Questioning the Governance of Culture in Turkey
A Review of Literature

R. Gökçe Sanul
Geography Department, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Over the recent years cultural policy making has become one of the debatable issues in Turkey. On the one hand the existence of the inherited centralized state structure on the other hand required reorganization of the Turkish public administration in the way of adaptation to the European Union, unveil interesting debates concerning the governance of culture. However, the concept of governance, defined by Rosenau (1992) as "a system of rule that is dependent on intersubjective meanings as on formally sanctioned constitutions and charters", is worthy of consideration in the Turkish experience which differs with its historical background from the Western European examples. Accordingly, this paper asks in what ways do central-local relations and public-private collaboration shape current dynamics of the governance of culture in Turkey. In this context, a literature review will be conducted in three sections by: 1) looking at the cultural policies in Turkey from a historical perspective as well as articulating the impact of the European Union (EU) membership accession process 2) revealing the role of fundamental actors of cultural policy making 3) analyzing power relations among actors with a focus on central-local dichotomy and public-private collaboration.

1. Historical Background of Turkish Cultural Policies

It is beyond doubt that cultural policy making has a political process which depends on the historical and political background of each state. Accordingly, this section will introduce the three phases of the Turkish cultural policy formation, by emphasizing the impact of the EU accession process of Turkey, in the way of understanding the historical background shaping the central-local relations and public- private collaboration.

Defined as 'the Construction of a National Culture by the State', the first phase of the Turkish cultural policy was situated between 1920-1950 during which the young republic of Turkey was adopting the project of Westernization by trying to extend classical Western music, opera and ballet, theater etc. (Ince, 2011; Akdede, 2011). Under the one party system, Turkey had a highly centralized cultural policy vision through establishment of the 'centrally guided' state institutions like Turkish Historical Society and Turkish Language Institute.

The second era defined as the 'Political Segmentation and Polarisation Era', which took place between 1950-1980, was seen as a period in which cultural institutions were considered as the part of public service and under the responsibility of the State. In addition, the unevenness of the culture sector had started to appear followed by the uneven economic development in the big cities. During this period, Istanbul started to become favored with regard to the cultural sector and the first steps of the philanthropic investments were seen with the direct initiative of Eczacıbaşı Holding through its NGO called Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts (IKSV) in 1970s.

Last period was determined as 'The Globalisation and EU Integration Period' taking place starting from 1980s. First of all, with the introduction of 'metropolitan status' in 1984, metropolitan municipalities have become one of the the decision maker actors of the cultural policy in Turkey. Moreover, increasing effect of the civil society is seen one of the outputs of this period which should be considered within the scope of EU membership discourse (Ince, 2011).

Overall, 2000s have witnessed the most crucial discussions about the main orientation of the cultural policies. As Serhan Ada states, *"there are two possible explanations for this phenomenon: the steps that Turkey was taking to fulfill the requirements for EU membership and the regulation and promoting of the needs of the private sector, which had begun to invest in the cultural sector"* (Ada, 2009, p.102). In addition, Ada identifies two major external triggers of the official and written determination of the Turkish cultural policy as both the signing of the Participation Partnership between the EU Commission and Turkey and the declaration of Istanbul as a 2010 European Capital of Culture (ECoC).

On one hand, by developing a comparative analysis of the discourses on Turkish accession to EU through the process of 2010 ECoC, Rumelili and Cakmakli precipitate "While a variety of Turkish political actors have eagerly capitalized on the Capital of Culture title to present Turkey as culturally European, given the limited reception of such EU cultural initiatives, these representations have failed to achieve the necessary level of resonance to trigger debates in Europe" (Rumelili & Cakmaklı, 2011, p.114). On the other hand, the National Cultural Policy Report of Turkey, prepared by Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT) with respect to the Compendium[1] framework, presents the cohesiveness of the EU on the formation of the Turkish cultural policy as below:

"Turkey shares the aims and targets of European Union in terms of improving national culture and encouraging the preservation of the cultural diversity. Turkey also follows the EU policy related with enhancing the cooperation with EU member countries and organizations such as UNESCO and Council of Europe." (MoCT, 2013, p. 10).

Additionally, it is also possible to see the bindingness of EU cultural policies through the article, entitled *Cultural Policies in Europe: Debates and Dilemmas,* written by Fusun Ustel which presents a theoretical approach to the EU cultural policies by encompassing all the basic concepts and relevant discussions of the Turkish cultural policies, such as cultural participation, cultural rights, democratization of culture, cultural diversity (Ustel, 2011).

The last but not the least, Compendium, which is the information and monitoring system of European cultural policies, provides a framework for the significant researches conducted in Turkey. For instance, the first written document of cultural policy entitled *Turkish Cultural*

---

[1] Compendium system encompasses 9 chapters: Historical development, Main Objectives, Decisiopn-Making Processes, Current Policy Issues, Legal Frameworks, Cultural Infrastructures, Funding Provisions, Support toCreativity, Participation and Information Source.
http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/themes.php

Policy Report: a Civil Perspective which is prepared with the contribution of 185 civic people is compatible with the Compendium methodology. Moreover, *Istanbul Cultural Economy Compendium,* being the first reflection of these researches at the urban scale has served as a model for two other biggest cities of Turkey, namely Ankara and Izmir.

2. The Role of Fundamental Actors of the Cultural Governance

2.1 The role of the central government and its perspective on cultural policies

Being the principal actor of the cultural policy making in Turkey, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT) which was established as a New Ministry in 2003, comprises of the central, provincial and foreign organizations. Legal and institutional framework of cultural policies primarily refers to the law 'no 2863 Preserving Cultural and Natural Properties' which charges MoCT with a responsibility of the preservation of the cultural and natural properties (MoCT, 2013, p.7). In addition, the other articles attach importance to the roles of the institutions like Turkish Language and History Institution, Turkish Radio and Television Institution Corporation as well as to the preservation of the art and artists which are employed by the State Theaters, State Opera and Ballet and State Galleries of Fine Arts.

Table 1: The duties of MoCT

a) Investigate, develop, preserve, enhance, evaluate, spread, promote, adopt the national, moral, historical, cultural and touristic values and contribute to the strengthening of the national unity and economic growth,

b) Guide the public institutions and organizations on issues regarding culture and tourism, cooperate with these institutions and organizations, and improve the communication with the local authorities, nongovernmental organizations and the private sector,

c) Preserve historical and cultural properties,

d) Make use of, improve and market all the locations in the country which are available and convenient for tourism in order to make tourism a productive sector of the national economy,

e) Guide all types of investment, communication and development potential in the field of culture and tourism,

f) Provide the immoveable properties related with culture and tourism, publicize when required, and carry out the investigation, project and construction of them,

g) Carry out the promotion services related with culture and tourism by benefiting from all types of opportunities and facilities and perform activities to promote Turkey's touristic properties in all fields.

Source: MoCT, 2013, p.12-13

In addition, policy priorities stated in the 10th Development Plan addresses again primarily the protection of the Turkish culture and language through by giving priority to the collaborations with the countries having from the common culture. Some relevant articles showing this aim are as follow:

> *By enabling the support for the preservation of our cultural values and traditional arts will continue to be implemented.*
>
> *Our cultural relationship will be developed with world countries, notably with the countries having common historical background. The impact of the culture industry on national income, exports and contribution to the promotion of the country will be increased.*
>
> *The incentive mechanism will be created to handle the basic elements of our culture and values of the Turkish film industry.*
>
> *Due to the fact that the Turkish language is under the risk of losing its distinctive and fundamental characteristics because of the negative effects of foreign languages on Turkish language, it will be ensured that Turkish language especially in media institutions will be used actively and correctly in all areas of life (National Report, 2013, p 8-9).*

At this point, Akdede (2013) interprets form a critical perspective the 9th and 10th Development Plan by stating that for the current AKP government, the priority of the cultural field is to protect cultural heritage and to construct an identity. In addition, based on the important debates taking place in the media concerning the intention of the government for closing down the State's art institutions, Akdede criticizes those plans for not presenting any clear proposition and he highlights the quest of Turkey for finding its own peculiar cultural policy model. Another crucial interpretation related to the current government's perspective to cultural policy is expressed by Ada as "Turkey is mainly promoted abroad through traditional artwork and handicraft. This repetition of the so called 'traditional only' represents a vicious circle resulting in an inadequate involvement of contemporary art production" (Ada, 2011, p.6).

In other respects, Dragan Klaic draws attention to the underestimation of the cultural policies comparing with tourism strategies with the argument below:

> "With its odd name, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism implies that government sees culture primarily as a factor of tourist promotion rather than a developmental entitlement of the people living in Turkey. Of the Ministry's 2006 budget of 445 million euros, a huge part supposedly goes into tourist promotion. How much is left over for culture I could not find out, and nor could my Turkish colleagues" (Klaic, 2005,p.12).

The criticism raised about this issue in the *Review of Cultural policy in Turkey: Independent Experts' Report* calls attention to the same point by stating:

> "In particular we do not understand the rationales behind the Ministry's allocation of its annual budget between culture, tourism and heritage, let alone any subdivisions within these major responsibilities. With Tourism having a published development strategy and plan in English, it is possible to chart progress and some changing priorities for government expenditure. For 'culture' and 'the arts' we have nothing comparable (Expert Report, 2013, p.21).

The last but not the least, from a political economy perspective, Uymaz presents different cultural policy models within Europe based on their way of financing culture, and compares the share of central governments' investments in culture as well as the level of autonomy of the local administrations. Then, the analysis about Turkey reveals primarily the difficulty to compare the financing of culture with the European countries due to the limitations of data and secondly that the expenses of central government in culture have not been adopted according to the emerging needs of Turkey (Uymaz, 2013).

2.2 The role of local administrations and hierarchical structure among them

Before proceeding to the role of the local administrations, it should be mentioned the organization of MoCT at the urban scale. In this context, MoCT is represented in 81 Turkish cities through the Provincial Directorate for Culture and Tourism (PDCT). As stated in the Article on its establishment "PDCTs conduct the coordination duties given by the Ministry between other PDCTs and units directly related to the central organization of the Ministry such as Directorate General for Museums, Libraries, Art and Sculpture Museums, Orchestras and Choirs, Tourism and Education Centers, Fine Arts Galleries, Tourism Information" (MoCT, 2013).

In terms of the local governance, central government is organized in the form of 'province' at the urban scale. First, the most relevant actors of local administrations with regard to the cultural policy making are known as Special Provincial Administrations (SPA)[2]. Broadly, SPAs "offer services to the whole province, including to rural areas and urban settlements their main sphere of operation is related to cultural assets (protected areas, excavations, museums, etc.) which are located within their province"(Ada, 2011, p.4). More specifically, SPAs own responsibility in the maintenance and repair of the artefacts affiliated to MoCT, restoration of museums. Whereas the decision making body of SPAs, namely provincial assembly which have administrative and financial autonomy is elected by the electorate, the governor, who is the SPAs executive body, is appointed by the central government (Enlil & Aksoy, 2010). Accordingly, it should be stated that governor is also the executive body for the PDCT and is entitled to the operations of PDCT. Therefore, in the field of culture, the realm of authority of the governorships stands at the intersection of central governments and local administrations (IZKA, 2012, p.222).

Second, Metropolitan Municipalities, according to the 'no 5393 Act of Metropolitan Municipality' enacted on 03.07.2005, have become a public entity having financial and administrative autonomy. With regard to cultural field their areas of responsibilities include the services of culture, the arts, tourism, and the promotion within urban settlements as well as the development of social and cultural relationships and the protection of cultural assets.

The effect of both the central government and the local administrations on the cultural policies is defined as 'dual structure' of the cultural policy making (Aksoy&Enlil, 2010).

---

[2] According to the law no 6360 Provinces which have more than 750.000 people gain a metropolitan status and new district municipalities are established. Through this law amended on 13.03.2014, all the SPAs, taking place in metropolitan municipalities are closed down including provincial assembly being an elected body. The section numbered 2.2 refers to the literature which presents the condition before the amendment.

In order to understand the hierarchical organization among these actors we can refer some examples. For instance, one of the most important responsibilities of SPAs regarding to cultural field is the management of the taxes levied by Municipalities with respect to the Law 2863 "On the protection of Cultural and Natural Property'. In other words, it could infer that the disposal of this tax levied by Municipalities is under the control of the SPAs (Aksoy& Enlil, 2010, p.44). As the research of Ayca Ince sheds light in her article entitled *Cultural Policies and Local public Administrations:*

> "Following in depth interviews with these institutions, it became clear that because of the expanding responsibilities and competencies granted to them by the new Special Provincial Administration Law, SPA should be considered among the most influential public institutions in the cultural domain in the cities" (Ince, 2011, p.237).

2.3 The role of non-governmental organizations

Although the cultural field in Turkey is mostly shaped by public actors, the impact of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) has started to be more visible through the neoliberal policies of 1980s. In addition, due to the decision of European Council for opening accession negotiations with Turkey, NGOs have unarguably become one of the fundamental actors of the cultural policy making in Turkey since 2005. Within this scope, NGOs of the cultural field are defined by MoCT as "voluntary organizations with autonomous nature for benefit of society, contributing to social, political, cultural and financial development of state" (MoCT, 2013, p.17).

Aksoy and Enlil (2010) put forth the subcategories of the NGOs starting with private companies which perform in two different ways either as the corporations, which conduct the culture and arts activities within their organizations instead of incorporating (for example: Akbank Sanat, Siemens Art Gallery) or as the corporations which prefer to incorporate in the field of culture. The second category leads to the two different subcategories such as the incorporations of banks (for example: Garanti Kültür Inc., Yapı Kredi Culture and Arts Publications Inc.) or incorporations being in service of performance and visual arts like private museums, private theaters and art galleries.

In addition to the private companies, artist initiatives, which aim to create independent art production and shared artists space, as well as associations appear as other crucial subcategories of the NGOs. It should be stated that associations could also be separated in two subgroups. Whereas one group consists of cultural managers who intend to realize cultural production (for example: Çatı Contemporary Dance and Independent Dancers Association, Art Lovers f Istanbul) the other aims to defend the rights of occupational groups active in the cultural field and defined as merit-driven associations (for example: International Plastic Arts Association) (Aksoy &Enlil, 2010).

Another significant way of organization of private sector in the cultural sector is realized through the foundations such as Istanbul Culture and Arts Foundation, Vehbi Koç Foundation, Sabancı Foundation etc. Herein, Dervisoglu establishes a link between the structure of philanthropy in the Turkish business world with that of the 'Boston Brahmins' known as the cultural hereditary of English protestants, who are associated with the history of US cultural policies. Also mentioning that the private sector initiatives in art and culture

increased obviously starting from 2005, Dervisoglu gives green light to the idea that the priorities of the investments of private sector cover the aim of "understanding Western art, sharing its knowledge with people, and supporting the project of Westernization" (Dervisoglu, 2009, p.44).

Moreover, Kosemen analyzed the causes and the types of investments by conducting interviews with 10 effective actors of the private sector and reached to the conclusion that private sector considers the cultural field as a subsidiary of the existing areas of activities. According to the results, the essential factor behind their investment decision is determined as 'social prestige' and, the most used method is defined as the 'event sponsorship' (Kosemen, 2012, p.159).

Finally, the major problems of the NGOs in the cultural sector are identified by Deniz Ünsal as 1) fragmentation of the sector 2) limited management capacities 3) problems of sustainability 4) professionalism of staff 5) lack of determined cultural policies (Ünsal, 2006).

3. Towards Analyzing Power Relations among the Fundamental Actors of Cultural Policy-Making

3.1 Discussing local cultural policy making with a focus on decentralization

The process of Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture (ECoC) was a turning point not only for bringing forward the place of culture in such a big city attempting to succeed in globalization, but also for introducing a new cultural governance model introducing a bottom-up approach including diverse actors from the civil society, public and private sectors. One of the aims for providing a sustainable governance model, Istanbul European Culture of Capital Agency has suggested to have its own income from the fuel levy and consequently to reinforce its artistic independence. However, as a result, the central government supplied 95% of the funding by exerting control over the ECoC Agency and by resulting in the frustration and resignation of the independent cultural operators (Rampton et al., 2011). Therefore, as asserted in the *Ex-post Evaluation of 2010 European Capitals of Culture "state* bodies then came to exert effective control over ECOC to frustration of some of the independent cultural operators that had conceived the ECOC and developed original application   (Rampton et al., 2011, p.74).

Apart from the case of Istanbul, local cultural policy making has started to take place also in some Anatolian cities especially starting from the second half of 2000s. Dietachmair, Senior Programme Officer in European Cultural Foundation, provides a general framework for the role of shareholders of local cultural policy making in Anatolian cities by claiming that there isn't any developmental framework in existence including all actors on the local scene mentioning civil society, politicians, citizens, local economy and media. In addition, he also claims that the gap in the decentralization enables to emerge a more powerful civil society in the field of local cultural policy making. One of the key statements of this article, articulating a need in the Turkish cultural policy making process, comes to light with the following sentence:

> "A decentralized approach to cultural infrastructures and a focus on socio-cultural developments outside of Istanbul would automatically also bring along involvement with the political process which are gradually transforming the local structures determining cultural policy across Turkey" (Dietachmair, 2009,p.225).

Osman Kavala, founder of the Anadolu Kultur[3], attributes importance to the development of urban based cultural policies with a focus on the decentralization. By believing that the formation of the cultural policies in association with social and economic policies in several cities of Anatolia having a rich cultural heritage will contribute to the strengthening of a local identity in harmony with the modern concept of citizenship, Kavala asserts:

> "For a long time, centralized decision-making structures in Ankara have determined the policies concerning culture-as was the case in many other areas. On the other hand, Istanbul's cultural institutions and its artistic environment have developed alongside a prospering business and social life. It is a sad fact, however, that this modernization process, led by these two cities, has worked against the welfare of other Anatolian towns whose cultural lives have experienced a steady decline" (Kavala, 2009, p.214).

In this context, being the most comprehensive project on the local cultural policy making in Anatolian cities, called 'Invisible Cities: Building Capacities for Local Cultural Policy Transformation in Turkey' gave birth to the significant publications. First one is the *Local Cultural Policies Handbook: Steps, Tools and Case Studies* which aim to transfer the experiences gained from Anatolian cities during the project in terms of the local cultural policy making. Mostly formed by practical sections, this book aims mainly to "be useful for administrative units working on or engaged with arts and culture throughout Turkey as well as local civil society organizations and initiatives" (Erturk, 2011, p.10).

On the other hand, approaching from a more scientific perspective, the article entitled *Cultural Policies and Local Public Administration* stands in a prominent place for establishing a link between cultural policy formation and local governments. Written by Ayca Ince, the article puts forth the first research conducted in the three Anatolian cities namely, Kars, Antakya, Çanakkale, through in depth interviews with the representatives of four major public institutions of cultural governance, namely governorship, SPAs, municipalities and universities. Starting with the legal framework of Turkish public administration, the article highlights the gaps in the decentralization process which highly affects the local cultural policy making in the Turkish cities and reaches to the conclusion below:

> "the central government is simply transferring its unwieldy structure and expenses to local administrations. According to this approach, the reform as it stands is a dispersal of authority and budgets between governorships, SPAs and municipalities rather than act of autonomy […] However, the declared aim of devolving considerable authority and responsibilities from central to local administration has not been fully acted upon" (Ince, 2011, p.257).

---

[3] Anadolu Kültür was founded as a not-for-profit cultural institution in 2002 when individuals from various fields of the art world, the business world and civil society came together to support the production and sharing of culture and art in cities across Turkey and abroad.

3.2 Analysis of the power relations with a focus on central-local dichotomy and public-private collaboration

It is obvious that the current process of cultural policy making in Turkey is affected by two crucial phenomena: 1) Withdrawal of the government institutions by supporting the privatization of the cultural activities and 2) Attempts of decentralization for the cultural administration in the way of providing more sustainable urban regeneration. Based on them, Asu Aksoy introduces the necessity for the central government to leave management and organization of cultural institutions to local administrations as below:

> "We see that cultural programs and operations run by municipalities have rendered the central governance of culture ineffective and no longer meaningful. Festivals and similar organizations run by municipalities create a direct connection between local and international cultural domains and therefore make it possible to carry out central governance practices" (Aksoy, 2009, p.203).

However, another article written by Asu Aksoy and Kevin Robins which demonstrates how the attempts for decentralization couldn't be accomplished, sheds light on the collaboration between local administrations and central government through the renewal of historic areas and well-financed programs in the way of development of the city's cultural and tourism infrastructure. The major criticism of the article lies in the following statement:

> "On the political side, there is pressure from central government and from the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality to carry out large-scale renewal projects. Pressure to conform, that is to say, to what has become a standard, imposed model for urban development [...] In this complex force field of motivations and invested interests, there is minimal room for manoeuvre. Exceptionalism has no place in the overall planning logic in play. Local autonomy is not an issue to be addressed (Aksoy, Robins, 2011,p.11).

This critic validates also the concern depicted in the *Review of Cultural Policy in Turkey Independent Experts' Report.* It is explicitly argued "Turkey has a highly organized cultural policy system. Its dominant and centralized administration (both Ankara and through governorships) seems to us to create the risk of undervaluing local action even when this has full democratic legitimacy" (Gordon et al., 2013, p.20).

Moreover, Ince aims to analyze the cultural policies of AKP government considering the different founding bodies of cultural centers in Istanbul consisting of state, private sector, NGOs and municipalities. This article, enabling to make crucial inferences about the dynamics of cultural governance, sheds lights on both the central-local and public-private relations. According to Ince, cultural centers stand in an important place for analyzing the redistribution of power from the central government to the different local public organizations such as municipalities, special provincial administration, mukhtars, provinces and universities (Ince 2009).

On one hand, Ince claims that the field of culture is mostly dominated by municipal politics based on the analysis conducted on the cultural centers. A closer look into the Istanbul case makes explicit that " the blurring boundaries between the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and the district municipalities has made things easier and cut expenditure for same party

municipalities, while limiting the resource development and activities of district municipalities run by different parties" (Ince, 2010, p.109).

On the other hand, the cultural centers established by NGOs enable to analyze the public and private sector relations. Considering the investments of philanthropic family companies like Koc, Sabanci, Eczacıbası in the field of culture it is possible to observe that they are also present in the city through the cultural centers that they established. Accordingly, Ince's statement highlights the public-private relationship in the case of Istanbul:

> "Following the state's support for this field with incentives and sponsorships, the relationship has started to become double-sided one. The strategic maintenance of the relationship between state and the private sector is possible with their mutual feedback according to certain criteria"
> (Ince, 2010, p. 104).

Therefore, it is highly possible to observe through the operation of cultural centers that the state withdraws from the management by transferring the responsibility to the private sector and local administrations. However, as Ince states "while partially withdrawing from the field of culture, the government displays a conservative and populist attitude to the production of culture, deciding the contents of cultural centers through local administrations controlled by the AKP" (Ince, 2010, p.111).

The underlying reasons of this statement above are also depicted by Ince. Although municipalities gain more control on the cultural field, Ince asserts "the problems defined in the beginning have not been solved on the part of democratization yet. Thus the local governments are still dependent on central governments for the delegation of authorities and utilizable budget" (Ince, 2012, p.53). Similarly, the *Experts Report* reveals that their meetings held in four Anatolian cities, namely Mardin, Diyarbakir, Izmir and Trabzon have capital importance in observing the constraints of the local governments based on their reliance on central government for resources and support (Gordon et al., 2013, p.22). Due to this finding, experts defined the major need as an "improved relationship between Ankara and the local structures" (Gordon et al., 2013, p. 78).

By criticizing the lack of trust between central and local bodies, Experts Report attaches also importance to the increasing collaboration between public and private actors through the following statement:

"The National Report contains a section about NGOs, Foundations and Associations, referring to them as having 'very high potential' in expanding contemporary cultural and social development. This corresponds to what we heard, particularly from the Governorships we encountered – where it often seemed that more trust and potential for future development was being ascribed to them than on the basis of partnership with democratically-elected local government. Ankara seems to see NGOs in particular as key agents of civil society, ranked above the elected local authorities – although independent observers (such as the CLRAE) confirm our sense that democratic progress requires much greater delegation to the elected local authorities" (Gordon et al., 2013, p.23).

On the one hand, the statement above addresses the advantageous position of private sector comparing with local governments in terms of collaboration with central government; however, on the other hand, the relation between NGOs and public authorities is defined as a 'difficult marriage' by Deniz Ünsal despite the increasing number of collaboration (Ünsal, 2006, p.4).

At this point, significant empirical evidence could be presented from the case of Izmir pointing out this 'difficult marriage' of public and NGO actors. Being the third biggest city of Turkey, Izmir, has also the intention of rebuilding its city image through the bids for mega-events or flagship projects by attaching a particular importance to culture. One of the most distinct examples of conflict took place during the EXPO candidacy period. Based on the location of the EXPO site, the planning process of the site was the main reason of dispute between the officials from the central government and the Izmir Chamber of City Planners (CCP). Then, as Dündar claims:

> "CCP Izmir Branch has taken the conflict to the State Council by suing the Ministry of Culture and Tourism about the anticipated location of the EXPO site. The subject matter of the action was concerned with the existing planning proposals for the area, which was claimed by CCP to be contradictory to the proposed Fair use" (Dündar, 2010, p.62).

Another evidence is introduced by Sibel Yardımcı through the festivals, which are seen both as a tool of analysis for public-private collaboration and as an element which supports the integration of a city with the globe. Yardımcı touches upon the issue by stating:

> " Festivals act as an interface between public policies (the Metropolitan Municipality of Istanbul, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism) and private development, which, most often than not, conceive of urban space and culture in different ways […] Festivals perfectly fit this project, and are therefore increasingly 'instrumentalised' by different interest groups that have a stake in their organization, which believed that a more vibrant culture would enhance the flow of capital, attract tourists and professional workers, and as such boost economic process in Istanbul" (Yardımcı, 2007, p.5).

Bearing in mind that festivals are highly dependent on private funding, Yardımcı also expresses the possibility for causing controversy between sponsors and olitical/administrative bodies by claiming "more private funding may mean that this source of funding exerts a direct influence on what will be displayed-heard-acknowledged-problematized-criticized while others will remain hidden and ignored" (Yardımcı, 2007, p. 13).

4. Conclusion

Although it is seen that the EU membership discourse has an obvious impact, it is also crucial to consider the historical perspective for understanding the dynamics of the cultural governance in Turkey. Concerning the EU accession it could be said that this process has targeted 1) the reorganization of the public administration system by delegating more power to the local administrations 2) to open more space to the private sector for investing in the cultural sector. Therefore, due to the increasing number of actors which are included in the cultural policy making process, 'governance' has become one of the debatable issues of the cultural policies research agenda.

Considering the hierarchical scheme obtained as a result of the reviewed literature, it could be argued that at the local level, public actors which function as the representative of central government, mainly governorships, are more dominant than the elected bodies, namely municipalities. In addition, conflicts between governorship and municipalities, being from different political parties, could appear as obstacles in terms of the implementation of the cultural policies in Turkish cities. The last but not the least, despite of the 'difficult marriage' private actors appear as more preferable partners for the central government comparing to the municipalities.

However, increasing collaboration between private and public actors sets alarm bells ringing in terms of the uneven development of the cultural sector in big cities, particularly in Istanbul. In other words, the concentration of capital in Istanbul has resulted in the uneven growth of the cultural sector while the gap with other Anatolian cities has become bigger. Accordingly, it could be argued that this inequality has also been reflected on the researches. As being demonstrated in this review, the majority of the researches are conducted on the case of Istanbul whereas the Anatolian cities have been kept in the background.

Finally, it is also found out that most of the researches are not based on the scientific methodology in the Turkish case. For instance, recently used in 3 countries, namely France, Flanders (Belgium) and Catalonia (Spain), performance contracts, appear as one of the most solid methods in order to examine cultural governance. However, in Turkey, the inexistence of the contract based performance evaluation throughout the public arts institutions prevents the utilization of this method. Therefore, this paper, attaching importance to the necessity of the scientific outcome in Turkey, suggests as a further research, to examine the central-local relations through cultural policies in Anatolian cities. Within this scope, it is proposed to focus on cities governed by different political parties' municipalities, and to analyze the differentiation of their budget allocated to the culture; their power relations between governorships; and their collaboration with the private sector. In doing so, it is envisaged that the empirical evidence which will be obtained from the central-local relations analysis will contribute to the theoretical debates on the democratization of Turkey.

References

Ada, S. (2009). For a New Cultural Policy. In Ada, S.,& Ince. A. (Eds.), *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey* (pp.87-118). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Ada, S. (2011). Cultural Policy Development in Turkey: A Civic Perspective Report. Matra Project Invisible Cities: Building Capacities for Local Cultural Policy Transformation Conclusion Meeting, Istanbul Bilgi University, 25-26 March.

Ada, S.,& Ince, A. (2011). *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press

Aksoy, A. (2009). The Atatürk Cultural Centre and AKP's 'Mind Shift' Policy. In Ada, S.,& Ince. A. (Eds.), *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey* (pp.191-212). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Aksoy, A.,& Enlil, Z. (2010). *Istanbul Cultural Economy Compendium*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Aksoy, A.,& Robins, K. (2011). Changing Urban Cultural Governance in Istanbul: The Beyoglu Plan. Istanbul Cultural Policy and Management Research Centre Working Paper 1. Retrieved from http://bilgikpy.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/KPYWP1aksoyRobins.pdf

Gordon et al. (2013). *Review of Cultural Policy in Turkey: Independent Experts' Report* (Document for Information and Decision, item 3.1 of the draft agenda). Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Dervisoglu, G. (2009). Corporate Support on Art: A vicious or virtuous cycle? In *The Texts-11th Biennnial* (pp.39-55). Istanbul: Istanbul Foundation for Culture and Arts

Dietachmair, P. (2009). Cultural Capacities for Transformation: The European Cultural Foundation& Local Cultural Policy Development in Turkey. In Ada, S.,& Ince. A. (Eds.), Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey (pp.217-233). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Dündar, S.G. (2010). Rise of Culture and Fall of Planning in Izmir, Turkey. *PASOS 8(3)*, 51-66.

Ince, A. (2009).Cultural Policies and Local Public Administration. In Ada, S.,& Ince. A. (Eds.), *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey* (235-261). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Ince, A. (2010). Cultural Centres in Istanbul: Changing Cultural Policies in the 2000s. In Kutlu, U. Z., & Smithuijsen, C. (Eds.), *Cultural Policy and Management Yearbook 2010* (pp.97-112). Amsterdam, Boekmanstudies

Ince, A.& Öncü, A.& Ada,S. (2011). Cultural Policy in Turkey Today: Introduction and Overview. In Ada, S (Ed.) *Turkish Cultural Policy Report: a Civil Perspective* (pp. 191-200). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Izmir Kalkinma Ajansi (IZKA). (2012).Izmir Kultur Ekonomisi ve Kultur Altyapisi Envanteri ve IzmirKultur Ekonomisi Gelisme Stratejisi. Retrieved from

http://izka.org.tr/files/planlama/2_bolge_plani_dokumanlari/2014-2023/izmir_kultur_stratejisi.pdf

Klaic, D. (2005). *Istanbul's Cultural Constellation and Its European Prospects*. Retrieved from www.labforculture.org/en/content/.../Istanbul%20Report_D.Klaic.pdf

Kosemen, B. (2012). Turkiye'de Ozel sektorun Kultur ve Sanat Alanindaki Artan Gorunurlugu, *Marmara Universitesi I.I.B Dergisi 33(2),* 145-172.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT). (2013). *Cultural Policy in Turkey: National Report* (Document for Information, Item 3.1 of the draft agenda). Ankara.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism Department of the Supervisory Board. (2013). *Regulation on the Duties, Competencies, Working Principles of MoCT Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism.* Retrieved from http://teftis.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,14653/kultur-ve-turizm-bakanligi-il-kultur-ve-turizm-mudurluk-.html

Rampton et al. (2011). Ex-Post Evaluation of 2010 European Capitals of Culture (Final Report for the European Comission DG Education and Culture. Birmingham: ECORYS.

Rosenau, J. N. (1992). Governance, order and change in world politics. In: J. Rosenau/ E . - O. Czempiel (Eds.), *Governance without Government. Order and change in World Politics* (pp.1-29). Cambridge.

Rumelili, B. & Cakmaklı, D. (2011). 'Culture' in EU-Turkey Relations. In Batora, J.& Mokre, M. (Eds.), *Culture and External Relations* (pp.99-115). Farnham: Ashgate Publisihing Limited.

Schmitt, T. (2011). Cultural Governance as a Conceptual Framework. MMG WP 11-02. Retrieved from http://www.mmg.mpg.de/publications/working-papers/2011/wp-11-02/

Uldemolins, R., J. & Arostegui, R. A. (2013). The governance of national cultural organizations: comparative study of performance contracts with the main cultural organizations in England, France and Catalonia (Spain). *International Journal of Cultural Policy 19(2),* 249-269

Uymaz, B. (2013). Kuresel Kriz ve Kulturun Finansmani: AB Ornegi ve Turkiye Hakkinda Genel Bir Degerlendirme. *Ekonomik Yaklasim, 23(84),* 55-80.

Ünsal, D. (2006). *How to Talk about the Cultural Sector in Turkey.* Retrieved from http://www.labforculture.org/en/directory/contents/region-in-focus/turkey/how-to-talk-about-the-cultural-sector-in-turkey-by-deniz-%C3%BCnsal

Üstel, F. (2009). Cultural Policies in Europe: Debates and Dilemmas. *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey* (pp.7-25). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Yardımcı, S. (2007). Festivalising Difference: Privatisation of Culture and Symbolic Exclusion in Istanbul. European University Institute Working Papers RSCAS 2007/35. Retrieved from http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/7670/RSCAS_2007_35.pdf?sequence=1