

**DEVELOPMENT OF TOURISM POLICIES IN TURKEY
THROUGHOUT THE REPUBLICAN PERIOD IN SOCIO-POLITICAL,
ECONOMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSPECTIVE:
FROM STATE-SPONSORED DEVELOPMENT TO VARIOUS FORMS
OF COOPERATION**

Ahmet NOHUTÇU*

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, Türk turizm politikalarının gelişimini tarihsel çerçevede detaylı bir biçimde incelemektedir. Türkiye’de turizm sektörünün gelişim aşamaları ekonomik, siyasal, toplumsal ve yönetsel dönüşümler ışığında betimlenmektedir. Sonunda, Türkiye’de turizm politikalarının çeşitli türlerdeki işbirliği ve katılımcı mekanizmalara doğru değiştiği iddia edilmektedir.

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes developments of Turkish tourism policies in a historical perspective in a detailed manner. The development stages of tourism sector in Turkey are being portrayed in the light of policy changes paralleled to economic, political, social and administrative transformations. At the end, it is claimed that tourism policies in Turkey has been changing towards various forms of cooperation and participative mechanisms.

1. Introduction

Tourism is one of the largest and fastest growing industries and an important source of employment in Turkey as well all other countries. Tourism, in Turkey, has generated 5.2 percent of Gross Domestic Product and 618.000 jobs and it is also a major producer of government revenue, accounting for US\$ 3.5 billion of taxes in 2001(MOT, 2002). Since the 1980s, tourism has also been the focus of successive governments’ policies to achieve export-led industrialization. The Tourism Encouragement Law of 1982, that gave generous incentives to tourism investment, has resulted in exceptionally rapid growth in tourism in terms of volume, value, and physical infrastructure (Şahin, 1990).

The main policy problem of Turkey, since the inception of the Republic, was the development of the economy. Tourism, after 1960, is increasingly being recognized by both governments and the public as the main driver of economic prosperity and development. Using Anderson’s (1994:5) definition of policy as “a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem”, tourism policies, in Turkey, as in other developing countries, have rooted in to remedy macroeconomic problems. The main purpose of the chosen tourism policies, since 1960s, has been to provide desperately needed foreign exchange and employment. In other words, like many governments in the developing world, successive Turkish governments, as actors which define the problem, design, formulate, adopt and implement policies, have seen tourism as a relatively cheap and easy means of securing foreign currency earning and of creating job opportunities for an increasing number of unemployed people (Özen & Kuru, 1998). This is needed simply to

* Araştırma Görevlisi Dr., Muğla Üniversitesi İ. İ. B. F. Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

finance imported investment goods required for industrialization, repayment of foreign debts and interest, and to give hope to the large number of unemployed young people (Tosun, 1999).

Moreover, in line with new right philosophy and neo-liberal policies of 1980s, Turkey has also accepted tourism as one of the new “growth sectors” and means of demonstrating the implementation of the “outward-oriented, export-promotion” growth policy designed and recommended by international lending agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB) (Brohman, 1996:49). That is to say, under pressure from macroeconomic imperatives, crippling debts, low export potential and the loss of revenue from Turkish workers living abroad, Turkish government prioritized the development of the tourism industry since the 1980s (TYD, 1992) without the benefits of a proper cost-benefit analysis and without taking into account the risks associated with international tourism (Tosun & Jenkins, 1996).

In the 1990s, with the deep impact of globalization, the increasing environmental awareness in the world and in Turkey has initiated new concepts such as sustainable development and soft tourism. In this period the development of tourism was still encouraged, but it has also been realized that tourism was not a miracle solution to all economic problems and that unsustainable tourism policy could destroy the cultural and natural resources of the country. Therefore, the scope of the problem within the conceptual framework of public policymaking has broadened. While the main concern of tourism policies, until the 1990s, that is to cure the economic problems of the country, preservation and enhancement of natural and cultural heritage, after the 1990s, has gained ground as a new policy issue. Tourism policies have been revised with a new perspective embodied in sustainable tourism development. Within this context, the state has assumed a new role which put more emphasis on increasing the quality of life for all the participants of tourism industry rather than indulging in the previous one-dimensional economic approaches. That is to say, priorities, parameters, institutions and objectives of tourism policies have gradually evolved from being state-led and bureaucratic-centered framework to a governance framework of multi-actor policymaking.

2. Stages of Turkish Tourism Development

This article will analyze all these developments in a detailed manner. The development stages of tourism sector in Turkey will be portrayed in the light of policy changes paralleled to economic, political, social and administrative transformations. It is possible to identify four main periods regarding the tourism policies of Turkey, the Pre-Problem Period (1923-1950), the Problem Identification and Formulation Period (1950-1963), the Legitimizing and Advocacy Period (1963-1982) and the Implementation (Action) Period (1982-2000). These periods, of course, are not clear-cut and distinguishable in the development of tourism in Turkey, but they are

Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective

categorized for purposes of analysis. These periods, not coincidentally, also correspond to the main political, economic, social and cultural developments in the country. As Eyestone (1978:80) pointed out “Policy questions are questions of differing values, and policy decisions are the result of some kind of settlement among people whose preferences are somewhat different”. Therefore, even though some periods may overlap, it seems appropriate to distinguish analytically the main periods of tourism development parallel with political and socio-economic developments, in order to capture and comprehend the actual policy process.

2.1. The Pre-Problem (Early-Republican) Period (1923-1950)

During this period, Turkish Republic was under the rule of the Republican People’s Party, the single party of the country at the time (Heper, 1985). Until the establishment of an opposition party in 1946, the Democratic Party, there was no competitive politics and a multi-party system. Turkey adopted and implemented statist (state-sponsored development) economic policies (Boratav, 1990). When the Republic was established in 1923, there was almost no private enterprise, national industry, capital accumulation and skilled labor (Kepenek, 1990). The first decade passed mostly with the consolidation of republican ideology and the revolutions in line with ‘modernization’ ideology (Heper, 1988). In the 1930s, statism was set in motion. According to the new policy, private sector was still expected to function as the main element of economic activities, but the government had to create the necessary capital and make the industrial investment directly (Kuruç, 1987; Pamuk, 1999). Therefore state monopolies, involved in textile, sugar and cement industries emerged (Boratav, 1990). Under this “nationally owned industry”, economic policies were based on self-sufficiency (Kuruç, 1987), and a five-year industrial development plan which determined the rational priorities of state investments was also prepared (Bostancı, 1996).

In this period, the Travelers’ Association (Seyyahin Cemiyeti) was established in 1923 and dominated the tourism policy in Turkey (Sezer & Harrison, 1994). This Association changed its name into the Club of Turkey Touring and Automobile (Türkiye Turing ve Otomobil Kulübü) in 1930. This institute published the first road map and touristic guides, arranged courses and examination for tourists guides, organized tourism related researches, meetings and conferences. After 1930, the Turkish Office (Türk Bürosu) took responsibility for any policy formulation (Sezer & Harrison, 1994). It should be noted that these two institutions were private sector bodies.

The first government interest and actual involvement in tourism would coincide with the establishment of a specific section in the Ministry of Economy in 1934. This was the first representation of tourism policies at governmental level and initialization of the National Tourism Administration in Turkey (Göymen, 1998). In 1940, this Tourism Section, was absorbed into the

Ahmet NOHUTÇU

General Directorate Press (Matbuat Umum Müdürlüğü), and, in 1949, this structure was reorganized and converted into the General Directorate of Press, Publication and Tourism (Tarhan, 1998). This was one of the important steps towards the evolution of a tourism ministry.

At the end of this period, in 1949, government interest in tourism had been consolidated with the meeting of the first Tourism Advice Committee whose report constituted the basis of an initial national tourism policy (Şahin, 1990). The Tourism Master Program, prepared by the Committee, was such an important document that it influenced the Tourism Industry Encouragement Law in 1953 and even inspired the Five-Year Development Plans of the planned period (Barutçugil, 1982; Sezer & Harrison, 1994).

During this period, a small number of international tourists began visiting Turkey. Many of them traveled to Istanbul on the Orient Express. The Government opened Ottoman palaces to the public and Topkapı and Ayia Sophia were turned into museums. Although a network of railways connected Istanbul to other regions of Turkey, most tourists remained in Istanbul due to the absence of suitable accommodation elsewhere and security concerns (MOT, 1965).

Throughout this period, as it can be understood, tourism came on the agenda of the government as a policy issue. It is not possible, however, to talk about a tourism policy or strategy yet. In this period, tourism was not defined as a response and policy solution to economic problems of the country. Because economy, as aforementioned, was suffering due to the lack of an entrepreneurial class with sufficient capital accumulation and experience. Nevertheless, this period made undeniable contributions to the development of tourism. As Göymen (2000) put:

...there would probably be no local capital and indigenous entrepreneurs to be lured into tourism if it had not been for the planned economic development-taking place since the 30s. If transition to a multi-party system and pluralistic politics had not been achieved in the 40s eventually leading to the formation of a limited but still dynamic civil society, new partnerships might not have emerged (Göymen, 2000:1041).

The establishment of private institutions, governmental agencies and, most importantly, the meeting of the Tourism Advice Committee were indicators of growing government interest in tourism albeit the lack of a national policy, policy actors or instruments for this period.

2.2.The Problem Identification and Formulation Period (1950-1963)

Democratic Party (DP) came to the power in 1950 with economic liberalization policies after a 20-year statism (Kepenek, 1990). DP aimed to decrease government intervention while supporting the private sector by favorable credit facilities and liberalization of foreign trade (Tokgöz, 1997).

Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective

This unprepared and uncalculated liberalization of international trade resulted in a sharp increase in imports against a negligible increase of exports, causing huge balance of payment deficits. Foreign currency reserves and international credibility of the country were exhausted within a couple of years (Tarhan, 1998).

Tourism was now being considered as one of the basic measures and solutions of government policies to overcome this critical shortage at foreign currency and serious deficit at balance of payments (Barutçigil, 1982). The main objective was to establish a tourism industry capable of attracting and accommodating international demand. To achieve this objective, legal, organizational and project-based instruments were utilized in a policy framework.

2.2.1. Legal Instruments

For opening tourism to indigenous and foreign investors and offering them various incentives including a credit system and tax concessions, the Tourism Industry Encouragement Law (law number 6086) of 1953 has been promulgated (Turkish Republic Official Gazette, 22 May 1953). This law was the first attempt to design a regulation to administrate tourism facilities in accordance with a policy. The law also brought a new “Licensing System” for the tourism facilities. Facilities were now required to establish certain standards and service quality (determined by the regulation) to obtain the tourism certificate. These requirements were aiming to establish tourism facilities at international standards (Tarhan, 1998).

After a year, the Foreign Capital Encouragement Law of 1954 was also been promulgated which needs to be evaluated together with the law of 1953. This law facilitated and encouraged foreign capital by extending incentives and providing additional safeguards (Şahin, 1990).

2.2.2. Organizational and Project-Based Instruments

2.2.2.1. Tourism bank

In 1955, Tourism Bank, as an organizational instrument of tourism policy, was established to provide credits for private sector and to establish and operate tourism facilities built by other public entities (Türsab, 1997). This Bank, not only would support private investment by credits and technical assistance but also would be involved in creating new capacities to demonstrate and to become a model for private sector (Tarhan, 1998). Tourism Bank, therefore played an important role in this ‘pioneering’ task (Göymen, 1998). The Bank bought and renovated some historical buildings (Such as Sait Halim Paşa Yalısı) for purposes of touristic use and provided credit for the hotel chain of Tusan (Şahin, 1990).

2.2.2.2. Emekli Sandığı (Pension Fund)

Emekli Sandığı was commissioned to establish high standard hotels in major touristic cities to accommodate the increasing foreign business and selective tourism demand (Tarhan, 1998). The main concern was to provide an example and a model and pioneering for the private sector investments. Emekli Sandığı built Hilton and Büyük Trabya in İstanbul, Büyük Ankara and Efes in Ankara, Büyük Efes and Foça in İzmir and Çelik Palas in Bursa in compliance with this policy (Şahin, 1990).

2.2.2.3. Ministry of Press, Publication and Tourism

General Directorate of Press, Publication and Tourism was reorganized and upgraded to ministerial level in 25 November 1957. Tourism policies started to be dealt with and directed at the cabinet level after this date. This ministry was converted into the Ministry of Tourism and Promotion in 1963 and, with small differences of name and organization, endured up to today.

2.2.3. General Assessment of the Period

In sum, between 1950 and 1963 tourism came to the agenda of the government as a policy sector and began to be represented at ministerial level. The reason for government involvement was as a result of increasing crisis in balance of payments which emerged due to uncontrolled and unbridled economic liberalization policies. Governments aimed to utilize tourism potential to reduce critical shortages of foreign currency. To achieve this goal, tourism was accepted as a policy area and, therefore, organizational and legal policy instruments were utilized.

As an output of these efforts, serious developments took place. Between 1950 and 1963, bed capacity, which is suitable to tourism increased seven fold and the number of foreign tourists increased six-fold (Yaşa, 1980).

Although there were other actors in tourism arena, all authority was vested in the government. All developments were under the strict control of DP. This period was called as the “second single party” period by Turan (1988) as a legacy of the single party period. At the end of the period the authoritative and depressive nature of the government has exceeded its bearable limits in a democratic polity (Heper, 1985; Özbudun, 1988) and the 1960 military intervention was triggered.

1960-1963 period can be called a transition in terms of tourism policies from infancy to adaptation and ‘advocacy’ stage (Korzay, 1994). The 1961 Constitution recognized the right to expropriate coastal land to transfer to investors. In 1962, the Tourism Development Fund was established for providing grants and loans for the construction of hotels and motels in tourist areas by the United States Agency for International Development (US.AID) (MOT, 1965).

*Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In
Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective*

2.3. Adoption and Advocacy Period (1963-1982)

Following the 27 May 1960 military “coup d’etat” Turkey entered planned development era with the 1961 Constitution. The constitution delineated the economic system as ‘mixed’ (participation of both the public and private sectors) within a planned framework which was compulsory for the public sector and only ‘indicative’ (providing general direction, motivation and incentives) for private sector (Göymen, 1998). The new administration increased its interventions into the economy (Şahin, 1997). The first step of this major policy change was the establishment of the State Planning Organization (SPO) in 1961. This new model was expected to secure optimum utilization of national resources and economic growth by five-year development plans (Tokgöz, 1997). Therefore, in most of the Turkish literature on economy and tourism, post-1963 period has been called the ‘planned period’ (Boratav, 1990; Şahin, 1997; Göymen 1998 & 2000).

From a political point of view, the 1963-1982 period, just as the 1923-1950 period was marked by the consolidation of republican regime and evolution of a political structure for political democracy; and the 1950-1960 period initiated the integration of masses into national political life and was characterized by the expansion of individual liberties and the proliferation of an infinite number of voluntary organizations (Turan, 1988). According to Heper (1985 & 1988), in the 1960s, bureaucratic intellectuals attempted to promote the idea of ‘state capitalism’. It is also in this period that a rapid expansion in the number of voluntary associations, the range of interests they incorporated, and the scope of activities they covered proliferated (Özbudun, 1988; Özdemir, 1990). In sum, politics in Turkish society came increasingly to be a process in which competing interests were articulated, and negotiated through a highly sophisticated network of organizations.

2.3.1. Tourism Development in 1963-1982

2.3.1.2. Development of the 1960s

The increasing affluence of the 1960s saw a market growth in international tourism. More and more developing countries were discovering the economic advantages of becoming involved in the tourist industry and Turkey was one such country.

One of the most important stages of development of tourism emerged in 1963, when a serious interest was shown at ministerial level with the establishment of Ministry of Tourism as a specialized governmental organization responsible for guiding, supporting, coordinating and supervising tourism (Lök, 1995). In the 1960s the basic strategic priorities of tourism, set forth in the development plans prepared by the State Planning Organization, could be outlined as mass tourism, coastal tourism and the search for large scale investments (MOT, 1994).

Ahmet NOHUTÇU

The United States Agency for International Development (US.AID) played a major role in this development by providing grants and loans for the construction of roads, hotels and motels in tourist areas (MOT, 1965). The government stated that “the ultimate success of tourism as a national industry will only come when Turkey more fully mobilizes its resources for developing this asset” (MOT, 1965: 14).

It was realized that tourism industry required not only foreign aid but also private enterprise and investment in manpower. The governments appreciated that they had to plan their investments carefully and ensure that tourist facilities were well constructed and well maintained by properly trained management and staff (Dirik, 1993). The first tourism cooperation agreement was signed with Bulgaria, in 1964, followed by agreements with Yugoslavia, Egypt and Lebanon in 1965, 1966 and 1968, respectively (Türsab, 1997). Moreover, The first comprehensive official research project, Tourism Trends of Turkey, was conducted by the Ministry of Tourism with the cooperation of the State Institution of Statistics (Türsab, 1997).

As the 1960s proceeded, Turkey began to take constructive steps towards further developing national tourism and the number of foreign visitors in Turkey rose from 198.000 in 1963 to 724.000 in 1970 while tourism receipts increased more than sevenfold from US\$7 million in 1963 to US\$51 million.

2.3.1.3. Tourism Development in the 1970s

The March 12, 1971 Military Memorandum brought Nihat Erim to the head of a government with a strong tendency to interfere in all aspects of polity and economy (Özdemir, 1990). The new government expected to solve all social and economic problems by strong government control and intervention in these activities. Therefore state control and interference on economic activities highly increased (Tokgöz, 1997).

The early 1970s saw a continuing and steady growth in the number of visitors increasing from 724.000 in 1970 to 1.341.000 in 1973. In 1974, however, the number of visitors fell due to the world oil crisis and although the figures rose again in 1975, there was no significant increase for the rest of the decade. In fact in 1980, the number of visitors was less than in 1973.

The authority of regional tourism planning was transferred to the Ministry of Tourism in the 1970s. Within this context first land-use plans were prepared and put into effect for Western and Southern coastlines of the country. At the same time, various infrastructure investments both at national and regional levels were realized by the related government agencies (Ateş, 1993).

The lack of growth during the 1974 to 1980 period can be attributed to several different factors. First, Turkey was a late entrant and by the time it did enter the tourist league it faced intense international competition (Türsab,

***Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In
Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective***

1998). Second, Turkey's relative inaccessibility to tourists from North and West Europe meant that 'sun seekers' were tending to stay closer home, with the result that Turkey found itself waiting for 'overloading' of Western resorts before receiving visitors first hand. In the book 'The Geography of Travel and Tourism' Boniface and Cooper (1987: 145) attribute Turkey's lack of success in the 1970s to the fact that the country was expensive to reach and poorly publicized. Third, although serious infrastructural investments had been accomplished by the state, Turkish tourism was still severely handicapped by the country's poor transportation and communication facilities and by the fact that significant improvements depended on foreign equipment and investments, which were often the subject of considerable 'red tape' on the part of the Turkish authorities (Özen & Kuru, 1998).

Fourth, during these 7 years, the fundamentalist religious partner (Nationalist Salvation Party) of Nationalist Front Governments (Turan, 1988) took highly obstructing attitude towards tourism activities and operations due to the justification of erosion 'moral' values. Finally, increasing terrorism, assassinations, social disturbances, excessive fragmentation and polarization of the political structure, lack of a decisive political authority and massive outbreaks of communal conflict during this decade negatively effected tourism. So, in spite of Turkey's unrivalled tourism potential and the actions of the government to develop the industry, by the end of the 1970s Turkey was far behind its Mediterranean neighbors in terms of the numbers of visitors it was receiving.

2.3.2. Policy Instruments of the Period

During this period tourism policies were developed within the framework of three basic aims (Çetin & Benövenli, 1977: 131): (a) to increase net tourism earnings in order meet to the need for foreign exchange, (b) to meet the recreational and vocation needs of the people of the country, and (c) to conserve the cultural and natural environment.

To achieve these aims a number of policy instruments were utilized, in the form of plans, organizations, and legal and financial arrangements and special projects, which will be briefly analyzed below.

2.3.2.1. The Five- Year Development Plans

The five-year development plans, the first of which was launched in 1963, set out national goals, objectives and targets. The SPO was entrusted the preparation of plans. These plans were basically development policy documents containing strategies, tools and investment programs at a macro level (Boratav, 1990). The five-year development plans were legal documents which were imperative for the public sector, and providing guidance and 'indicative' (encouraging and providing general direction, motivation and incentives) for the private sector.

For nearly four decades, Turkey has continued using five-year plans as a major policy instrument for overall socio-economic development (currently, the Eight Five-Year Plan, covering the 2001-2005 period is in implementation), although the objectives, parameters, instruments and public-private balance of plans has changed (Tokgöz, 1997).

Tourism was taken as a subsector in the development plans of this period under the heading of service sector. There were basically five objectives, actually the main targets in all Turkish tourism development history (Çetin, 1981): (1) to benefit from economic, social and cultural impact of tourism, (2) to contribute to balance of payments and the Gross National Product, (3) to benefits from its foreign exchange effect as a tool for industrialization, (4) to create new employment possibilities, and (5) to provide more holiday opportunities for Turkish citizens.

2.3.2.2. Organizational Instruments

2.3.2.2.1. Ministry of Tourism and Promotion

In July 2, 1963, Ministry of Press, Publication and Promotion, established in 1957, was renamed as Ministry of Tourism and Promotion with the law number 265 (The Official Gazette of July 12, 1963). The ministry became one the most significant organizations of the period. In the five-year development plans, it was entitled with the responsibilities of utilizing the tourism resources of the country so as to maximize their contribution to the national economy and foreign currency earnings; increasing holiday possibilities of the native population; mobilizing the tourism resources of the country, balancing utilization with protection and preservation.

The Ministry of Tourism and Promotion took over responsibility in licensing and standardization of tourism establishments; planning; supervising the operations of existing facilities; determining room rates for hotels and prices on 'touristic menus' of restaurants; opening 'tourism training centers' (Türem) to meet increased demand for qualified personnel; creating 'pioneering' facilities to serve as models; promoting and marketing the Turkish tourism product by opening bureaus in Turkey and abroad; and encouraging the establishment of professional organizations (unions of travel agents, hoteliers and guides) which were to gradually play a greater role in tourism management in Turkey (Göymen, 1998: 24).

In 1971, the authority of regional tourism planning and administration of the Central Project Directorate, initially established within the State Planning Organization in 1969, was transferred to the Ministry (Ateş, 1993). Within this context, first land-use plans were prepared and put into effect for western and southern coastlines. A coastal strip from Balıkesir provincial border, up to the end of Antalya province which included İzmir, Kuşadası, Bodrum, Marmaris and the other popular destinations of today was declared priority regions. To concentrate both public and private investments in these

*Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In
Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective*

regions tourism orientated physical planning studies were initiated by the Ministry of Tourism and Promotion, in coordination with the Ministry of Reconstruction and Re-settlement, to fill the gap between development plans which had no spatial dimension and implementation projects (MOT, 1994; Ertaç & Ergin, 1995).

2.3.2.2.2. Tourism Bank

The Tourism Bank was established with state capital to provide credits for tourism investments and operations in 23 June 1955. In 4 May 1960, Turkish Republic Corporation of Tourism Bank was established with the aim of establishing and managing 'model tourism facilities' for private sector and providing technical and project support to private entrepreneurs (The Official Gazette, 10 May, 1960). The Bank took over the Tourism Development Fund and until it merged with the State Investment and Worker's Investment Bank in 1988 to form the Turkish development Bank provided a total of US\$ 453 million in credits (Göymen, 1998) for 146.705 beds.

2.3.2.2.3. The Association of Turkish Travel Agencies (TÜRSAB)

Another major organizational tool was the Association of Turkish Travel Agencies (TÜRSAB), a non-profit institution and a legal personality, established by Law in 1972 (The Law concerning Travel Agencies and the Association of Travel Agencies; Law No 1618, effective as of 28 September 1972). The main aims of the Association are to promote travel agency profession, to encourage travel agencies to offer best possible service to public, to contribute to the development of tourism both at home and abroad in cooperation with the Ministry of Tourism, to set the rules of commissioning and decommissioning them, to introduce and maintain professional ethics and to protect the consumer (traveler and tourists) (TÜRSAB, 1998). Travel agency business has flourished parallel with development of Turkish tourism. A great leap in the number of travel agencies has been observed since 1990 reaching a total of 4300 by January 1999.

As a leading institution, TÜRSAB performed, and still performs, a major, active role in all issues concerning tourism of Turkey through decision-making process, implementation and operation stages. TÜRSAB worked in co-operation with all authorities, public and private organizations concerned, in order to achieve its goals and objectives for development of tourism and for well-being of industry. Its involvement comprises any areas of development and management of tourism, from policy formation and definition of strategies to preparation of legislation, planning and promotion (TÜRSAB, 1997).

TÜRSAB also acted as a pressure group in areas of common interest especially in cases where conflicting factors were in question, such as

sustainable tourism, conservation of natural and cultural values and environmental problems (TÜRSAB, 1997).

2.3.2.4. South Antalya Tourism Development Project

As indicated previously, the five-year development plans aimed to concentrate tourism investments in “priority zones” in order to reduce infrastructural costs and to maximize the capital invested. In this context, the South Antalya Tourism Development Project was utilized as one of the major policy instruments to realize these goals. The zone, to the south of Antalya, covered 80 kilometers of coastline from Antalya to Kemer and 9 kilometers in depth. There are many places of historical interest here, some going back several thousands years, such as the ancient site of Phaselis, Olympus and Idyros (MOT, 1991). The zone is clearly well chosen and this is also confirmed, among other things, by the creation in the past few years of a Club Méditerranée holiday village here. The macro-infrastructure for the project is being provided by the state with a financial aid of US\$26 million granted by the World Bank. The macro-infrastructure has communication routes, including 58 kilometers of motorway, various roads one of which is connected to Kemer, parking areas, hiking trails and cycling paths. It also includes transmission of electricity, telecommunications, water supply, sewage facilities, treatment of effluents and wastes, installation of the Kemer marina, provision of facilities and maintenance of the national park, various projects at the site of Phaselis (access, reception building, etc.) and the creation of a hotel that could also provide hotel training for 240 students (MOT, 1991). The main targets of the project were basically creation of 65.000 beds, generation of 20.000 jobs and production of recreational facilities with a daily capacity to serve 200.000 people (MOT, 1991: 1-3). These were generally realized and even exceeded. Therefore, in general terms, the project was successful although some problems emerged like attracting new and unplanned investment to adjacent areas and triggering migration to area, developments both of which put the ‘carrying capacity’ of the region under strain (Göymen, 1998).

2.3.3. General Assessment of the Period

In this period, tourism policies that have been realized were adopted at governmental level. Although these policies could not be put into action successfully, main targets, orientation and directions of tourism development have been clarified and reinforced. The establishment of a distinct ministry to deal with tourism affairs, considerable and directive emphasis of five-year plans on the main targets, principles and means of tourism growth, and other organizational, legal, financial and project-based policy instruments were all clear indications of significance of tourism policies for the period. Because of the ‘late-comer’ position of the country, lack of experience and serious inadequacy of infrastructure and superstructure capacities (associated with the

Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective

political, social and economic turbulences of the period) tourism industry did not flourish and meet the desired goals. Needless to say, thus, there was a serious gap between policy goals and results of implementation.

Some of the reasons of this failure can be explained by the fragmentary, sporadic and reactive nature of the policymaking or planning process. While setting the increasing foreign exchange earning as the principal goal of the sector, no effort has been made to develop a coherent, feasible and proactive policy which would take into consideration the country's socio-economic conditions. Furthermore, no distinct attempt has been made to determine what kind of policy adjustments and development process were required to meet the potential international demand oriented towards Turkey (Çetin & Benövenli, 1977).

Due to these and other pitfalls of the period which were explored above, the share of tourism investments has never exceeded 0.7% of total fixed capital investments until 1980 according to objectives and realization rates of five-year development plans and, consequently, the share of tourism in GNP never reached above 0.8% of the total. In other words, the sole objective during the planned period between 1963-1980 has been to increase the contribution of tourism to the balance of payments. Although this was an advocacy, preparation and adaptation period of setting up the main targets and parameters, a certain degree of success has been attained. The contribution of tourism, however, has never been more than alleviating foreign currency difficulties to a certain extent.

In this context, at the beginning of the 1980s, it was realized that the quantitative aggregates, so far attained, neither responded to economic requirements nor matched Turkey's exceptional tourism potential. Therefore, it was the time for changes of tourism perspectives and to benefit the period of preparation outputs by implementation and action.

Just as the 1960-1963 period, 1980-1983 period was a period of transition from preparation or adaptation, in terms of stages of policy terms, to implementation period. During that period, The Tourism Encouragement Frame Decree of 1980 and the Tourism Encouragement Law of 1982 were prepared and issued. These pieces of legislation carried the seeds of the next liberal period of implementation in tourism policies, and, of course, heralding the dynamics of governance in tourism sector.

2.4. Implementation of New Policies (Stage) (1983 - to present)

The military coup of 12 September 1980 opened a new chapter for Turkish political, social and economic structure. Constant deficits in the balance of payments, saturation of economic growth rate and other macro-economic problems created an economic crisis in Turkey in the late 1970s. To overcome the crisis, an export-promotion economy was seen as the only solution. Therefore, in order to solve the economic problems of the country,

export-oriented economical decisions were taken, as recommended by international donor agencies such as the International Money Fund (IMF) and the World Bank on 24 January 1980. However, these decisions could not be put into effect before the end of 1983 because of political crisis in time. Later, they were adopted rapidly by the new governments.

24 January Decisions (of 1980) emulated global ‘new right’ and opened up the way of liberalization in Turkey. The main characteristics of these new economic decisions were realistic rates of exchange, rational price policy at State Economic Enterprises (SEEs), denunciation of government interference on the prices of private sector and foreign trade, and increase in money supply by the Central Bank (Kozak, 1993). Within this economic directives and framework, in 1980, the Turkish governments embarked upon a series of reforms designed to accomplish the following goals: remove price controls and subsidies, lessen the role of public sector in commerce, emphasize growth in the private sector, stimulate private investments and savings, liberalize foreign trade, reduce tariffs, ease capital transfer exchange controls, privatization, and reform the taxation system. The three major objectives of these new policies and programs were minimize state intervention; establish a free market economy, and integrate the Turkish economy with the world economic system

2.4.1. Impacts of ‘New Right’ and Globalization on Policymaking Process

These economic policies, not coincidentally, were developed along with the new right principles in mind. Because the main pillars of the ‘new right’ were always on the agenda of the “transformation” policies of the government such as gradual dismantling and shrinking of the state by privatization of the SEEs, decentralization (Saracoglu, 1994) and the establishment of alternative project-oriented bureaucratic organizations like Treasury and Foreign Trade Undersecretaries, the Council of Competition, the Council of Capital Market based on managerialism proving the inadequacy and inefficiency of the classical state organizations.

Turgut Özal and the Motherland Party (MP) governments heralded this new era by attempting to curb the powers of civil bureaucracy by liberalizing economy, privatizing the SEEs and decentralizing the government (Heper, 1994). In this vein, the power of the State Planning Organization was curtailed because of its centralist and classical bureaucratic nature. The underlying philosophy was the dismantling of the state from economical and political sphere, the main pillar of new right policies. This approach illuminates the transformation attempts of administrative reforms in a different way (Aksoy, 1995). The restructuring of the state, in this sense, denotes the reformation of policymaking process and public administration.

Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective

In a historical development perspective and an analytical scheme, if the main actors and determinants of policymaking process were civil-military bureaucrats during the single party period (1923-1950), political elites during the Democratic Party period (1950-1960), and bureaucratic elites and politicians towards the end of the period between 1960 and 1980 (Heper, 1985, Turan, 1988) during the 1980s, the market conditions have dominated policymaking process. Beginning with the end of the 1980s and during the 1990s, as an implication of imperatives of ‘sectoral adjustments loans’, later, ‘structural adjustment programs’, and privatization encouraged by the World Bank and the International Money Fund, concepts of autonomy, participation, transparency, accountability and decentralization started to invade the policy agenda of the state (Göymen, 2000). Starting with the second half of the 1990s, as a result of neo-liberal policies and under the impact of globalization process, the principles of governance started to dominate the policymaking process. Under the liberal atmosphere of the 1980s new capable actors emerged. Private actors flourished and the limited but dynamic civil society gathered strength; all embodies in the dynamics of governance.

2.4.2. Development of Tourism Policies

2.4.2.1. 1983-1992 Period

The general economic and political policies of neo-liberalism also shaped tourism policies. Thus, it was decided in the early 1980s that a radical change in the overall tourism strategy was needed. Consequently Ulusu Government issued the Tourism Encouragement Framework Decree and the Tourism Encouragement Law passed in 1982. However, by 1985, it was realized that existing legislation was not going to provide the necessary impetus for the tourism sector (Göymen, 1995: 1414). Therefore, tourism was included among the “sectors of special importance for development” and some monetary incentives in forms of grants and allowances were given (TYD, 1992: viii). In this framework, the government introduced the following incentives in order to achieve a significant increase in tourism investment:

- Allocation of public land to investors on a long term basis,
- Soft loans provided by the Turkish Tourism Bank,
- Exemptions from various taxes including customs and export taxes,
- Preferential tariff rates for electricity, water and gas consumption,
- Priority for communication needs, i.e. telex, telephone, fax, etc.,
- Allowance of foreign personnel employment up to 20% of total workforce,
- Casino operation license for accommodation facilities,
- Investment allowance, and

Ahmet NOHUTÇU

- Special incentive premium for foreign investors (TYD, 1992; Özen & Kuru, 1998).

Between 1985 and 1992, US\$ 422 million worth of grant resources were provided to investors under the cash incentives program that constituted an investment volume of TL 5.5 trillion. This program provided 10 times as much an additional foreign currency inflows and 40 times as much an added value for the economy as the cash incentives offered during this period (TYD, 1992). In the 1985-1992 period, a total of US\$ 710 million credit was provided by the Tourism Bank and Turkish Development Bank and US\$ 1.250 million foreign investment were realized which was 13.8% of total incoming foreign capital (TYD, 2002). As a result of these incentive policies between 1985-1992, 200.000 ministry-licensed beds were created which was two times bigger than the 1993-2000 period. While in 1983, the visitor numbers were 1,625.000, tourism receipts were US\$ 411 million, the share of tourism revenues in GNP was 0.8%, and the share of tourism receipts in export revenues was 6.4%, these numbers increased to 7.076.000, US\$ 3.639 million, 2.4%, and 24.7%, respectively. These quantitative indicators show how appropriate and important the incentives for tourism development proved to be.

All these positive developments coincided with the favorable conditions for Turkey in the major tourist generating markets of Europe, where tour operators were in search for new destinations (Kozak et al., 2000). All actors and stakeholders, emerged within the climate of neo-liberal policies and globalization process, actively started to make great efforts to push the development when important tourist operators in major tourist markets included Turkey in their programs. Media coverage enormously increased (Dale, 1993). This was the start of phenomenal achievements of Turkish tourism which have continued so far. These conditions with new products on offer brought Turkish tourism development to a stage of “take off”.

This development was signaling the dawn of a policy change for tourism development in Turkey. Until this date, tourism policies had been justified by economic concerns pertaining to redress balance of payments, to earn foreign currency and to create employment opportunities. Starting with this date, preservation of environment and socio-cultural heritage was declared a main target of tourism policies. Needless to say, the definition of problem and agenda setting of tourism were extended. These developments were alarming and signaling sustainable tourism and, of course, dynamics of governance practices in the 1990s.

5.2.2. 1993 – to the Present

Despite Turkey’s late entry into international tourism and the numerous ‘teething’ problems the country faced, the 1980s was regarded as a

***Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In
Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective***

successful decade which certainly helped to enhance Turkey's economic status:

Turkey entered the 1990s with her licensed bed capacity increased by 3 times; tourist revenues by ten times and number of travel agencies 3 times in comparison to the beginning of 1980s (Taşar, 2001). With the considerable progress made in the 1980s and onset of mass tourism in a serious development drive, those involved in the industry had very high expectations for the 1990s.

The decade began well, with the peak months between June and August of 1990 experiencing an increase in visitors of approximately 25% and with increasing amount of monies being put aside to improve the basic infrastructure (Cooper & Özdil, 1992). Then, in August 1990 Iraq invaded Kuwait. Despite the fact that it was only the southeastern borders which were in any sense regarded as vulnerable, the Gulf War proved to have a crippling effect on Turkish tourism during most of 1991 (TÜRSAB, 1998).

In 1992, The True Path Party (DYP) and the Social Democratic Populist Party (SHP) formed a coalition. The coalition government of 1992 criticized the developments of the past decade in the tourism sector and proposed changes in both objectives and strategy (Özen & Kuru, 1998).

During the 1990s, the successive coalition governments started to change policy targets towards improved quality (both in facilities and service), environmental sustainability and a more egalitarian approach in spreading the beneficial effects of tourism, particularly to economically less developed areas (Göymen, 1998). It was stated that the increase in the bed capacity has not been matched by improvements in the areas of marketing, air transport, training and technical infrastructure. The number of travel agencies is continuing to increase and yet foreign tour operators dominate them. Moreover, only 30% of air passengers use Turkish airlines. Consequently, more than half of the tourism income generated in Turkey goes abroad, shared between the foreign tour operators and airlines (Ateş, 1993).

There is acute shortage of skilled personnel, up to 70% of the demand from establishments (MOT, 1994). There is regional imbalance in tourism development in favor of the west and southwest, at the expense of the north and the east. This produced undesirable environmental results as well as aggravating economic discrepancies between regions (Ateş, 1993: 135). There is also bias in the incentives policy for big investment against small, medium, and local investment (Göymen, 1995).

Out of these considerations and evaluations emerged the new goals of Turkish tourism (MOT, 1994): development of an efficient and competitive structure in tourism sector; creation of the best possible social environment for both foreign and domestic tourists, and the local resident

population in conformity with universal values, and extension of economic benefits of tourism to all regions; preservation and enhancement of the country's natural resources and cultural heritage.

Although most of these objectives and principles have not been realized thoroughly, they were signaling to a shift from a centrally planned and implemented tourism policy to participatory decision-making process which increases cooperation among all interested parties of tourism activity in a sustainable development drive.

During this period, due emphasis was given to sustaining both natural and man-made values to ensure a balanced and sustainable development. In order to ease the excessive pressure on coastal areas and distribute the activities throughout the country, diversification policies were adopted (Ateş, 1993; MOT, 1994). This was indeed sound judgment. Because it is an alternative solution not only to ensure sustainability but also contribute to balanced economic development, enabling different parts of the country to benefit from the positive socio-economic impact of tourism. Winter holidays and sports, mountaineering, sub-aqua diving, tracking, golfing, horse riding and all other tourist activity holidays, cultural tours, special interest tours for the enthusiast, spas, meeting, incentive travel and many others were taken as priority issues in order to utilize the wide range of diverse resources. Consequently, Turkey started to encourage diversification and it is still on the main agenda of tourism policies.

As a final remark, it can be concluded that tourism has grown at a dramatic rate over the last ten years – well above the world average. Although the number of tourist arrivals and tourism expenditures declined during the early 1990s as a result of the Gulf War, the post-war period has seen renewed growth, which was briefly interrupted, in 1999, due to the two earthquakes and perceived threat of terrorism stemming from the arrest of a terrorist leader. However, in 2000, visitor numbers, reached a record level of 10.4 million, increasing 39% compared to the previous year, and visitor spending increased 47.4% compared to the 1999 level.

2.4.3. Policy Instruments of the Period

2.4.3.1. Five-Year Development Plans

The Five-Year Development Plans and the Implementation Plans devised by the State Planning Organization gave increasing importance to socio-cultural and environmental issues in the tourism sectors since the mid-1980s. The Five-Year Development Plans set out the targets, principles and policies for individual sectors. For that reason, although they are 'indicative' for private sector they are of importance in terms of setting policy objectives and directives.

The five-year plans were affected by neo-liberal policies and principles of the 1980s and during the 1990s, emphasis in tourism goals and

Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective

policies began to shift towards macro-level planning and tourism policymaking in cooperation with the private sector, environmental sustainability and a balanced development, provision of infrastructure with the participation of private investors and special organizations set up for this purpose, and promotional and training activities in collaboration with professional sectoral organizations. These policy issues were clearly indicating a change in policymaking structure which was triggered by dynamics of governance along with the globalization process.

2.4.3.2. Organizational Instruments

In addition to Ministry of Tourism and Association of Turkish Travel Agencies, a number of new professional organizations emerged as new capable actors of tourism policy sector such as the Turkish Hotel Association, the Turkish Tourism Investors' Association, the Tourism Development and Education Foundation, the Kemer Tourism Promotion Foundation, the Promotion Foundation of Turkey, the Turkish Private Air Carriers Association, the Association of Bus Operators, etc.. Actually, all branches of tourist industry established their own independent organization or association. However, the only association which was established by a special law is the Association of Turkish Travel Agencies.

The emergence of these new organizations, their formation patterns, objectives, principles, activities, implementation strategies and tools are all clear indicators of new interactive relations between state and society. Some of these organizations, like TUGEV and TÛTAV, were founded by state and private sector partnership. Some of them, like KETAV and BETUYAB, were established by the encouragement and support of state and operated with the principles based on cooperative efforts of central, local and private organizations. The other organizations, like TÛRSAB, TYD and TUROB, realized serious projects and attempted to create new forms and patterns of partnerships with central and local public bodies, other sectoral corporations and, even, international tourism organizations. Although the desired level and intensity of partnerships and cooperative bilateral interactions among public and private actors in a governance framework have not been attained, and functional and structural deficiencies persist, these attempts and developments can be evaluated as harbinger of shift in process, orientation and structures of tourism polices.

3. Conclusion

Turkey has experienced large-scale development in tourism within a span of 40 years. Tourism was taken up as a policy agenda of the governments as a panacea, firstly, for macroeconomic problems such as large deficits in balance of payments, unemployment, and vital foreign currency. Secondly, it was considered as an engine for social change to comply with the economic and financial exigencies of international platforms. Thirdly, it turned out to be an

Ahmet NOHUTÇU

international political strategy to create a favorable image for acceptance of the country for full membership of the European Union which is actually a very current and hot political agenda issue (Tosun & Jenkins, 1996). Having targeted these main objectives, tourism attained rapid growth in terms of revenues of tourism, number of tourists, and physical investments. Physical and quantitative growth, however, should not be seen as the sole criterion for success. It is now widely accepted that at every stage of development in tourism industry, it is necessary to balance the economic, social, cultural and ecological consequences so that the effects of tourism might be overall positive. Therefore, definition of success cannot be only based on economic criteria particularly when this growth has been achieved at the expense of the natural, historical, social and cultural inheritance of the country. In this context, it is likely to be true to claim that since the 1960s, Turkey's strategic tourism objectives and consequent financial incentives were mainly centered on the expansion and improvement of physical infrastructure. This pattern of development brought a host of shortcomings and threats to natural and cultural environment of the country which required urgent and comprehensive policy remedies.

The historical development of Turkish tourism policies has created a fairly inconsistent picture. During the single-party period, there were fragmented and haphazard attempts with respect to developments of tourism mostly implemented by non-state actors. Apart from a couple of limited, but still promising, initiatives, the state failed to acknowledge the phenomenon of tourism. During the 1950s which was called "two single-party" period, tourism belatedly came on the agenda of the government. This period might be depicted as problem identification and agenda-setting phase in terms of the development of tourism policies. Laws and regulations encouraging the development of tourism facilities and organizational instruments such as the formation of the Ministry which was partially charged with tourism together with press and publication affairs were the examples of the state's interest towards tourism. Although tourism was not a priority policy in front of the government, the sphere of tourism was dominated by the central bureaucratic administration. In the 1960s and the 1970s, by contrast, the five-year development plans adopted a highly étatist and centralized approach to tourism. Under the impact of the 1961 Constitution and its organization of the state and public administration, public policies, including tourism policies, started to be formulated and implemented heavily by the state. For that reason, this period can be called "state-sponsored development" of tourism policies. Despite some developments in terms of infrastructure and tourism facilities, the period was still lacking serious initiatives and investments for a major leap for tourism growth. Due to serious focus in the development plans on tourism and the entailing organizational, financial, and legal instruments of the policies, this period might be delineated as a period of formulation, adaptation and legitimization of the tourism sector. It is not possible to mention a successful implementation because although the

*Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In
Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective*

state identified the problems of inadequate infrastructure, illegitimate and environmentally damaging development, due to the lack of physical planning, it failed to take effective measures to solve these problems.

In the 1980s, under the impact of neo-liberal, outward-oriented and export-promotion economic models, tourism was determined to be a tool and an agent for realizing economic objectives of the state. To this aim, it was listed among “sectors of special importance for development” and generous monetary incentives such as grants, tax subsidies, and investment allowances were introduced. With these incentives, tourism experienced a remarkable jump forward after mid-1980s. What is striking is that in spite of the influences of intensive “new right” and neo-liberal economic policies which are imposing the lessening of responsibilities, authorities and resources of the state, deregulation, delegation, privatization, and decentralization, these policies were only paid lip-service in political realm. Therefore, it is possible to mention the dominance of central political authority in the policymaking process despite liberal economic policies and discourse. However, this is not in contradiction with the neo-liberal philosophy of “small government but strong state” which stresses the significant role of the state and central political authority to facilitate the implementation of its economic programs. The lack of a general and appropriate tourism culture and sufficient experience due to the newcomer position of the country impeded the decentralized administrative structures in tourism industry too. Further, decentralization, indeed, was used as a tool to gain credibility and reliability in international financial and political arenas so as to borrow large amount of capital to finance imports and stimulate the country’s economy.

In the 1990s, new capable actors emerged and started to affect and dominate the tourism policies in new types of partnerships, new arrangements, structures of participation, communication, and accountability. Of course, there would probably be no sectoral and local stakeholders, participative mechanisms, and limited but still a dynamic, sizable and viable civil society if generous incentives and general encouragement policies of the 1980s had not taken place. In this decade, the state encouraged further decentralization in planning and decision-making process. Therefore, more planning authority was transferred to local bodies through the modification of already declared tourism areas, regions and centers. The new emerging actors demanded greater say in planning and implementation of policy and strategies. Participation of related parties to decision-making processes increased both cooperation among public, private and voluntary bodies, and awareness and knowledge about the environmental, social, cultural and psychological impacts of tourism activity.

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, James E. (1994). **Public Policymaking: An Introduction** 2nd Edition, New Jersey, Houghton Mifflin Company.
- AKSOY, Şinasi (1995). “Yeni Sağ ve Kamu Yönetimi” in **Kamu Yönetimi Sempozyumu Bildirileri**, Cilt II, Ankara: TODAİE.
- ATEŞ Abdülkadir (1993). The Official Speech Addressed on the behalf of the Minister of Tourism of Turkey in **Seminar on Tourism Development and the Responsibility of the State, Budapest, Hungary**, Spain, World Tourism Organization, pp. 130-136.
- BARUTÇIGIL, İsmet (1982). **Turizm Ekonomisi ve Turizmin Türk Ekonomisindeki Yeri**, İstanbul.
- BORATAV, Korkut (1990). “İktisat Tarihi (1908-1980)” in **Türkiye Tarihi 4: Çağdaş Türkiye, 1908-1980**, S. Akşin (ed.), pp. 265-354, İstanbul, Cem Yayınevi.
- BONIFACE B. and P. Cooper (1987). **The Geography of Travel and Tourism**, London, British Library Cataloguing.
- BOSTANCI, Naci (1996). **Cumhuriyetin Başlangıç Yıllarında Ekonomi ve Siyaset**, İstanbul, Ötüken.
- BROHMAN, J. (1996). “New Directions in Tourism for Third World Development”, **Annals of Tourism Research**, 23: 48-70.
- COOPER, C.P. and İ. Özdil (1992). “From Mass to ‘Responsible’ Tourism: the Turkish Experience” in **Tourism Management**, December, pp. 377-386.
- ÇETİN İhsan (1981). “Turizmin Değerlendirilmesi ve Geliştirilmesi” in **2. Türkiye İktisat Kongresi İç Ticaret ve Hizmetler Komisyonu Tebliğleri**, Cilt: 7, No: 1783, Ankara, DPT.
- ÇETİN, İhsan (2000). “Tourism in the 7th Five-Year Development Plan” in **EMU Journal of Tourism Research**, 1(1): 119-125.
- ÇETİN İhsan and C. Benövenli (1978). “Turkey’s Tourism Policies: An Evaluation of the 1963-1977 Period and an Approach for the Future” in **International Tourism Congress: “New Perspectives and Policies”**, pp. 129-139, Marmaris.
- DIRİK, Meltem (1993). **Avrupa Topluluğu’nda Turizm Politikası, Türkiye’de Turizm Politikası, Kıyaslanması**, Ankara, Araştırma ve Planlanma Müdürlüğü.
- ERTAÇ, Gürkan and Y. Ergin (1996). “Türkiye’nin Turizm Planlanmasına Bir Bakış ve Yeni Yaklaşımlar” in **Türkiye’de 19. Dünya Şehircilik Kollokyumu, 7-9 Kasım 1995**, pp. 71-78, İstanbul.
- EYESTONE, Robert (1978). **From Social Issues to Public Policy**, New York, Wiley.

*Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In
Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective*

- GÖYMEN, Korel (1995). “1980’lerde Türkiye’de Turizm” in **Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi: Yüzyıl Biterken**, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- GÖYMEN, Korel (1998). “Tourism and Governance in Turkey: From State-Sponsored Development to Public-Private Co-operation” in **2. Bilkent Turizm Forumu 1997**, pp. 17-36.
- GÖYMEN, Korel (2000). “Tourism and Governance in Turkey”, in **Annals of Tourism Research**, 27(4): 1025-1048.
- HEPER, Metin (1985). **The State Tradition in Turkey**, The Eothen Press.
- HEPER, Metin (1988). “State and Society in Turkish Political Experience” in **State, Democracy and The Military: Turkey in the 1980s**, Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin (eds.), Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- HEPER, Metin (1994). “Transition to Democracy in Turkey: Toward a New Pattern” in **Politics in the Third Turkish Republic**, M. Heper and A. Evin (eds.), pp. 13-20, Boulder, Westview Press.
- KEPENEK, Yakup (1990). **Gelişim, Üretim Yapısı ve Sorunlarıyla Türkiye Ekonomisi**, Ankara, Verso.
- KORZAY, M. (1994). “Turkish Tourism Development” in **Tourism: The State of the Art**, A.V. Seaton, et. al. eds., pp.85-99.
- KOZAK, Metin (1993). “24 Ocak Kararlarının Türk Turizmine Etkileri” in **Turizm Yıllığı 1993**, Ankara, Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası A.Ş.
- KOZAK, Nazmi, M.A. Kozak, and M.Kozak (2000). **Genel Turizm: İlkeler – Kavramlar**, 4th Edition, Ankara, Turhan Kitabevi.
- KURUÇ, Bilsay (1987). **Mustafa Kemal Döneminde Ekonomi**, İstanbul, Bilgi Yayınevi.
- LÖK, Hasan (1995). **Avrupa Birliği’ne Entegrasyonda Türk Turizminin Sektörünün Rekabet Şansını Arttırıcı Yeni Teşvil Politikaları**, İstanbul, Sınai Yatırım ve Kredi Bankası AO.
- MOT (Ministry of Tourism) (1965). **Tourism in Turkey**, İstanbul.
- MOT (Ministry of Tourism) (1988). **National Tourism Policy**, Ankara, T.R. Ministry of Culture and Tourism.
- MOT (Ministry of Tourism) (1991). **South Antalya Development Project** Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.
- MOT (Ministry of Tourism) (1994). **Tourism in Turkey**, Ankara, Ministry of Turkey.
- MOT (Ministry of Tourism) (2002). **Turizmde 2. Atılım Dönemi: Çalışmalarımız ve Hedeflerimiz, 12 Nisan 2002**, Ankara, Turizm Bakanlığı.

Ahmet NOHUTÇU

- ÖZBUDUN, Ergun (1988). "Development of Democratic Government in Turkey: Crises, Interruptions and Reequilibrations" in **Perspectives on Democratic Turkey**, E. Özbudun et al.(eds.), pp. 1-58, Ankara, Sevinç Matbaası.
- ÖZDEMİR, Hikmet (1990). "Siyasal Tarih (1960-1980)" in **Türkiye Tarihi 4: Çağdaş Türkiye, 1908-1980**, S. Akşin (ed.), pp. 191-261, İstanbul, Cem Yayınevi.
- ÖZEN, Tuğrul and Ş. Kuru (1998). **Turizm Yatırımları**, İstanbul, Özkan Ofset.
- PAMUK, Şevket (1999). "Dünya İktisadi Bunalımı ve 1930'lara Yeniden Bakış" in **Bilanço 1923-1998: "Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin 75 Yılına Toplu Bakış" Uluslararası Kongresi, II Cilt: Ekonomi, Toplum, Çevre**", pp. 33-40, İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- SARACOĞLU, Rüşdü (1994). "Liberalization of the Economy" in **Politics in the Third Turkish Republic**, M. Heper and A. Evin (eds.), pp. 63-76, Boulder, Westview Press.
- SEZER, H. and A. Harrison (1994). "Tourism in Greece and Turkey: An economic view for planners" in **Tourism: The State of the Art**, A. V. Seaton et. al. (eds.), pp.74-84.
- ŞAHİN, Adem (1990). **İktisadi Kalkınmadaki Önemi Bakımından Türkiye'de Turizm Sektöründeki Gelişmelerin Değerlendirilmesi**, Ankara, TOBB.
- ŞAHİN, Hüseyin (1997). **Türkiye Ekonomisi**, 4th Edition, Bursa, Ezgi Kitabevi.
- TARHAN, Cem (1998). **Tourism Policies**, Ankara, Bilkent University.
- TAŞAR, Mustafa (2001). "Turizm" in **Yeni Türkiye**, No42, pp. 1041-1048.
- TOKGÖZ, Erdinç (1997). **Türkiye'nin İktisadi Gelişme Tarihi 1914-1997**, 4th Edition, Ankara, İmaj.
- TOSUN, Cevat (1999). "An Analysis of the Economic Contribution of Inbound International Tourism in Turkey", in **Tourism Economics**, 5(3): 217-250.
- TOSUN, Cevat and C.L. Jenkins (1996). "Regional Planning Approaches to Tourism Development: the Case of Turkey" in **Tourism Management**, 17(7): 519-531.
- TURAN, İlter (1988). "Stages of Political Development in the Turkish Republic" in **Perspectives on Democratic Turkey**, E. Özbudun et al.(eds.), pp. 59-112, Ankara, Sevinç Matbaası.
- TÜRSAB (1997). 25. Yılında TÜRSAB, İstanbul.
- TÜRSAB (1998). **Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Seyahat Endüstrisi: Trendler, Beklentiler, İstatistikler**, İstanbul, Türsab.

*Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In
Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective*

TYD (Turizm Yatırımcıları Derneđi) (1992). **Turizm Yatırımlarının
Ekonomiye Katkıları** (Benefits of Tourism Investments on the
Economy), İstanbul, TYD.

YAŞA, Memduh (1980). **Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ekonomisi (1923-
1978)**, İstanbul, Akbank Kültür Yayını.