas there is actually no increase in inhabitation centers having population below 100.000. Among the 50.000 and above populated cities the urbanization of each city is more than the whole rate<sup>74</sup>.

Disorder of urbanization is also evident from the density of population. When a gradual increase of population density is seen in some cities; an unchange or a decrease can be seen in other cities<sup>75</sup>.

74) Ref in gen. Darkot, 30 - Cillov, 38 - Geray, 70 - 71 - Beygo, 6.

75) Tanoğlu, 194 - 195.



The urbanization condition stated points out to the creation of metropolitans in certain areas of Turkey. Some certain centers becomes "metropolitan area" as they share the most of urbanization, widen, and as the vicinities becomes a part of the urbanization. In this way a sum of small cities comes out. For example outside the central city 27 municipalities and 156 villages make up Istanbul. The radius of Istanbul from Büyük Çekmece to Tuzla is 75 Km. Similiar developments can be seen in Izmir and Ankara<sup>76</sup>.

bb) *Disorder and inequality form regional point of view :* The same disorder and inequality seen from the point of cities can also be seen between the geographic regions of Turkey. This inequality increases every year. Figures below showing the urbanization according to regions will clearly show the inequality :

Regions	1927	1935	1940	1945	1950	1955	1960	1965
Marmara	36.3	34.9	35.1	36.2	36.5	41.8	43.3	47.0
South Anatolia	19.2	19.1	20.1	21.9	21.7	25.8	31.6	34.4
Ege	20.5	22.3	23.3	22.7	24.1	26.9	30.3	31.2
Inner Anatolia	11.1	13.0	14.8	16.5	19.9	23.3	24.8	30.0
s.e. Anatolia	15.0	16.0	15.8	15.6	15.1	15.4	16.1	18.5
East Anatolia	7.6	6.3	9.3	8.8	8.5	10.1	13.4	16.8
Black sea	5.7	6.7	7.2	7.2	7.1	9.1	11.4	13.5
TURKEY	16.4	16.6	18.0	18.3	18.5	22.1	25.3	28.3

The difference between the urbanization rate of developed western areas and undeveloped eastern areas also shows the economic development difference between these areas. The increase in the urbanization rate difference instead of a decrease as years go by between the Marmara region and the Black sea region also shows the urbanization in Turkey is not parallel to economic development. When the urbanization rate of Turkey in 1965 which was 28.3 is considered it is easy to see; south east Anatolia eastern Anatolia and Black Sea region are below this average. This is true for other years also. For inner Anatolia to exceed this average is

76) Beygo, 14.

due to the presence of rapidly urbanizing Ankara. The presence of Ankara lets only this area to exceed the countries average. Other areas have maintained their positions for years. After 1960 Marmara and inner Anatolia have started to show a rather high rate of urbanization. West Anatolia compared to the years 1950 and 1960 have shown a decrease in urbanization<sup>77</sup>.

Even in the regions we have mentioned there is no balance in population distribution, scattering of cities and city population. The urban net is formed in certain sections within the areas. Even though Marmara region attracts high amount of population, no organized city system have been established next to the Istanbul metropolitan. There are many examples of this<sup>78</sup>.

The causes which creates development differences are the uneven developments between sectors and the non presence of elements which spreads out the development from the center. Because the economic development speed is not high certain development in developing areas do not spread out to the vicinities, on the contrary the vicinities recede<sup>79</sup>.

## 2. Urbanization problems created by demographic disorders :

When the causes of urbanization and demographic specialities of urbanization are considered the causes of demographic disorder will be unhealthy urbanization not based on economic or industrial development. When urbanization is not based on economic development or the outcome of needs created by industrialization, urbanization rate exceeds the development rate thus bringing out problems.

In developed and industrialized countries services and organizations develops parallel to the urbanization and workforce need which pulls the the urban population is always present. New industrial cities have created adequate organizations in accordance to the increasing population. In the case of urbanization being pa-

77) Darkot, 30.

78) Beygo, 15 - 16.

79) Tekeli, 11, 15.

rallel to the development rate; when industrialization loses speed naturally the attractiveness of the city also diminishes and because the repulsive agent does not play a big role the urbanization speed decreases.

Urbanizations not parallel to economic development have created the following problems :

a) *Inadequacy of urban services* : The growth of the cities by urbanizing beyond the necessities and normal conditions obstructs the establishment of certain services within a certain limited time. Sudden "urbanization explosions" falls ahead of suitable urban service organizations thus the services become inadequate. This inadequacy is true from the smallest municipal services to the most important health, transportation and other services. Today our biggest cities are deprived from the most important modern means and services, those that can not be given up. Comparison of Istanbul with a city of which the country has developed by way of industrialization will also show this inadequacy clearly.

Inadequate services mentioned are also true for "judicial services". Judicial service inadequacy comes up in fields such as preventive police services, maintenance of the guilty seizure function, judgement function and in the maintenance of executions. There is an absolute effect of sudden and beyond the needs urbanization on the "conjunctural" and "structural" problems of judicial mechanism<sup>80</sup>.

For example the share of each person within the expenses used by police services decreases from big cities to small cities. In other words the wideness of a city, and police services are directly proportional<sup>81</sup>. The sudden growth and widening of a city will cause the police services to fall behind the cities needs in many aspects.

The same causes also leads the justice to become inadequate under the increasing amount of criminality rate which crowds the courts. This heavy load on courts increases the amount of days of

80) **Dönmezer, S.**, Sosyoloji, İstanbul 1973, 65.

81) **Aru, K.A.**, Yerleşmeler ve Faal Nüfus Hareketleri, Mimarlık, 11, 62, For more inf. re; **Keleş, Şehir ve Bölge Plânlaması**, 232.

cases, makes the prisons and bailif courts insufficient thus lessening the power of executions and limiting the possibilities of the police in finding the suspects.

The inadequacy in judicial services is the natural outcome of urbanization with characteristics we have mentioned above.

b) *Non presence of urban organizations* : The inadequacy of urban services is the necessary outcome of non presence of city type organizations. City organizations are established according to the preference of urban services. Sudden urbanization changes the directions of urban service preferences, forms new needs but the organizations stays the same as before the urbanization. This has the meaning that the organizations and city capacity are not level and the organizations are inadequate in meeting the new needs. Urbanization means a positive renovation. This renovation means new organizations to meet the needs of the widening city in the most suitable ways. In the case of gradual and normal urbanization the creation of new functions and the organizations to meet these functions shows an increase parallel to urbanization<sup>82</sup>. In the case of sudden and beyond the limits urbanization, urbanization is accomplished before the establishment of suitable urban changes. This leads the city to problems. The city gets populated but structurally it stays very small.

Non presence of suitable organizations in a developing city also effects the criminal justice functions. A widening city makes the judicial organizations insufficient as weel as the judicial personnel. The enlarging also causes the widening of the police petrol area, thus decreasing the success. For example today in Istanbul it is impossible to maintain traffic order and stop violations with the limited amount of traffic policemen. It is also impossible with the police staff of today to investigate petty crimes and to seize the offenders of such crimes. The limited police organization which is loaded with draft jobs to judicial communique ends up doing everything insufficeintly which effects the criminal justice negatively.

82) **Lehmbrock, J.**, Şehirsel Örgütlenme (terc. Orhan Göçer), Mimarlık, 11, 61, 64.

This insufficiency increases with the widening of the metropolitan cities, because as the organization stays the same the city enlarges; this decreases the suitability rate of the judicial and police organizations.

There is also the functional disharmony of organizations to the growing city. Today the problems discussed especially in Istanbul; such as whether the courts be gathered in one center or not and the limits of the police service are the problems created by unhealthy and negative urbanization. The harmony of judicial functions to the growing city is not a problem to be solved alone. For example this problem is closely related to the traffic problem of the city.

c) *Unproductive investment and insufficiency of investment*: Urbanization which is not based on industrialization or which does not cause any functional change, accumulates the industry and urbanization in certain areas leading to big structural investment needs. These needs causes the investment sources to be used in unproductive investments. This type urbanization because it creates big needs for unproductive investments, can not lead the area into the development process nor will it cause any social and cultural changes<sup>83</sup>. Sources will be assigned to one or two metropolises.

Irregular urbanization as well as obstructing the guide of sources to development, makes the sources insufficient in accomplishing structural construction compared to the urbanization speed. In other words, the investment sources loose their economic importance and because of the insufficiency compared to the urbanization rate "lack of urban organizations" and "urban service inadequacy" can be seen, as we have stated above.

Rapid urbanization and the criminality problems this urbanization brings up also makes it necessary for large investment sources to be assigned to criminal justice services. Even after the appropriation development can not be achieved. For example in spite of all the appropriations qualified personell and devices for judicial services can not be obtained. These are well known facts for us the lawyers.

---

83) 1970 Yılı Programı, 501.

Rapid urbanization in the shown way makes it necessary to shift the investment sources to areas outside the countries needs and preferances, but even there no adequate outcome can be obtained.

The shift of the investment resources from productive areas and the inadequate outcome in those areas also causes the insufficiency of criminal justice services and organizations as well as an increase in crimes related to economic development poorness or at least a decrease in such crimes can not be obtained.

d) *From disguised unemployment to unemployment* : As we have stated before, urbanization in Turkey is the outcome of repulsive causes created by village living conditions, more than the attraction of cities. In other words, scarce land and insufficient income produces migrations to certain metropols. In spite of everything the possibilities or just the change of employment is greater in cities. But because the cities does not have an attraction depending on industrialization, from those who come to cities not all of them finds employments. Even if migrants work in unqualified and seasonal jobs some are left unemployed. In other words disguised unemployment in villages becomes unemployment in the cities. In eight cities showing a high rate of urbanization 8% of active population were unemployed in 1966.

It had been stated in the 1971 Program that the excess workforce in cities would reach 152.000 and to 1.4 million from 1 million in rural areas. Workforce offer between 1965-1971 increased approximately 399.000 yearly. Productive employment on the other hand increased approximately 235.000 yearly. This shows that every year from the 10 workforce joiners only 6 find productive employments within the country, the rest is excess. In this way the total workforce excess reached 1.6 million in 1971 from 1 million in 1965. We had mentioned this above at the "industrialization" paragraph.

The possibility of criminal justice problems to be created by the irregular urbanization in Turkey which accumulates population in certain areas and thus causing unemployment because the employment capacity is not enough, can not be argued. Unemploy-

ment and scarce income in cities can be estimated as an element leading to crime. Insufficiency of living standards could lead to offences against property. It is a known fact that such offences is more in cities than in rural areas. It is possible that the result found is the outcome of weakness in social control mechanism as well as economic inadequacy.

In the same way economic insufficiency naturally leads people to find means of living outside the law. From this point gambling, prostitution, trade of prostitutes, drug trade, forgery, bribery and drunkenness are easily committed with economic causes. Similarly offences violating some disciplinary rules for example violation of municipal rules can be the outcome of unemployment or inadequate income and these offences may increase.

Contrary to the workforce increase because the demand does not increase proportionally this obstructs the usage of marginal sources which prevents the dispersion of economic development and distribution. In non industrialized countries this will cause the establishment of industry centers and all the workforce will cause the establishment of industry centers and all the workforce will accumulate around these centers. In such a case a workforce supply higher than the demand will come up in certain areas. This negative situation effects the employment relations, obstructing the labour relations to function in the normal way. In unhealthy economic conditions the employers will be able to use the free workforce potential for their benefeits. This of course will lead to labour disputes, labour crimes and to crimes of violance, demonstrations which are the outcome of ill labour relations. Such crimes are normal and typical in areas industrializing slower than urbanizing.

It is also a known fact that the wealth differantiation and economically rich person type caused by unbalanced population accumulation are goals wished to be reached for the others. This will cause an increase in the amount of unlawful acts.

In summation, it is a reality that urbanization with heavy demographic aspects leads to some suspicious jobs, deviation from social discipline and to crime. Even though this type of urbanization helps in social mobility and production increase, gradually

big cities becomes a burden on weak economies and social organizations not reaching a certain level restricts the control possibilities leading to economic undulations. Because of this criminal justice problems which the mentioned type of urbanization will create will have a nation wide effect not only in urbanizing areas. In other words inequality will show itself all over the nation. "Insufficient employment" will not only be a small areas problem but will be the problem of the whole nation<sup>84</sup>.

e) *Habitation problem in urbanization* : One of the most important problem urbanization creates is the habitation of those who migrates. The crowding of the cities creates a house problem both for the natives and for the migrants. Actually this subject is a big problem all on its own, we shall discuss it as much as it concerns us.

Urbanization which is not based on industrialization will create unemployment and poor inhabitation as we have mentioned before. Shanty town surrounds the cities vicinities. Some even call the irregular and demographic urbanization as "shanty towning"<sup>85</sup>.

The creation of slum areas in big cities and the negative conditions of habitation in such areas can not be argued. Today 34.7% of Ankara's shanty houses have walls made of adobe, 25% have roofs of soil. Again the population per room of Ankara's shanty houses is 2.4 persons. The general percentage of newborn child death due to malnutrition for Turkey is 2%. This rate was 25.3% in Rami where newborned babies died within the first six months due to malnutrition, insufficient care and epidemics.

In a research done in Ankara schools 49.2% of children from shanty towns had parasitic roundworms, this ratio was 32.3% among the Old Ankara region children and 15.7% among those who lived in Kavaklıdere and Çankaya. The percent of tenants in Turkey is 19.7% this figure is 54.4% in Istanbul, 53.3% in Ankara and 45.4% in Izmir<sup>86</sup>. These brief figures shows us the presence of habi-

84) Tekeli, 3 - Beygo, 2 - 1970 Yılı Programı.

85) Beygo, 2.

86) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 41 - 42.



tation problems in growing cities which actually depends on poorness. The shanty towns thus created are very primitive in health and living standards and there exists a big unbalance between these towns and the other regions of the city. 90% of those who populate the shanty towns are outsiders.

In rapidly urbanizing cities the employment areas in the center exceeds its boundaries and occupies the habitation areas as well. These areas becomes mixed with employment facilities and homes. Such areas are very unhealthy, unclean and poorly built. Rented rooms are found in such areas. This adjacent and mixed areas becomes where the social discipline violations are mostly seen. In Istanbul; Laleli, Aksaray, Süleymaniye, Tarlabası, Galata and Tah-takale can be mentioned as examples. In such areas permanent habitation can not be seen. The unbalanced population accumulation in these areas are made up of unemployed, those who dont have a particular job and prostitutes; in short of thore who will have difficulty in adapting to social discipline. Such an area will be the place of gambling dens, brothels, drug distribution and organized gangs. As the employment areas occupies this area the native and permanent population will move out leaving an unbalanced crowd which we have explained<sup>87</sup>.

"Shanty towns" are seen to be established mostly like an outer circle of the city. Even in these areas which have developed under negative conditions the conservative living of the rural areas continues. This is a collective living which is very rigid' creates favorable conditions for conflicts between the inhabitants. In these areas majority of the population are workers and small tradesmen. For example 85% of the population in Adana shanty towns are workers, 13% are small tradesmen and 2% were employees<sup>88</sup>. In spite of everything shanty houses are more developed than those houses in villages but they have higher rate of persons per room. The superiority of shanty houses comes from the fact that even if it is

87) Kıray, M., Modern Şehirlerin Gelişmesi ve Türkiye'ye Has Bazı Eğilimler, Mimarlık No. 7, 1965, 11.

88) Abrams, C., Gecekondu Yerleşmeleri Sorun ve İmkânları (terc. Ahmet Keskin), Mimarlık, 11, 52.

very primitive they still have the chance of being benefited from urban services. In shanty towns where the workers are in majority, only 25% of them are qualified workers, the rest are either temporary workers, seasonal workers or product workers. 17.3% of those who live in shanty towns, which are the outcome of disguised unemployment in the agriculture sector moved into the city, works as shoe shiner, room servant, servant or garbage man. From this point it is not possible to define the shanty towns as worker neighbourhoods of an industrialized country. The monthly income of most in such areas differs between 350 and 500 TL. It is not possible to find anyone earning above 1.000 TL. in Ankara's shanty towns. Those shanty town habitants who earn 500 to 1.000 TL. exceed 20% of the total population<sup>89</sup>.

These short informations we tried to give was to point out to the effect of population increase in urbanization to inhabitation problem. In order to point out to the peculiarity of the habitation considering "criminal justice" we must study "shanty towns" and "old habitation areas" separately :

a) Shanty towns for some with no further studies are crime areas (slums). Actually shanty towns are not crime regions as believed. On the contrary in these areas because the village way of life still exists, social control and pressure prevents the formation of an organized crime area. For example the establishment of gambling dens, brothels and the sale of illegal drugs can not be seen in these areas. The "mobility" element which makes the organized crime easier is not present in these areas.

Although, shanty town way of life and economic stresses may create causes for crime. First of all the unlawful construction of shanty houses means a struggle between the authorities which will try to prevent it and the owner of the construction. In a way the construction of such houses is a riot against authority and an attack to private property. The rigid living conditions and the closeness of families may create conflicts. The insufficiency of urban services and life standards and the high percentage of population trying to use them may also be causes of conflicts. For example

89) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 187.

arguments which grow and become misdemeanours takes place in front of fountains where lots of people try to get water for their needs. We read such conflicts in the newspapers often. Even the conflicts between children have serious outcomes.

Negative economic conditions in shanty towns and the necessity of women to work, high rate of birth obstructs the adequate education of children. This may increase the possibilities of new generation to be delinquents. Crime producing economic stresses created by unemployment are also true for shanty town areas. But it must be stated immediatly even if economic conditions are cause of crime this does not mean shanty towns are crime regions. Actually even those who commits crimes with causes shown above, commit them not in the shanty neighbourhood but in the cities. For example a thief may be inhabited in shanty houses but he will steal in the city.

Those who come to cities from villages compare the living standards of the mushroom houses with that of the village and find it gratifying and better. Because of this population coming from the village do not think of going back. Social control mechanism works. But with time as generations change, those living in mushroom houses make the comparaison not with the village but with the better parts of the city. As the difference between life and economic standards, culture conflict is understood by those coming from villages, contradiction and culture conflicts will arise and criminal justice problems created by the change of culture will clearly show themselves. By time "alteration process" will take place in the shanty towns where people keep their relation with the village. As a matter of fact certain "crime centers" have developed in the shanty towns. Etlik Bağları can be given as an example in Ankara.

Our advantage is to know what sort of problems and changes urbanization will create. We have the ability of detecting when urbanization will lead to crime and the ability to take measures to prevent it.

Under these conditions shanty towns are not crime areas but it has crime producing elements in its nature.

b) Areas to be called slums within the urbanizing centers are places where the employment buildings takes over the old habitation centers of unbalanced crowds and the mobility causes the distruction of social control mechanism. The formation of "rented room areas" as mentioned in ecologic studies are possible. These areas can be used in hiding, being taken care by the same type of persons and as centers of organized crime.

Naturally our statements are not based on observations or studies but are logical and possible results.

To state the possible effects of demographic disorders in urbanization, we can put forth the following summaries actually depending on guesswork and must be studied<sup>90</sup> :

a) The inadequacy of judical services is seen in a widening city due to an overincrease of population.

b) The unemployment which is the outcome of insufficient employment possibilities could be a cause in the creation of crime.

c) It is possible for new types of crimes to be created, for example social crimes.

d) Widening of cities may obstruct crime preventing functions to operate.

e) The hiding of criminals may be easier due to insufficiency of police organization and the width of the city.

f) The population mobility and habitation areas of permanent population may create crime centers.

g) Violations of the disciplinary rules of the city may increase the amount of misdemanours.

h) The increase in the city population naturally leads to inadequacy of judicial organs and services, and extends the period of cases.

---

90) **Dönmezer, S.**, Kriminoloji, İstanbul, 1974, 170 - 172.

C) *Urbanization in Turkey does not lead to functional change.*

1) **Element of functional change in urbanization.**

As we have stated before urbanization in its real meaning is not a certain population increase in a certain area. Urbanization is also the appearance of a city type organization and way of life and it is also a functional alteration in services, commerce and industry. Functional alteration means a change in the composition of profession at the habitation centers, a change in the system of social differentiation, increase of secondary groups, appearance of city type organizations, specialization in profession, development of non-agricultural function. From this point "urbanization phenomenon is an economic structure alternation, it is a civilization more than it is a type of civilization"<sup>21</sup>.

As the functional change element of urbanization takes place, the profession types in the area changes, differentiation in the national income per person takes place, agricultural services becomes secondary, and the relation of those who come to cities with areas break off.

The advance of a country on the route of civilization is measured by heaviest functional trends in its population. According to this civilization of a country takes place in phases such as; transition from agriculture to production industry and to constructive industry, from here to transportation, commerce - bank - insurance and finally to industry. 150 years ago the agricultural population of all the countries were equal, but today a big difference exists. This difference points out to the different development levels of countries. The agricultural population rate in U.S.A. was 73% in 1820 this rate have decreased to 7% in 1965. This ratio difference shows that urbanization means sector change and therefor means functional change of cities. If technical and economical development does not take place in a country than the transition to final sector group will be difficult. A healthy transition of sectors will take place when the balance between the population employed in a sector and the national income per person are equal. The secto-

21) **Tanoğlu**, 192.

ral activity of our times is productions, the income per person must increase parallel to this activity<sup>92</sup>.

Economic, social and administrative differentiation created by urbanization can only be removed by a functional and economic integration between rural habitations and urban habitations.

## 2. Urbanization in Turkey cannot accomplish 'functional' change :

From the point of view of different elements it can be argued that urbanization in Turkey causes only crowding in certain places. Some say that urbanization is not accomplished in Turkey but the cities are becoming "shanty towns"<sup>93</sup>. As we have said above the facts that the urban organization and services are limited and besides the kind of occupation does not change, the cities do not become the center of service and industry and no income increase parallel to the population increase occurs, are shown as evidences which indicate that in Turkey urbanization does not mean the change in functional structure.

a) *The workforce structure of the cities do not change* : In general, in the regions where the level of urbanization is high the ratio of industrial workforce rises. But the increase in the ratio of industry is not as fast as the decrease in agriculture. Instead there should be an accordance between the rise in the level of urbanization and in the level of industrialization. Otherwise there exists an extreme urbanization, in other words the population detached from agriculture is not absorbed as a whole by the industry<sup>94</sup>. This indicates the principal characteristic of the city does not change or the rate of urbanization does not change. As a matter of fact in places where urbanization is very high the activities that are non agricultural are always below the proportion of the urban population. For example in Istanbul the proportion of the urban population is 86.9% the proportion of population employed in non

92) Aru, A.K., 22.

93) Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 41 - Çapar, M., 19.

94) Yazgan, Şehirleşme Açısından Türkiye'deki İşgücünün Demografik ve Sosyo Ekonomik Bünyesi, İstanbul 1968, 98.

agricultural jobs is 67.48%. All kinds of occupations can be placed in non agricultural activities. In the same way in all the cities with population 200-500 thousand the proportion of urban population 48.8%, the non agricultural activities proportion is 33.82%<sup>95</sup>. To add similar examples is possible. But all the examples show that the percent of workforce which are occupied by non-agricultural activities are always beyond the percent of the urban population.

In fact the urban growth which is above the economical growth, the increase in workforce causes the scattering of economic activities, technological advance which is parallel to population increase does not occur, economical growth is not profound but is widespread<sup>96</sup>. In fact when the urbanization measured in relation to the population, countries which are underdeveloped economically are seen as the most urbanized countries. South African Union can be given as an example to this. And when the activity area of the workforce is taken as a criterium this result changes. Because the migrating population that comes to the city stops working on agriculture, cannot find any work in the industry area, without being specialized on anything starts to accumulate. From this point of view in urbanizations of such countries no "specialization" and no "division of labor" can be seen. In industrialized countries like England, Belgium and Sweden cities which bear crowded, dense and industry workers population are being formed. This is real urbanization<sup>97</sup>.

*b) Urbanization is not parallel to the increase of the national income :*

As a criterium of urbanization the increase of the national income per person is also accepted by some writers<sup>98</sup>. For example in the United States, in 1949 in cities with population of more than 3 million the average income per person was 3.078 \$, as the popu-

95) Yazgan, 100 - Keleş, Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, 38 - 39.

96) Çapar, 19 - Tekeli, 10 - 11.

97) Bergel, 11 - 12.

98) Ogburn - Nimkoff, 317.

lation decreases the income decreases too, in regions where population was 1800-2500 the average income was 2.268 \$<sup>99</sup>.

The mentioned criterium is not valid for Turkey. Even though an increase occurs in the income rate of the population which work in the industrial sector, no increase of income parallel to population increase is seen.

The income distribution in Turkey is unequal and this situation is against those who work in the agricultural sector. Although the level of income is very high in cities, the proportion of inequality concerning the internal distribution is very high. When the share taken from the nonagricultural income is calculated, we see that 80% of the population shares only 36.4% of the income. The rate of inequality is even more in comparison to the agricultural income 20% of the population who earn their living which shares the highest income of the non agricultural income takes 63.6% of the income<sup>100</sup>. This situation shows that the high non agricultural income is not distributed on the urban population.

The unjust situation in the income distribution and the income increase is true for the three big cities<sup>101</sup>. Even though the highest average incomes are accumulated in big cities the most uneven income distribution occurs in these cities too. The similar contradictory situation can be traced in parallel to the growth of the cities. The most equal conditions are seen in villages where the rate of income is low. The state of equality - inequality is different in cities of different regions<sup>102</sup>.

c) *The population that migrates to towns keeps in contact with the village :*

The opinion that considers the urbanization in Turkey a "ruralization of cities"<sup>103</sup> argues that there is no change in the econo-

99) Ogburn - Nimkoff, 317.

100) Boratav, 200.

101) Bulutay - Timur - Ersel, Türkiye'de Gelir Dağılımı, 1968, Ankara 1971, 174 - 175.

102) Bulutay - Timur - Ersel, 68 etc.

103) Tanoğlu, 180, 192, 199.



mic understanding and activity and the population that comes to the cities keeps in relationship with the rural area and earns his living partly from agriculture. Therefore no great change occurs in their way of life and their values. In our cities which have primitive urban organizations, the establishment and application of contemporary possibilities will mean the integration of peoples of different social structures.

According to another argument<sup>104</sup> the population that comes to the city does earn his living from agriculture and there is an improvement in the value systems and family structures and in adaptation to the urban order.

Although there are different opinions on this subject concerning an urbanization which is not based on industrialization, the fact that the population coming to the city is not absorbed and that they earn their living on unspecialized works makes it difficult for this population to break off from the village. In an agricultural country the question of temporary seasonal unemployment causes temporary local migrations<sup>105</sup>. Some of the peasants who own small lands also work in the city to obtain additional income. The population who cannot find a specific and specialized work in the cities keep their relations with the village. The population section which is both agriculture and industry workers keeps being the man of the rural area concerning their judgements of values and their way of life.

Under these circumstances, at least some sections of the migrating population that causes urbanization will not be adapted to the city so the urban population cannot be all townsman.

### 3. The problems of the non existance of functional change :

The non occurance of the functional change of the cities together with urbanization causes "culture conflict" and "social unravelling". This interests especially the criminal justice. These re-

104) Kıray, 7 - Keleş, Şehirleşmede Denge Sorunu, 27 - Darkot, 34 - 35.

105) Talas, C., İçtimai İktisat, Ankara 1961, 532.

sults are important effects concerning the industrializing and therefore urbanizing countries. Especially the urbanization phenomenon that causes regional inequality and that are not based on functional structure change the said effects are even bigger concerning the criminal justice.

The arguments that consider the "cultural changes" and the "culture conflicts" that they cause as the direct and indirect reasons for crime are great in number. The criminologists who consider the crime as a production of social relationships argue that the "culture changes" which mean the changing of the social relationships, creates new relationships which cause criminality. Cultural changes alter the structure of the human behaviour and this gives way to the necessities of adaptation to new conditions and non adaptation creates crime<sup>106</sup>.

Industrialization and urbanization changes the agricultural characteristics of these cities, therefore it causes "change of culture". What ever the type of urbanization may be this change of culture takes place. The "change of culture" effects criminality this way :

a) Urbanization creates new factors and forms new relationships in the society. New factors mean new disciplines. On the other hand the population from the urban areas becomes individualized and selfish because of urbanization. This is especially true for the population that cannot find permanent work and that cannot specialize. They will commit non disciplined acts by disobeying the new rules<sup>107</sup>.

b) Urbanization causes the change of the traditional structure. This means the change of the concepts of religion, family and moral system. These changes mean the alteration of basic elements of that society. These changes are the formation of a heterogeneous cultural structure and the conflicts it causes. The discipline in the secondary groups disappear and many systems and values loose their function. This formation may cause the individualism

106) **Dönmezer**, Kriminoloji, 239.

107) **Tannebaum**, Crime and the Community, 1938, 31 - **Bergel**, 154.

of the person, deviation from the social discipline, different group conflicts and the formation of the urban type criminal<sup>108</sup>.

c) Urbanization utterly destroys the mechanism of social control. The mobility in the cities, change of population, continual changes of residence causes the disappearing of the mechanism that can prevent crime. For example the non existence of the neighbour relationships, local solidarity and discipline, the effects of the religious men cause the disappearance of the mechanism that prevent criminal tendencies of the individuals<sup>109</sup>.

d) Especially the industrialization in the industrializing societies causes the formation of new interests groups and new classes. The integrating profits become scattered with conflicts. In other words urbanization causes profit conflicts and contradiction. These conflicts may result "crime"<sup>110</sup>. The rivalry, in these societies has an urging effect towards crime.

e) In a specific and settled culture medium, the formation of new and different culture, i.e "culture renovation" causes conflict between these different cultures. Unadaptation to the new culture causes resistance towards it, and the culture conflict may become crime<sup>111</sup>.

Culture change is the alteration of the "social model" accepted by the society. Crime is the deviation from the social model accepted by the society. Being inharmonious with the change of model may cause crime.

Naturally "culture conflict", "the disappearing of the control mechanism", "mobility", "the formation of new profit conflicts" are different conclusions that urbanization causes. Taken separately they cannot be accepted as crime causes. But when they combine with other factors, they facilitate and encourage crime. In other words, "culture change and conflict generally may not be a cause for the crime but it is an element that prepares the suitable medium for the crime factors and growth of criminality."

108) Sutherland, Principles of Criminology, 32.

109) Tannebaum, 26 - Dönmezer, Kriminoloji, 166 - 172, 298.

110) Tannebaum, 32.

111) Dönmezer, Kriminoloji, 301.

Considering the urbanization and criminal justice in Turkey on the subject of "culture conflict and change" we can make some approaches :

a) Even though an urbanization which is not based on industrialization does not change the functional structure of the city, it effects the cultural structure of that city. Especially crowding, the vanishing of the closed district life and neighbourhood relationship weakens the effects of the social control mechanism. Since even people living in the same apartment do not know each other, criminals are not known in the society. The criminals can hide and run away from social control very easily. Without being confronted with social pressure the individual can behave antisocially. The changing of culture in the changing society causes culture conflicts. So undisciplined behaviour and deviation from the norms are not considered as bad deeds and even encouraged. Individualism and the selfishness it creates becomes regular.

b) People coming from rural areas cannot adjust to the society and adapt to the culture. While the citizens cannot adapt to the changing and renovation the new citizen is completely incongruous with the urban life. The impossibility of the integration of contradictory inclinations and unadaptation causes conflicts. Especially the temporary and seasonal workers do not feel the discipline of belonging to a certain group, in this case unadaptation is even more.

When those that come to the city are out of the effects of traditional and strong social control, it is easier for the conflicts to become crimes. For example, crimes against property are rare in the villages compared to cities. Because the social control mechanism consider these acts bad and prevents them. The same individual coming to the city is not confronted with the same control and when he is unemployed, he can easily and frequently commit crimes against property. When the difference in the culture structure increases, social control mechanism weaken, the number and variety of crimes will increase. The most natural increase and change can be seen in crimes against property<sup>112</sup>.

112) **Clinard**, Urbanization and Crime, 238 - 246.

Concerning the unadapting of the population to the city and its criminogenic effects we can find out the following : Functional change is not very great in urbanizing areas. This means the culture change is not rapid and deep. We can say that there is not very much contradiction between the rural and urban culture yet. Whatever the difference between the way of life there still is not very much difference between the functions of social control mechanism, values and morals except in the metropolises like Istanbul. Since the culture, functional structure and problems of an industrial society do not exist in our cities there is not a big culture conflict between the city and the newcomers. This leads us to the solution that urban crime has not developed in Turkey and urbanization does not have an absolute effect in criminality yet. The existence of functional change causes the inexistence of a criminality parallel to urbanization. We can reach to another solution : The more urbanization causes functional change, the more urban crime and criminality will occur and urban and rural criminality will be different. The fact that urbanized crime is not a problem in Turkey indicates that criminality does not increase as much as the rate of urbanization.

In other words, the nonpresence of functional change will prevent a criminal state change parallel to urbanization. We can derive another result from this, urbanization proportional to the functional change it causes city type crime and criminals appear and rural-urban crime rate will change. The nonpresence of "organized crime" as a problem in Turkey which is the outcome of urbanization shows that there exists no change in crime in relation to the speed of urbanization.

It must be stated immediately that to think urban type crime not showing any danger in Turkey now, even though there is a population accumulation, will stay the same will be wrong. Population accumulation not causing an urban type crime is due to the cause that "alternation process" does not show itself clearly in urbanization and because the old social structure keeps its effect. In spite of urbanization, cities in Turkey have not lost their "communal society" character. But even if the urbanization is fake and has a demographic character, by time the alteration process will

take place and communal society will lose its effects. The strong ties of the people to their customs will lose its effect during the alteration process.

c) The city life is effective on the part of the population which comes from villages but does not take part in the industrial sector and keep their contact with villages. In a different culture media, beliefs, value judgments and life views of people change. This change will cause a conflict between the person and the village culture which he is coming from. The person who keeps his contact with the village will be in a conflict whenever he is in the village society. The person who comes to cities and does not end his relations with the village will have difficulty in adopting to city culture while he falls out of village culture.

#### CONCLUSION

Summarizing our findings on the characteristics, problems of urbanization in Turkey its relationship with criminal justice we may determine the following:

1 — Although Turkey is still not as much urbanized as the developed countries of west, it is rapidly urbanizing. Especially after the 1950's the rate of urbanization increased in relation to the transportation possibilities caused by the transition from the village economy to market economy.

2 — Rapid urbanizing is above the rate of birth and this indicates that urbanization is the result of a large internal migration.

3 — Urbanization in Turkey is not caused by the workforce demand of the industrialization therefore it is rather the "repulsion" of the rural economic conditions than the attraction of the cities, and occurs as an explosion. The main causes for urbanization are the agricultural nonproductivity, disorder of land distribution; mechanization of agriculture transfer to the market economy and the limited income possibilities in villages.

4 — Because the urbanization in Turkey does not depend on industrialization and it does not fit the needs created by urbanization.

Migrations takes place from those certain areas having the most repulsive causes to certain centers. The accumulation of economic advantages and industrialization in certain areas deviates the population flow to these areas. In result of this, rapid urbanization in Turkey is the excessive growth of one or two centers. This urbanization is defined as "forged urbanization". In this way a demographic inequality parallel to an economic inequality between regions can be seen. Those areas attracting population is determined by cities becoming metropols but because the vicinities of these metropols do not show the same development a regional integration nor a functional combination does not take place. Even though the employment possibilities in those centers which attracts a large population increases compared to villages still the employment of all those who migrate can not be maintained.

5 — The unplanned and immediate growth of certain cities results the inefficiency of services. There is no urban organization, the investments are non productive and unemployment exists.

6 — The problems of an unhealthy urbanization with only a demographic basis is also true for criminal justice. We can estimate these problems as the insufficiency of the judicial services and organization, the deprivation of possibilities of the police when functioning for the criminal justice, the increase of the hiding possibilities of the criminals, formation of areas of crime, increase in the crimes against property, occurrence of social crimes, the limit of the possibilities of fighting with crime, negative conditions of the places of prosecution, because of the lack of urban organizations considering normal misdemanours that disturb the order.

7 — Urbanization in Turkey is generally demographic, and there is no certain functional change. Migrators from the villages cannot find permanent and specilized work and work in temporary, unproductive activities. So the new population of the city keep their rural characteristics and relationships. Work in the city is considered additional income besides the income from agriculture. Thus the functional change does not occur and according to some the phenomenon in Trukey is not urbanization but formation of shanty towns.

8 — Since the functional integration does not take place in our cities there exists the problem of "culture conflict". This conflict exists also with the village that the migrant still related with. The mentioned culture conflict causes oppositions of interest and prepares a suitable medium for crime.

9 — Only it must be certified that the non presence of functional change means that those coming to cities carry the effects of a traditionalist community. Because of this the social control of such a traditionalist community obstructs certain types of crimes. This prevents the formation of an urban type crime and an urban type criminal. For exemple organized crime is not a great problem for the time being. Due to these the urban-rural crime condition in Turkey does not change paralel to the urbanization speed. But as the population grows the "alteration process" will take place and the criminal justice problems not seen at the moment will come up.

10) Even though the functional change is not determined, a certain differentiation is seen in cities. A new culture is formed within the old culture media, a "culture conflict", distructs the social control mechanisms, new living style dissolves the effect of the old social structure. If the role of the culture change and conflict in the creation of crime is accepted; then it must be accepted that the same effects is present in Turkey and will increase in time.

11) If the problems likely to come up to the demografic urbanization and the urbanization not being based on industrialization in Turkey are unknow, then there is the possibility of determining the criminal justice problems scientifically. Urban crime not being determined and the unchange in the urban-rural crime ratio does not mean that this will go on forever. We have the ability of determining the "crime transition" process and to take measures. But for taking measures we have to leave off guesswork and do some serious studies. It must be accepted that the inadequacy of Police, judicial mechanism, execution abilities, personnell and devices will by time create a grate problem due to the result of the urbanization in Turkey. The natural crisis in the structures of the institutions working to maintain the criminal justice functions, will certainly become magnified due to an irregular and unhealthy urbanization. From



this point, if we really want to end the crisis we have to determine the problems present and future in a scientific way and find solutions.

When looking for solutions it must be known that the problem is structural and the solutions besides some simple statutory alterations, changes must be done in the organic structure of juridical mechanism and a renovation in the crime and penal policy.

12) Naturally, when we say that the solutions to criminal justice problems can be found in the structural reform of criminal justice we do not mean that this reform has an abstract character. In other words, solutions to the criminal justice problems which are the outcome of urbanization are closely related to the general problems related by urbanization. As stated above criminal justice problems are also closely related to the problems which are the outcome of an irregular demography of urbanization and the non presence of functional alteration. Those general problems of urbanization also reflects to the criminal justice area. Than actually the solution of the general problems of urbanization. For the solution of general problems measures must be taken to straighten up the irregular migrations. We'll be contented to put forth the few points which comes to our mind in this subject.

a) To stop the migrations and to return those who migrated is not possible. Impossible requests are made on this subject which do not consider the needs.

b) We had stated the main cause of migrations from villages to cities as "repulsive" factors in villages. Insufficient income, unproductivity, excess of workforce create migration so to overcome these would solve the migration problem in large. We believe that the most important problem here is to increase the productive employment possibilities in rural areas. When the non agricultural services are taken to rural areas than new employment possibilities will come up and the excess workforce will not find it necessary to flow to cities.

c) When measures are taken to overcome the repulsive factors in villages and create new employment possibilities in rural areas, the attraction of cities must be taken in straightening the attractive

factors of cities. But these measures should: aa) Increase the employment possibilities, bb) Employment possibilities must be spread all over the country, cc) Economic and functional integrity must be maintained between areas and within an area, dd) Industries which do not depend on raw materials should be established in areas having the highest workforce, ee) Cities must be the centers of services and industries must have an out of city character. In short, since the main cause to today's unhealthy and unbalanced urbanization is "irregular employment" the prevention of such an urbanization depends on the industrial population being balanced all over the country.

d) To increase the employment possibilities in villages and to disperse the employment possibilities in cities equally all over the country are measures which are in the general economic development plans and they require long term plans. Until these are achieved some measures must be taken to straighten the present condition. For this, considering the possible developments, transportation studies must be made, urbanization expenses must be made, urbanization expenses must be determined. Also legal and administrative measures must be taken from the point of urban services. Naturally these measures would give a temporary relief but would not solve the problem altogether.

As a last remark we must state that whether we like it or not urbanization is a social reality. The heavy side of demographic character of urbanization which creates problems is also a reality. We have to accept these realities. Not to see such a reality is not a solution. From this point we have to accept urbanization with all of its characters and think of solutions. It is the same with the migrations leading to urbanization. The important thing is not to obstruct such a formation but try to find ways of putting this formation in order and apply them.

---