

available at www.sciencedirect.comwww.elsevier.com/locate/ecocon

ANALYSIS

Public participation in forestry in Turkey

Erdoğan Atmiş^{a,*}, Sezgin Özden^b, Wietze Lise^c^aFaculty of Forestry of Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Bartın, Turkey^bFaculty of Forestry of Ankara University, Cankiri, Turkey^cEnergy Markets and International Environmental Policy Group, Policy Studies, Energy Research Centre of the Netherlands (ECN), Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 9 September 2005

Received in revised form

20 June 2006

Accepted 6 July 2006

Available online 9 August 2006

Keywords:

Forestry

Public participation

Turkey

Stakeholders

Community forestry

JEL classification:

Q23

Q28

ABSTRACT

Recently public participation in forestry has been seriously considered in Turkey. Participation is however quite a challenge for a country with a long tradition of top-down management and a strong bottom-up dependence on public provisioning. In such a setting, it may not be surprising that the experiences with public participation in forestry in Turkey are mixed. There are some positive initiatives like the creation of farmer's cooperatives and NGOs, but their role is quite limited and small of scale. This paper is bringing together different views based on existing studies in Turkish related to Turkey's experience with implementing public participation in forestry.

© 2006 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

During the National Forestry Congress held in 2003 in Ankara, participation was the main topic of discussion (Anonymous, 2003a). One of the main outcomes of this Congress is that public participation in forestry is considered an important issue. This shows that the issue of participation has recently been put higher on the political agenda in Turkey.

It is well known that forestry becomes more efficient with a well-balanced involvement of all relevant stakeholders (Lise, in press; Poteete and Ostrom, 2002). This paper studies the possibilities for implementing Agenda 21 of the Rio conference

in 1992, which can also be of interest for other countries which have gone through similar processes as Turkey. Public participation can be a tool for enhancing sustainable forestry (ILO, 2000). In a modern sense, public participation is a voluntary process where people, individually or through organised groups, can exchange information, express opinions and articulate interests, and have the potential to influence decisions or the outcome of the matter at hand (ILO, 2000).

Public participation is most effective when it is based on mutual trust, improved communication and cooperation among all people involved in the process. This may contribute to sustainable forestry by increasing public awareness,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90 378 2277422; fax: +90 378 2277421.

E-mail addresses: atmis@foresteconomics.org, doganatmis@hotmail.com (E. Atmiş).

increasing benefits from forests, sharing of costs and benefits in an equitable way, and enhancing the social acceptance of sustainable forestry (Düzgün, 2003).

But what have been the experiences with public participation in forestry in Turkey? During the reign of the Ottoman empire there was restricted protection of the forests including the empire's game areas; the forest was used for the construction of naval ships and private forests. Although the Padishah was the owner of the forest, the adjacent villagers were free to use the forests as they wanted. This became a good breeding ground for community forestry where villagers built up a wealth of local knowledge on how to use forests sustainably. From 1870 onwards the policy of free access slowly by slowly moved into the direction of more protection. This led to the first Forestry Law in 1937 during the rule of Atatürk.

Limiting the free use of forests commenced in 1870 and continued until law no. 4785 was implemented in 1945. The state became the sole owner of the forests by this law. However, this law still permitted the people to use the forests. As a protest major forest fires occurred between 1945 and 1947 to such an extent that about 350,000 ha got burnt all over Turkey, with the most severe impact in the Mediterranean region (Anonymous, 1973). In contrary to experiences in, for instance, Northern India where forest use rights were restored partially after forest fires in the 1930s (e.g. Lise, *in press*), there was no response from the government. Near to the parliamentary election in 1950, the Republican People's Party (CHP) government gave up the policy of nationalising forest ownership. The newly created Democratic Party of Adnan Menderes achieved victory over the ruling CHP in the parliamentary election by promising the villagers more rights in the forests. These rights were formalised in the so-called last Forest Law no. 6831 in 1956. This law has been amended at various occasions afterwards. In the period until the 90s the local people had to face uncertainty over their ability to access the forests, as the entry rules changed as often as did the government. Hence, in the past people had rights in the forests to a large extent, but this has been reduced considerably over time with various governmental decisions. Nevertheless, some instances of public participation are still present in Turkey.

Both the book "Our Common Future" (WCED - 1987) and the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in 1992, leading to Agenda 21, stressed that global environmental problems are important and they underlined that deforestation is a very important part of them. These events changed the traditional way of managing forest resources also with the help of international cooperation. This also had an impact on Turkey where political parties started including the term participation explicitly into their election programmes. In addition, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), universities and working unions also started to exert pressure.

Yet, in most countries, forest dependent communities are not major players in the legal arena. As a result, their interests are still unreflected in national laws and judicial decisions concerning forestry. This argument is also valid for Turkish forest legislation. Therefore, it is a must to determine the gaps in forest legislation and to revise the legislation to make public participation possible (Coşkun and Elvan, 2003).

The current practice is that villagers can use forests adjacent to villages informally. Besides the state forest

protection policy, protection is taking place by denying the entry of people from other villages. Local villagers have traditionally managed their forests and still do this in the forested areas of Turkey, namely in the Mediterranean, Aegean, Marmara and Black Sea regions.

Turkey is working towards including sustainable forestry into their forestry policies. However, Turkey has often tried to implement 'Western' ideas without questioning them. Consequently, they often fail to implement them in accordance with local conditions in the full sense, as it was merely introduced in the administrative system, without the public opinion. As a result, these Western ideas failed to gain public support and even sometimes caused additional chaos. In this context, there is a need to analyse public participation, as a tool for rural development in Turkey.

Participation in forestry is a relatively new idea for Turkey, which has been discussed among various interest groups. The lack of consensus on its contents caused important problems for implementation. To implement participatory forestry into Turkish forestry, the current forestry laws and forestry organisations in Turkey need to be re-shaped and adjusted. Although the Turkish laws allow individuals to own forest areas as a private property, in practice 99.9% of the forests in Turkey are owned by the state and administered by state-owned enterprises. At present it is difficult to say to which extent interest groups have been involved in forestry. In this study, the Forestry Organisation and various interest groups have been researched. Furthermore, this study evaluates to which extent these interests groups have been involved in forestry in Turkey.

This study puts the interest groups in Turkey under the category of forest management authority, local participation, women and youth, and non-governmental organisations. This article critically reviews forest management authorities and interest groups in terms of their relation to actual participation.

The analysis of this paper suggests how the current set-up of the Forestry Organisation can be used to achieve more participation. For instance, the current practices of the Forestry Organisation often lead to exclusion of indigenous people from the forest.

The main research questions of this paper are: How can the level of participation in forestry in Turkey be improved? Thereupon the remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 focuses on the experiences with public participation in forestry in Turkey from the perspective of four stakeholders, namely the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, rural and urban public participation, participation of women and youth and the role of NGOs and forestry cooperatives. The method of research is bringing together different views, mainly based on existing studies in Turkish. Section 3 concludes and points out ways for improving the level of public participation in forestry in Turkey.

2. Public participation in forestry

2.1. The Forestry Organisation

The Forestry Organisation has been established in the middle of the nineteenth century in Turkey. Until 2003, the authority in charge of managing the Turkish forests was the Ministry of Forestry. In 2003 this ministry merged with the Ministry of

Environment to create the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The Ministry of Environment and Forestry controls the state-owned enterprises which are in charge of various forestry activities: 1) General Directorate of Forestry, 2) General Directorate of Reforestation and Erosion Control, 3) General Directorate of Nature Protection and National Parks and 4) General Directorate of Forest and Village Relations. They are known as the umbrella directorates of the Forestry Organisation. Erdönmez and Coşkun (2003) claim that having four different directorates is not efficient in terms of economics, time planning and work power.

The Forestry Organisation, presently situated in the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, specialises on several forestry issues and is present in every region of Turkey. In addition, the Forestry Organisation has a long historical background and is the most powerful organisation among the Middle East, Balkan countries, Caucasian countries and central Asian republics (Anonymous, 2003b). There are links with many interest groups due to the large organisational structure and experienced staff.

Yet, the current organisational structure, traditional forestry education and wood-based production techniques can be argued to be inflexible and not keen in adopting a new forestry role and meeting public expectations from the forestry sector (Doğru and Özüğür, 2003). Nevertheless, participation can be considered to be an opportunity for the administrators to share their powers with the society, while individuals can influence the decision-making process (Özden, 2003).

Review of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry reveals that none of them has participatory organisational structures. At the central level, the one and only organ that is allowed to participate in decision-making is the Forestry Council acting as an advising board for the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. Regulations of the Ministry require the Forestry Council to hold a meeting every five years, but the last meeting dates from 1993. In 2005, there was held an environment and forestry council in which the participation of scientists and NGOs was poor. The organisational structure does not facilitate local participation of forest users in decisions and implementation thereof at the local level. Therefore, the Forestry Organisation has a structure to enable only a few persons to make the decisions and to ensure the same to be implemented under the responsibility of only a few persons, instead of inviting interest groups to participate in the decision-making and implementation process.

The Forestry Organisation is not open to participation in terms of even its own structure, let alone to call other interest groups to participate. The Forestry Organisation does not allow its own personnel even to make comments about technical issues, and demands them to abide by the orders given to them. In other words, what we have in Forestry Organisation is a structure,

“...where the dominant approach of the organisation and management is to manage by means of centrally made decisions...”

Furthermore, it is commented that

“Especially the management staff of the Forestry Organisation are under immense political pressure, promotions

are made in accordance with the short-term interests of the politicians, central-level and political decisions are given priority, and its structure does not allow the management staff to make decisions by taking into consideration any local conditions, technical, economic and social requirements.” (Daşdemir, 1999).

In another study, 56% of the total 52 directors and deputy directors of the Forestry Organisation interviewed comment that they are unable to use their knowledge, principles, ideas or experience while performing their duties. As the reason, 45% of them cite political pressures, and 25% cite the excessive centralisation and organisational pressures (Daşdemir, 1998).

And those excluded from participating in the decision-making machine are not limited to the management staff. In another study, 179 forest engineers working at various levels under management were interviewed. They stated that most of them suffer under the pressure exerted by central management and they are not allowed to perform their duties in a manner that gives priority to technical and socio-economic relationships (Atmiş, 2001a).

The Forestry Organisation wants to implement the notion of participation for its own good and ignores thousands of petitions submitted by friends of the environment at times, and obtains approval signatures for some projects from certain interest groups at other times.

Interest groups are not selected in a correct way. The Forestry Organisation only takes the villagers living in and around forests and a few NGOs into consideration. The issue of relations between forests and the public is merely used as a tool to focus on forest dwellers and to raise their living standards. Although many citizens are aware of the socio-cultural aspects of forests, the Forestry Organisation does not look beyond villagers living in and around forests, who comprise only 10% of the population, while the remaining portion of the public can have expectations from the forests, and such expectations might differ in terms of regions, magnitude of settlement areas, development level, educational level, gender and age groups.

Interest groups can be treated in a biased manner. The Forestry Organisation usually selects non-governmental organisations which are not likely to raise objections to its applications or which can provide the support of the media with which it can cooperate.

Oppression and force can be exerted against civilians. As the culture of democracy leads to more and more concessive viewpoints and makes the administrations open to criticism through the participative management approach, the Forestry Organisation follows the opposite path. For example, members of the Chamber of Forest Engineers who criticise the Forestry Organisation can find themselves seconded to remote cities on the grounds that they are civil servants and the Forest Organisation sometimes files legal complaints with the justice authorities against individuals who are organised to react against certain forestry practices.

The Forestry Organisation is unable to predict the people's expectations. The reason of this failure is the existence of a unilateral relationship between the Forestry Organisation and the public. Instead of trying to predict the public's expectations, the Forestry Organisation prefers to enforce its own

ideas. For example, a number of village representatives who attended the Convention of Forest Villages held in 1998 reported that they

“...were forced to read out the texts written by the representatives of the Forestry Organisation in their own areas” (Türker, 2002).

Sufficient promotional and public relation activities cannot be performed. The Forestry Organisation is neither able to select its target population in a correct way, nor able to predict the public's expectations accurately, nor able to make its own public relations department function efficiently, nor able to select the correct public relation tools. Therefore, the Forestry Organisation fails to convey its messages concerning the forests to the public. For instance, the Forestry Organisation has been solving very important forestry problems such as protection of forests and increasing its quality and quantity. But these successes cannot be conveyed to the people due to inappropriate skills. Specialists comment that the Forestry Organisation's failure to establish efficient public relations is because of the following reasons:

“The Forestry Organisation does not have any publication and promotional plans, does not know much about the target population, does not employ a sufficient number of qualified personnel, its inventory of vehicles and equipment is insufficient, its office spaces are insufficient, it fails to make good cooperation and coordination, and especially its offices located outside the big cities are not well equipped for publication and promotional activities.” (Özdönmez et al., 1999)

A number of new notions are introduced into the agenda of forestry policies, especially after the Rio conference, without thorough review and without adaptation of the organisational structure. For example, the existing structure of the Forestry Organisation is not able to implement the notion of participation, but the National Forestry Program (Anonymous, 2003b), which is under preparation, gives priority to the notion of participation. The first draft of the National Forestry Program sets forth ten principles of national forestry including ‘participation, respecting the indigenous people's rights, transparency, coordination, and cooperation’. Hence five out of ten principles are somehow related to participation. The draft also states that the forests will be managed

“...with participation of and cooperation with indigenous people, non-governmental organisations, private sector companies, municipalities, universities, other public enterprises, and interest groups.”

Furthermore, each chapter of the draft gives details about cooperation with the parties listed above for reforestation, erosion control, watershed rehabilitation, valuation of wood and non-wood forest goods and services, reduction of poverty in forest villages, measures against biotic or a-biotic agents, clearing of forests and settlement within forests. The fact that public participation in forestry, which is modern but difficult to achieve within the existing structure of the Forestry Organisa-

tion, has been included in the forestry activities so widely, without thorough review, raises questions as to how the Forestry Organisation can bring about such drastic changes. It also does not take into account how the Turkish forestry officials react to such changes.

The present law in Turkey is of a central management type, where the contribution of society and NGOs to forest management is omitted to a great extent (Erdönmez and Coşkun, 2003). It is obvious that a strong public forest administration is needed when almost all forests are owned by the state. But, pressures from politicians on the Forestry Organisation can affect the efforts negatively to achieve this aim (Erdönmez and Coşkun, 2003).

2.2. Local participation

Experiences from the past led forest officials to develop and employ various methods to move indigenous people away from forests on grounds that they damage them. Employment performed by the Forestry Organisation not only failed to ensure that such indigenous people would consider forests an indispensable source for their own livelihood, but also alienated them from the forests.

However, it is reported that moving indigenous people away from the forests leads to a shortage of seasonal workers who are needed for various forestry tasks (Çalikoğlu, 1993). Moreover, without indigenous people around, some opportunists can find it easier to commit illegal activities like cutting trees and other offences; thus circumstances that might lead to forest damage increase (Warner, 1997). Exclusion of indigenous people from forest planning and management harms both the symbiotic relations which otherwise exist between them and the forests, and the immaterial and ecological relations arising from these relations (Carino, 1997). Experiences in the past clearly indicate that forest activities carried out without participation of indigenous people lead to unexpected and undesirable outcomes on the one hand, and are not sustainable in the long term on the other hand (Saltık, 1998).

Public participation does not only concern forest dwellers. People who live in villages, towns, suburbs, cities and metropolitan centres, located away from the forests, have expectations from the forests too, to such an extent that some of the expectations may contradict with the expectations of forest villagers. In fact, urban people can get closely related to forests. Therefore,

“The relationship between forests and the community falls into categories, namely the relations between the rural people including forest dwellers and the forests, and the ones between the urban people and the forests” (Ekizoğlu, 1997).

Urbanisation is particularly rapid in Turkey, leading to demographic changes. As of 2000, 70% of the Turkish population has settled in cities and suburbs. As most of the population moves to urban centres, certain problems arise and can cause the urban people to change their traditional views towards forests and their expectations from the forests (Atmiş, 1999). Once these people learn about the socio-cultural services

provided by forests, their expectations will continue to increase and diversify. Such expectations can lead to positive and negative outcomes. For example, unless the authorities develop sufficient recreational areas to meet the public's demand, forest areas may suffer negative pressures.

Most of the forest dwellers prefer to move to urban areas to escape from the perennial poverty of rural areas and to enjoy better employment, education, healthcare and comfortable conditions of the urban areas. Such demographic changes cause the population of forest dwellers to decrease dramatically. This decrease happens in spite of the rapid increase of the total population. In 2004, there are 20,080 forest villages in Turkey with a total population of 7,544,000. The development of the number of forest dwellers and the total population over time is shown in Table 1 (Atmiş, 2004).

Some of the laws and regulations allow investors to build houses, factories and roads in forests, to construct high-voltage power lines, and to build private schools and hotels, and some people choose to ignore legal vacuums. Unless the public's sensitivity to forests increases, such developments will continue to damage forests. In order to be able to have a successful campaign against this city-originated destruction of forests, urban people should be more aware of the importance of forests and develop organised decision-making and implementation mechanisms. However, most urban people are not sensitive to environmental issues, and environmental preservation associations only have a few members. For example, a survey conducted in the town of Bartın indicates that only 2% of the interviewees are members of an environmental or forestry association, moreover, most of the members belong to a hunting society or the chambers of trade (Atmiş, 1999).

Statistics indicate that forest dwellers constitute the poorest class of the population in socio-economic terms. For many years the Forestry Organisation sought ways to separate forest dwellers from their forests by accusing them of clearing trees for the purpose of settlement, smuggling, grazing, etc. and therefore damaging the forests. The current forest law even allows the authorities to drive such dwellers away from their villages if they are unable to improve their living standard at the local level. They have tried to improve the conditions of those who remain in their villages by using insufficient funds and the often-poor facilities available to the Forestry Organisation. Hence, the Forestry Organisation did not have a good impact here, but it also shows that they were quite well organised and had the power to enforce their decisions.

In Turkey, another important organisational structure is available to forest dwellers, namely agricultural development

cooperatives, which acts in the forestry field. 290,000 forest dwellers are members to a total of 2123 forestry cooperatives, which constitute only 4% of the entire forestry population. Hence, here we find existing power with the local people, which may be rare, but is very important for basing new participatory processes on and adapting it to the Turkish situation. However, considering that each member represents the interests of his/her household, the actual number is higher. Nevertheless, the scope of most of the cooperatives is limited with finding woodcutters in order to produce fuel wood under supervision of the Forestry Organisation.

Since the business scope of agricultural development cooperatives acting in forests is narrow, one might say that in time they lose their collective and participative aspects and focus on utilising some of the rights granted to them by the applicable laws. Furthermore, one might say that if and when these cooperatives realise a participatory and organisational structure, they will be able to undertake an important role in providing non-fuel wood products and socio-cultural services like recreation and eco-tourism.

2.3. Involvement of Women and Youth

Capacities, viewpoints and contributions especially of women were underrated or ignored for a long time in terms of utilisation and management of natural resources. In some cases, women's opinions and viewpoints were not even respected. This kept women from enjoying basic rights and responsibilities such as education and ownership of property to such an extent that in certain countries women were not allowed to own lands by purchase or heritage, to be respected, to get involved in political activities, and act as a decision-maker in the society (UNPF, 1996).

Women suffer most from environmental disasters and reduced availability of forest products. It is the women and children who collect fuel wood, animal fodder, decayed leaves and other forest products. Furthermore, they are responsible for tending sheep, goats and other domestic animals owned by their families (Molnar, 1987).

Participation of women and youth in management of forests in Turkey is an issue, which should be emphasised and not be neglected. Women and youth can play important roles, due to their close relationship with forests (Atmiş et al., in press).

In Turkey, the level of education of most women living in rural areas is very low. Differences in the level of education influence people's view on forests. For instance, uneducated people demand much more material products from forests than other classes. The main reason for this is that the women living in rural areas mainly collect fuel wood and other forest products and tend domestic animals, which they consider the main benefits from the forests. In spite of this, it is observed that women retreat when forest dwellers clash with the Forest Organisation, and that they commit fewer forest offences than men (Atmiş, 1998, 2003).

The youth's views on forests are based on common expectations and forestry services. The youth tend to see forests as very precious rather than a source of material products. This is partly because of the higher education level

Table 1 – Change in numbers of forest population and total population from 1970 to 2004 (Atmiş, 2004)

Years	Forest village population	Change (%)	Total population	Change (%)
1970	7,954,000	–	35,605,000	–
1975	9,332,000	17.3	40,348,000	13.3
1980	9,500,000	1.8	44,737,000	10.9
1985	10,161,000	7.0	50,664,000	13.2
1990	9,117,000	–10.3	56,473,000	11.5
1997	7,145,000	–21.6	63,989,000	13.3
2000	7,378,000	3.3	67,803,000	6.0
2004	7,544,000	2.3	72,003,000	6.2

of the youth as compared to previous generations (Atmiş, 1999, 2001b). Hence the next generation may do better.

Rural youth, especially living in forest villages, are inclined to migrate to cities in order to have better education and to find jobs rather than having to live and work under uneasy village conditions. However, if the authorities take measures to emphasise the collective benefits of the forests and create jobs in such fields as eco-tourism where young and educated manpower is needed, some youngsters may choose to remain in their home village and protect and manage forests.

The youth are not limited to those living in rural areas. The youth living in cities can also play efficient roles in managing forests by means of environment- and forest-based lessons to be included in the curriculum of primary and secondary schools. College students can initiate groups and voluntary establishments could emerge to organise them.

2.4. Non-governmental organisations

Many forestry organisations still suffer intolerance and restrictions with regard to their efforts to persuade the Forestry Organisation to adopt a new role for supporting the local people to manage forests. This caused non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to gain importance in many participatory forestry programs. NGOs make it easier to undergo changes at the village level, train the relevant civil servants, due to their skills to organise the society, and act like a mediator between the users and the state. Moreover, NGOs help to establish better communication for the purpose of participative forestry activities. Better communication becomes more and more important in transferring technologies, increasing the sensitivity of the public, and assisting the related parties to develop negotiation skills about the management of forest resources (Arnold, 1997).

NGOs involved in the forestry field in Turkey can be divided into three categories: vocational associations, voluntary organisations involved in environmental and forestry issues, and labour unions. Vocational associations include the Chamber of Forest Engineers and the Society of Turkish Foresters. Voluntary organisations, which managed to gain prominence at the national level, include such associations or foundations as the Foundation for Protection and Promotion of the Environmental and Cultural Heritage (ÇEKÜL in Turkish acronym), the Turkish Society for the Conservation of Nature (DHKD, now WWF), the Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats (TEMA), and the Environmental Foundation of Turkey (TÇV). Labour unions include the old unions for blue-collar people and the new established unions for white-collar people.

The non-governmental organisations mentioned above have taken responsibility for participation in the management of forests long before the Forestry Organisation subscribed to its importance. Some of them use financial support provided by the World Bank, United Nations, FAO and the European Union and some others use their own funds with or without cooperation with the Forest Organisation to develop projects on development of rural areas, prevention of erosion, (re)forestation, restoration of meadows and watersheds, preservation of forest eco-systems and biological diversity, development of national parks, organising eco-tourism activities, training the management staff of forestry cooperatives, and

raising public awareness. They also organise and hold various conferences, panels, meetings and symposiums, and publish a number of reports, magazines and books.

One might comment that the Turkish NGOs could not achieve as much success as they wanted due to both their own structures and some other reasons arising from social conditions. Turkey is developing a participatory democratic system including all of its institutions and organs. In this context, Turkish citizens are hesitant in becoming members of NGOs or in joining the activities carried out by them. Furthermore, NGOs are unable to enjoy wide-range support from the public, so that they have to put the workload on the shoulders of a handful of volunteers. It is observed that especially unions fail to adopt the principle of participative management.

It is known that the nation-wide voluntary organisations are mainly located in large cities like Ankara and Istanbul. Often when they develop countrywide projects, they fail in rural areas in terms of organising the people and persuading them to participate, and consequently do not reach many classes of the population. Moreover, local voluntary organisations possess neither sufficient knowledge nor facilities and means to implement their decisions.

It is also observed that voluntary organisations fail to cooperate and coordinate with each other with regard to forestry problems, they find themselves drawn into various conflicts and therefore they cannot act in an efficient way.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

The experiences with public participation in forestry in Turkey are mixed. There are some positive initiatives like the creation of farmer's cooperatives and NGOs, but their role is quite limited and small of scale. This paper has brought together different views based on existing studies in Turkish related to Turkey's experience with implementing public participation in forestry.

Participatory management may increase efficiency, and capacity of an organisation, expands the horizons of its management staff and leaders, and can lead to a more transparent decision-making process. Participation is an instrument to facilitate decision-making and information flow processes. It circulates information among members of an organisation, so that various inputs can be obtained to increase the quality of decision-making. Each member of an organisation specialises in his/her own field of expertise. Participatory management is a unique system where participants of the decision-making process are presented with such specialised knowledge (Cludts, 1999). In order to ensure successful participation in forestry in Turkey, its implementation has to be carefully re-shaped and adjusted to local conditions.

The review of participation in forestry in this paper indicates a number of issues for Turkey:

- The public's knowledge about forestry issues is low; various groups of the society have different expectations from the forest that may contradict with each other, so much that they are even divided among themselves.
- Forest products and services are not yet considered as multi-purpose benefits; production of fuel wood is still considered the major benefit.

- No incentive systems have been established to encourage participation in the decision-making and implementation processes, decisions are usually made under political pressures and on an individual basis.
- Forestry policies, plans and implementation are not known by the public, let alone accepted by the public. Hence, the decision-making process is not transparent.

Participation in forestry appears in two basic forms. It is observed in some countries where a mutual relationship is established between the forestry organisation and the public, the public's demands are noted, cooperation with non-governmental organisations is established, interest groups are allowed to participate in various planning and implementation stages, and the forestry organisation is ensured to have a transparent, efficient and swift structure. In some other countries, however, participation is considered as a process of transferring the right to manage the state-property forests to user groups subject to certain restrictions.

A participation model, implemented with various sections of the society that have limited knowledge of forests, are not sensitive towards forests and are not organised is representative of the current situation in Turkey. Such implementation might cause unbalanced participation on the one hand and give irreparable damages to the forests on the other hand.

Given the education level and different socio-economic levels of the forest dwellers, it is understood that various groups of these forest dwellers will have their own different expectations, and that the idea of a single-dimension local participation will not be successfully implemented.

Let us now address the main research question: How can the level of participation be improved in Turkey? Improvements are likely when forest dwellers are aware of the socio-cultural services provided by their forests, share their traditional knowledge on the forests with the Forestry Organisation, participate in the preservation and management of the forests, spend time and efforts for the said purposes, take the society's benefits into consideration, and are organised.

Participation in forestry should be reviewed in a more detailed way for all of its aspects in Turkey. And this review should be made through a participatory approach, with the participation of all interest groups. Participation in forestry should become a method employed by the Forestry Organisation as a whole, rather than turning it into a sine qua non rule for the management of forests.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful for the useful and thoughtful comments of two anonymous referees.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous, 1973. Cumhuriyetimizin 50. Yılında Ormancılığımız (Turkey's Forestry in the 50. Anniversary of the Republic). Forestry Ministry Publication, Publication Number 187/145; 102.
- Anonymous, 2003a. II. Ulusal Ormanlık Kongresi—Türkiye Ormanlarının Yönetimi ve Katılım (II. National Forestry

- Congress—Management and Participation in Turkey's Forestry). 19–20 March 2003, Proceedings, Published by the Society of Turkish Foresters, ISBN 975-93478-2-2, Ankara, 502 pp.
- Anonymous, 2003b. Ulusal Ormanlık Programı—2. Taslak- (National Forestry Programme Report—2. Draft-). <http://www.ogm.gov.tr>, accessed in February 2005.
- Arnold, J.E.M., 1997. Social Dimensions of Forestry's Contribution to Sustainable Development. Proceedings of the XI World Forestry Congress, 13–22 October 1997, Antalya, vol. 5, pp. 3–23.
- Atmiş, E., 1998. Bartın'da Ormanlık ve Toplumun Ormanlıktan Beklentilerinin Karşılama Düzeyi (Forestry and Supply Degree of Demand for Forests in Bartın). Istanbul University Natural Sciences Institute, Unpublished PhD thesis, Istanbul, 121 pp.
- Atmiş, E., 1999. Orman Toplum İlişkilerine Farklı Bir Bakış: Kentlinin Ormana Yaklaşımı-Bartın Örneği (A different approach to forest-public relations). Review of the Bartın Faculty of Forestry 1 (2), 56–68.
- Atmiş, E., 2001a. Tasrada Mühendisin Çığılığı Duyulmaz (Forest engineer's scream in countryside). The Journal of Forest and Hunting, Published by The Society of Turkish Foresters, 2001/3; 22–26.
- Atmiş, E., 2001b. Sürdürülebilir Ormanlıkta Halk Katılımının İlk Aşaması: Toplumun Beklentilerinin Tespiti (The first stage of the public involvement in sustainable forestry: determination of the public demands). I. National Forestry Congress Proceedings, 19–20 March 2001. Society of Turkish Foresters, Ankara, pp. 218–233.
- Atmiş, E., 2003. Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Ormanlıkta Katılım (Participation in forestry in the world and in Turkey). II. National Forestry Congress Proceedings, 19–20 March 2003. Society of Turkish Foresters, Ankara, pp. 81–101.
- Atmiş, E., 2004. Ormanlar Üzerindeki Kent Kökenli Baskılar ve Kentli Duyarlılığı (Urban based pressures on forests and urban sensitivity). I. National Urban Forestry Congress Proceedings, 9–11 April. Society of Turkish Foresters, Ankara, pp. 401–413.
- Atmiş, E., Daşdemir, İ., Lise, W., Yıldırım, Ö., in press. Factors affecting women's participation in forestry in Turkey. *Ecological Economics*.
- Çalikoğlu, T., 1993. Kırsal Sanayiinin Orman Köylüleri ve Köylüleri İçin Önemi, Yeri ve Türkiye'de Kırsal Sanayiinin Durumu (The importance of rural industry for forest villages and villagers). Proceedings of DPT Rural Industry Symposium, Ankara, pp. 93–113.
- Carino, J., 1997. Indigenous peoples, forest dwellers, women and local communities. Proceedings of the XI World Forestry Congress. 13–22 October 1997, Antalya, vol. 5, pp. 143–153.
- Cludts, S., 1999. Organisation theory and the ethics of participation. *Journal of Business Ethics* 21, 157–171.
- Coşkun, A.A., Elvan, O.D., 2003. Urgent amendments on Turkish forest legislation concerning participation. Congress Paper of the XIIth World Forest Congress (Québec). <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/ARTICLE/WFC/XII/0159-A4.HTM>.
- Daşdemir, İ., 1998. Devlet Orman İşletmelerinin Yönetimsel ve Örgütsel Boyutlarının Belirlenmesi. (Determination of the managerial and organisational features of the state forest enterprises). Ministry of Forestry East Anatolian Forestry Research Directorate publication, Technical Report, Erzurum, No. 3; 70.
- Daşdemir, İ., 1999. Çağdaş Ormanlık Anlayışı ve Örgüt Yapısı (Contemporary forestry approach and organisation structure). Review of the Bartın Faculty of Forestry 1 (2), 25–47.
- Doğru, M., Özüğür, E., 2003. Ormanlık Planlamasında Katılım (Participation in forestry management). II. National Forestry Congress—Forests Management and Participation in Turkey's Forestry Proceedings, 19–20 March. Society of Turkish Foresters, Ankara. ISBN: 975-93478-2-2, pp. 17–37.
- Düzgün, M., 2003. Advancement of forest village communities through effective participation and partnership in state-owned

- forestry administration: Turkey's case. Congress Paper of the XIIth World Forestry Congress (Québec). <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/ARTICLE/WFC/XII/0223-C1.HTM>.
- Ekizoğlu, A., 1997, March. Orman–Toplum İlişkilerinin Ormanların Azalmasına Etkileri (Effects of the forest–public relations to deforestation). The Journal of Association News. The Association of Engineer and Architect Chambers in Turkey, pp. 25–29.
- Erdönmez, C., Coşkun, A.A., 2003. Sustainability in Turkish forest legislation and administration. Congress Paper of the XIIth World Forest Congress (Québec). <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/ARTICLE/WFC/XII/0072-C1.HTM>.
- ILO, 2000. Public participation in forestry — in Europe and North America. Report of the team of specialists on participation in forestry. Published by the International Labour Office, Geneva, 130 pp.
- Lise, W., in press. An econometric and game theoretic model of common pool resource management: people's participation in forest management in India. Nova Science Publishers, Hauppauge, New York.
- Molnar, A., 1987. Forest conservation in Nepal: encouraging women's participation story. Seeds 10 13 pp.
- Özden, S., 2003. Karar Alma Sürecine Çağdas Bir Yaklaşım: Katılımcı Yönetim (A contemporary approach to decision-making process: participatory management). II. National Forestry Congress—Forests Management and Participation in Turkey's Forestry Proceedings, 19–20 March 2003. Society of Turkish Foresters, Ankara. ISBN: 975-93478-2-2, pp. 360–368.
- Özdönmez, M., Akesen, A., Ekizoğlu, A., 1999. Halkla İlişkiler (Public Relations). Istanbul University Publishers 975-404-559-3. Istanbul, Publication No. 4225; 101pp.
- Poteete, A., Ostrom E., 2002. An Institutional Approach to the Study of Forest Resources. International Forestry Resources and Institutions (IFRI), Research Program Indiana University, http://www.cbnrm.net/pdf/poteete_a_001.pdf.
- Saltik, A., 1998. Doğal Kaynakların Sürdürülebilir Yönetimi: Kavramsal Bir Yaklaşım (Sustainable Management of the Natural Resources: A Theoretical Approach). A Debate on the Application of Sustainable Development Proceedings. Environmental Foundation of Turkey Publishers, Ankara, pp. 27–33.
- Türker, M.F., 2002. Sürdürülebilir Ormanlık Toplantısı Kitabı. (Sustainable Forestry Workshop Proceedings). Environmental Foundation of Turkey Publishers, Ankara, pp. 43–44.
- UNPF, 1996. Dünya Nüfusunun Durumu 1996-Değişen Yerler: Nüfus, Kalkınma ve Kentsel Gelecek (State of the World Population 1996). United National Population Fund Publication, Ankara, 81 p.
- Warner, M.F., 1997. The Vision and Role of Community Forestry in Sustainable Development. Proceedings of the XI World Forestry Congress, 13–22 October 1997, Antalya, vol. 5, pp. 57–68.