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In the 2000/2001 World Development Report, the World Bank offered a new approach named ‘social risk management’ for poverty reduction. The World Bank documents present the aim of social risk management as to provide instruments to the poor and the vulnerable to decrease the impact of being exposed to risk. The empirical focus of this project is the Social Risk Mitigation Project (SRMP) in Turkey, which is a World Bank project that depends on the social risk management framework. Through in-depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis, this study considers the World Bank’s implementation of the ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’ by locating it at the intersection of the broad bodies of literature on development, globalization, risk, neoliberalism, and neoliberal governmentality. Here, by doing an ethnographic study, I explain what kind of activities the World Bank executes under a social risk management project, how different actors (World Bank consultants, state institutions and officials, NGOs, scholars, etc.) get involved in the implementation, what kind of power relations take place between these different actors, in which directions institutions are changed, what kind of subjectivities are formed, how local factors and processes intervene, and what kind of (especially unintended) consequences emerge as a result of project implementation. Although development interventions can fail in their own terms, they still have regular effects which may be very different from what was initially intended. Therefore, when I refer to the impacts, I consider both the intended and unintended impacts of the project.

I explain some major unintended consequences that have emerged after/due to the execution of this project in Turkey. I contemplate on the consequences of the establishment of a Project Coordination Unit (PCU) by the World Bank to implement the project and demonstrate that creation of such a private body under a public institution leads to significant power
struggles. I also explain how the Justice and Development Party (AKP), as a party that redefined social assistance as charity by incorporating Islamic values with neoliberalism, benefited from the SRMP for increasing its public support and how the AKP’s use of this project for its political aims further brought about the creation and spreading of discourses about the poor, the Kurdish population, and the emergence of a culture of poverty in the country. Finally, relying on my interviews with the scholars who did research within the context of the Social Risk Mitigation Project, I elaborate on the question of whether or to what extent this experience of producing knowledge for the World Bank plays a part in the reconstruction of scholars, or in this case Turkish scholars, as neoliberal subjects. I argue that although the researchers are in a position to act as neoliberal subjects in their knowledge production activities, it won’t be accurate to say that they have become neoliberal subjects as a result of this experience.

I aim to go beyond describing the unintended consequences of the project and answer the question of why these unintended consequences matter. I argue that outcomes that might appear as side effects of an intervention to alleviate poverty might, according to another perspective, be considered as unintended but instrumental elements in the formation of a configuration that exerts a depoliticizing effect. These outcomes, although not planned or intended, have all been instrumental in depoliticizing poverty and the poor in the country. However, my study of the case of the SRMP also demonstrates that while there is depoliticization at one level, we can also see repoliticization taking place at another level. While the consequence of the project at the level of the recipients has been a depoliticization, what happened at the level of the state officials can be considered as an instance of repoliticization. Both the officials working in the central government institution, SYDGM, but especially the officials working in the local SYDVs became resistant against the World Bank and the upper level administrators who make the
decisions to borrow from the World Bank. I also consider what the unintended consequences of this project mean for the World Bank. Although to the general public, the project was presented in a very positive light, if we consider the millions of people who were actually involved in the project whether as implementers or recipients, for many of them, this is either money coming from a source that they do not identify or money they receive irregularly after going through a burdensome process. Not only for these recipients, but also for the local implementers of the project and the state officials who are working in the related state agencies, this project certainly has not created a positive image of the World Bank. This will, without doubt, have negative consequences for the implementation of other World Bank projects in the future.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

“Assisting the poor is a means of government; a potent way of containing the most difficult section of the population and improving all other sections.”

(quoted in Procacci 1991, p.151)

For a researcher who wants to do research on a World Bank project, the name ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’ given to a poverty alleviation project seems appealing even at the first sight. After getting the small piece of information that the project was implemented after an economic crisis in Turkey, it becomes even a more interesting case to study. When I first heard the name of the project, the idea of the World Bank mitigating or helping to mitigate social risk by a project after an economic crisis in a neoliberal economy brought to my mind several questions and thoughts about the role of the Bank, what is meant by social risk, and how the Bank manages the crises of neoliberalism. What this name implied to me was the Bank helping the government so that social unrest would not turn into a ‘social risk’ and this seemed like an obvious validation of the role of the Bank in managing the reactions of the disenfranchised masses and governing poverty. My decision to study the ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’ was primarily based on the interest stirred by the name of the project and what this name implies.

A brief research made it clear to me that this was not a random name chosen for a project but rather derived from a World Bank framework for poverty alleviation. In the 2000/2001 World Development Report, the World Bank offered an approach that considered different dimensions of poverty and a more extensive program for poverty reduction. In this report, a new approach named ‘social risk management’ was proposed.
Although there are many scholars who have written on the World Bank’s involvement in poverty alleviation in general, this approach and its implications have, so far, been studied by only a few scholars. In the World Bank documents, social risk management is described as seeking to provide instruments to the poor and the vulnerable to decrease the impact of being exposed to risk. Its aim is declared as helping them to change their behavior so that they can exit poverty and lower their vulnerability. This framework includes not only ‘risk coping’ strategies that reduce the impact of risk once it takes place, but also ‘risk prevention’ and ‘mitigation’ strategies that intend to address the risk before it occurs. There is now a Social Risk Management Group under the World Bank, which works to “…extend SRM as a conceptual framework to guide and link social protection activities, and to develop practical tools to assist in the implementation of the SRM framework to support the World Bank’s mission of poverty alleviation.” (www.worldbank.org/srm). Currently, there are several projects under the title of risk management which have been applied all over the world, in a variety of countries such as Romania, Ecuador, Kirgiz Republic, Brazil, Ukraine, and Croatia. These projects’ aim is declared as not only to help the poor to deal with diverse risks but also to encourage them to engage in higher risk/higher return activities.

Besides a couple of feasibility studies conducted by the World Bank (Bendokat & Dar 1999, Al-Arhabi 2000), there are very few empirical studies of the social risk management approach in practice. The aim of this research is to fill this gap by looking at the case of Social Risk Mitigation Project in Turkey. The project was started after a major economic crisis in the country in 2001, similar to the economic crises of 1994 in Mexico,
1997 in Asia, 1998 in Russia, and 2002 in Argentina, all of which were related to the instabilities caused by the liberalization of capital flows under neoliberal programs (Koyuncu & Senses 2004). The fact that this project was introduced after an economic crisis gives evidence to Weber’s claim that poverty alleviation through risk management is a way to deal with the crises of global capitalism (Weber 2004). This project has been the subject of thousands of national and local newspaper articles in Turkey beginning from its initiation in 2001. In fact, poverty has emerged as a popular subject in Turkey in recent years within the context of the discussions on ‘the other Turkey’ (oteki Türkiye) and especially after the economic crisis in 2001 (İnsel 2001, Şenses 2001, Kalaycıoğlu & Rittersberger-Tılıc 2002, Erdoğan 2002, Buğra 2001, Pınarcıoğlu & İşık 2001). In spite of this general interest in poverty, the World Bank’s poverty alleviation project has been the subject of only a few studies. The popular interest was not accompanied by an equal interest at the academic level. With the exception of some studies on poverty - welfare system in Turkey that mention the project (Koyuncu & Şenses 2004; Buğra & Keyder 2005, 2006) and a few other studies that focus on the World Bank’s discourse on ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’ (Zabcı 2006; Taştan 2005) there is no systematic study that also includes empirical data on the impacts of the project. There is a lack of independent accounts on the impacts of World Bank activities which have a critical perspective; most of the information that exists about the World Bank projects is produced by the Bank itself. The aim of this study is to produce a critical account of a World Bank project rather than just focusing on the World Bank’s perspective on poverty reduction through risk management.
Development has, for a long time, been a major issue in the programs of key political actors such as governments, international institutions (IMF, World Bank, UN) and NGOs. Among these actors, especially the World Bank has emerged as a major authority, ‘a chief arbiter’ due to the development projects it applies all over the world and also its position as a ‘global knowledge bank’, a source of ideas in the area of development (Goldman 2005, George & Sabelli 1994, Gavin & Rodrik 1995). Beginning from its establishment in 1944 during a conference in Bretton Woods with the participation of 44 government representatives, the World Bank has been active for more than sixty years as one of the world’s largest sources of loans especially for the Third World countries.

During 2008, the World Bank provided $23.6 billion for 279 projects and was involved in a total of more than 1800 projects worldwide. In addition to these important roles as a lender for development projects, the World Bank has also produced those ideas which set the development priorities for the underdeveloped countries. Therefore, for scholars who are interested in global inequality and development, the World Bank and the projects developed by the World Bank have become key objects of analysis.

Turkey is an important place to study a World Bank project for several reasons. Turkey’s relationship with both the World Bank and also the IMF dates back to 1947. Since the start its country programs, the World Bank has approved 163 projects for a total of $25.3 billion for Turkey. Turkey has been one of the all-time largest borrowers from the Bank, together with countries like Mexico, India, Brazil, Indonesia, China, and Argentina (George & Sabelli 1994). Overall commitments for the active projects in Turkey

---

corresponds to 37% of the World Bank’s Europe and Central Asia Region lending and six percent of the overall active Bank lending, which is a pretty high proportion. In August 2006, Turkey was the third largest borrower from the Bank, following Mexico and Brazil and the largest borrower in the Europe and Central Asia Region\(^2\). In September 2006, Turkey, together with China, South Korea, and Mexico, was given a greater voting share in the Institution possibly due to its level of connection with the World Bank and its geopolitical position, being a secular country and an ally of the US in the Middle East region. Turkey has been one of the countries which has borrowed extensively from the World Bank and has gone through a significant number of World Bank projects. Although the enormous social impacts of these projects have constantly been the subjects of newspaper articles, the scholarly interest in the World Bank projects in Turkey has been limited.

In 2008, the World Bank had 23 active projects in Turkey under the titles of i) infrastructure and energy, ii) agriculture and rural development, iii) economic management, public sector, and finance, and iv) human development. The active human development projects were the Health Transition Project, Privatization Social Support Project, Basic Education Project, Secondary Education Project, and Social Risk Mitigation Project\(^3\). In 2001, the World Bank approved a $500 million loan for Turkey for the Social Risk Mitigation Project (SRMP) for supplementing the Bank’s ongoing economic programs in the country. The project started to be applied after the economic

---


crisis of February 2001 in Turkey, and its declared aims were to mitigate the impact of the crisis on the poor neighborhoods and to increase their capacity to deal with other risks in the future. The project has two main components: rapid response element to provide immediate support to the poorest groups to decrease immediate social risks and investment element to support programs for social risk mitigation, prevention, and management in the medium or long term. The project is presented as providing not only a ‘safety net’ but also a ‘springboard’ to the poorest to move out of poverty, through not only decreasing but also preventing and managing the social risks.

The adjustment portion of the project is also known as the rapid response element, which aims to give immediate support to the poorest who have been affected by the 2001 economic crisis. Through the adjustment portion, school attendance packs (uniforms, shoes, stationery, textbooks), pharmaceuticals and medical supplies, food and heating support were provided to the poorest households. The investment portion is composed of three elements:

1) Institutional development or building the capacity of state institutions which provide social services and assistance to the poor through strengthening policy research, monitoring and evaluation capacities; information technology development; staff development and training; and public information campaigns

2) Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs) or putting into action a social assistance system which aims to help the poorest six percent of the population, with the condition of using basic health and education services for the children,
3) *Local initiatives* or increasing the income and employment opportunities of the poor through supporting the local initiatives proposed by the provinces and local communities.

**World Bank Projects in Turkey (2008)**

- Loans
  - Infrastructure & energy
  - Human development
  - Agriculture & rural dev.
  - Economic management, public sector & finance

- Grants
  - Health transition project
  - Privatization social support project
  - Secondary education project
  - Basic education project

**Social Risk Mitigation Project (SRMP)**
1) Adjustment portion (providing immediate support to the poorest) - rapid response
2) Investment portion
   a- Institutional development component
   b- Conditional cash transfers (CCT)
   c- Local initiatives (LI)

Figure 1. World Bank projects in Turkey

The implementation of these components is not specific to Turkey; the World Bank has promoted especially elements such as conditional cash transfers to many countries.

During the Third International Conference on Conditional Cash Transfers, which took place in Istanbul in June 2006, case studies of conditional cash transfers in several countries such as Mexico, Brazil, South Africa, Bangladesh, Nicaragua, and Kenya were
discussed. For these different components, the project has different target groups. The
target group of the adjustment portion is determined as the ‘poorest of the poor’ in
Turkey. Considering the investment portion, institutional development element targets
state institutions. The target group of CCTs especially consists of the children of those
households which are under the absolute poverty line. And lastly, especially the local
initiatives component targets the ‘economically vulnerable’ who are especially employed
in the informal sector.4

1.1. Theoretical Background

Although there have been specific periods when poverty became a more critical problem
and received more attention, both poverty itself as a phenomenon and also interest in
poverty have been ongoing for a long time. It has also been an important area of research
for sociologists. Poverty has not always been regarded as a Third World problem;
through influential debates on culture of poverty and the underclass, the presence of
poverty in the US has previously been brought to our attention (Myrdal 1964, Lewis
Massey 1990, Peterson 1992). Also with reference to Europe, through the use of the
concept ‘two-third societies’, the argument that one third of the population is socially
excluded and locked into poverty or near-poverty has been widely discussed (Leisering &

During the last two-three decades, there has been a growing interest, both in terms of policy and also academically, in the subject of poverty. The World Bank’s World Development Reports, the symposiums organized and reports prepared by the UNICEF, OECD, and ILO, and the annual Human Development Report published by the UNDP may be taken as some of the indicators of this interest. Particularly in the case of the World Bank, this interest points to a shift in its position and agenda. Mainstream development approach of the World Bank has been generally redefined during the last couple of decades and it is now widely accepted that development is not just a matter of economic growth. After a long dependence on mainstream development models which argue that economic growth will trickle down to every segment of the society, the World Bank started to recognize the necessity of additional measures to improve the living standards of especially those people who are at the bottom, and the concept of ‘social capital’ became one of the key terms of the World Bank’s development discourse (Fine 1999). Concepts such as community participation, poverty alleviation, and empowerment have become indispensable elements of the World Bank’s development projects. Moreover, global poverty reduction is now the mission of the Institution.

It is necessary to consider the reasons why the World Bank integrated poverty into its agenda. After the debt crisis in early 1980s, when many Third World countries could not meet their debt obligations, the IMF and the World Bank took on a debt manager role for the world and they imposed structural adjustment programs on the indebted countries. These programs created adverse conditions both socially and also economically especially for the poor people, and this has been a major critique about the IMF and the
World Bank. The civil society actors have been questioning the social consequences of the World Bank’s development efforts and seeking alternatives at the local, national, and transnational levels (Rich 1994). The World Bank’s perspective on development has changed by the time through the efforts of these actors which have been struggling against the activities of the World Bank. The World Bank has embraced some issues which did not previously exist in its development agenda, especially due to the critiques and resistance of these civil society actors. As Goldman (2005) argues, the Bank has responded to these critiques and resistance through reinventing and expanding its neoliberal economic agenda to contain new social and environmental dimensions. Poverty, which is currently a part of the World Bank’s mission, is one issue that has been incorporated into the Bank’s agenda as a consequence of the efforts of different groups which were critical of the World Bank’s focus on economic growth as the sole determinant of development. By incorporating poverty into its agenda and making global poverty alleviation its mission, the World Bank found a way not only to deal with these critiques, but also to justify its own existence. The World Bank presented its poverty alleviation projects as the cure to poverty and poverty has become a problem that can be solved through projects. Hence, now there is more reason for the World Bank to intervene under the guise of trying to solve a global problem, in addition to helping Third World countries to develop. Moreover, its knowledge production in the area of poverty, as well as in other areas such as environmental protection, also contributes to the justification of the World Bank’s presence.
The interest in poverty especially within the context of the Third World has significantly been affected by the efforts of the international institutions. In the case of the World Bank, incorporation of poverty provided a way to integrate more humane elements to its mainstream development agenda without challenging its neoliberal framework. This incorporation took place as the World Bank embraced the human development approach into its own development approach. Key concepts of human development approach, such as social capital, poverty alleviation, and enlarging people’s choices, were integrated into the World Bank’s existing discourse. The human development approach mostly depended on Amartya Sen’s work on capabilities and entitlements (Sen 1983, 1985). Sen defined entitlements as “…the set of alternative commodity bundles that a person can command in a society using the totality of rights and opportunities that he or she faces.” (Sen 1983, p.754). Depending on these entitlements, an individual can have some capabilities such as being well nourished, being able to read, write and communicate, and fail to have others. Therefore, the failures in entitlement systems lead to poverty as capability deprivation. Development can be seen as a process which increases the capabilities of people through expansion of entitlements. Therefore, in this conceptualization, development is not defined as a totally economic process. Building people-centered development models (Ul Haq 1995), focusing on ‘capabilities’ to create a ‘normative conception of social justice’ (Nussbaum 2003) and putting people at the center through promoting poverty eradication (Streeten 1994) are other suggestions by human development scholars. We can argue that the World Bank’s SRMP is in line with what is proposed by the human development scholars. SRMP depends on a framework that aims to help the poor and the vulnerable to prevent and also cope with risk situations, without
reflecting on or critiquing the role of the general political structures and the processes, and also the part the World Bank plays in creating those risk situations and poverty.

Although the human development approach in general has been useful in defining development in broader terms rather than solely focusing on GDP and economic growth, and made ‘a strong case for equity and growth along the lines of human capital’, still it hasn’t challenged neoliberalism and depended on the neoliberal principle of competitiveness (Nederveen Pieterse 2001). As Nederveen Pieterse mentions, in this framework, the individual is regarded as the unit of human development, which shows that the intellectual roots of this approach are in liberalism. Moreover, as exemplified by ul Haq’s (1995) calls for making markets people-friendly, taking policy actions to ensure that people can participate in the operations of the markets, and making states the facilitators to help people share market opportunities, social concerns are merged with market concerns in human development approach. “To the extent, then, that human development does not challenge neoliberalism and the principle of competitiveness but endorses it, human development may enable development business-as-usual to carry on more competitively under a generally ‘humane’ aura.” (Nederveen Pieterse 2001, p.121)

When Sen (2000) states that “…the idea of human development won because the world was ready for it…”, he is correct in a sense; the idea of human development was embraced easily and rather quickly by mainstream institutions like the World Bank because it was an appropriate agenda within the existing conditions of neoliberalism.
Development has been one of the major concerns of many disciplines of social sciences at least for half a century. This interest in development in social sciences is also related to its significant position in the policy debates during the same era. The privileged status of development as an area of inquiry and of policy is mostly due to its influence on putting global inequality on the table (Ferguson 2002). Development has remained as a key issue of the international/global political agenda both during the period of developmentalism when national development models were advocated for Third World countries to follow the path of already developed countries and also after ‘the crisis of developmentalism’ (Nederveen Pieterse 2001), when the development policies failed and they were heavily criticized. Regarding the scholarship on development, it is important to stress that it would be a mistake to consider this scholarship as a monolithic one that includes one line of thinking. However, several different perspectives on development, which are otherwise so dissimilar, have one assumption in common, that is the unidirectionality of the development interventions. These diverse perspectives take it for granted that the development programs which are put into practice by the Western countries and institutions are always ‘successful’ in manipulating and shaping the Third World countries, people, and institutions in certain ways. Regardless of whether they see these programs as constructive or detrimental, these development perspectives have a consensus on the idea that development programs influence the local conditions without the interruption of any local factors. Their inattention to the effects of these factors inhibit them from making a more accurate analysis of what actually is going on in the real world after these development interventions.
Modernization theory, based on the idea that all countries of the world will make progress by following the same path and going through the same stages, exemplified by the classic works of Rostow (1971) and Eisenstadt (1966), has been the dominant development framework for a long time. From the perspective of modernization theory, the World Bank’s SRMP can be considered as another progressive step for the Third World countries catching up with the Western World, through eliminating poverty which is a major problem for the Third World countries. Modernization theory has been critiqued by many scholars and policy makers on the basis of many factors, such as, that it is Eurocentric, technocratic, top-down and assumes a unilinear development path for all countries regardless of their different economic, social and cultural structures.

Dependency theory is another influential development perspective which points out the inequality between different countries and regions, and argues that the processes of development and underdevelopment are in fact a single process and the disparities between the center and periphery countries are reproduced through international trade (Frank 1967, Baran 1973, Cardoso & Faletto 1979, Sunkel 1972, Prebisch 1964). Dependency theory may regard the SRMP as another form of the periphery’s dependence on the center: Underdevelopment of a peripheral country, Turkey, and the accompanying problem of poverty, which are closely connected and caused by the development of the center cannot be solved by a global institution which mostly serves the interests of the center. Therefore, the SRMP, like any other project applied by the World Bank, would be considered as increasing the dependence of Turkey on the center from the point of view of dependency theory. Although dependency theory is valuable in pointing out the interconnectedness of development of the First World and the underdevelopment of the
Third World countries, its sole focus on economy at the expense of other realms and on the influence of the center on the periphery without considering the periphery’s possible influences on the center are problematic.

Development, both as an agenda to modernize the Third World and also as a body of scholarship, is not without its critiques. Post-development as a perspective emerged as a result of the idea that the decades of development came to an end. Sachs and the other writers of the Development Dictionary are among those post-development scholars, who argue that development did not work as a program or as an idea, as development ideas were biased, historically inadequate, and they provided the basis for Northern interventionism in Southern countries (Sachs 1992). During the decades of development, rather than Southern countries catching up with Northern countries, global inequalities increased and the development project took the form of North’s imposition of Western institutions and habits of consumption on Southern countries (Illich 1992). Focusing on the development discourse, Escobar (1995) also stated that this discourse created an apparatus to produce knowledge about and exercise power over Third World countries. Development, as it was applied, was a top-down, ethnocentric, technocratic approach that regarded people and cultures as abstract concepts. It translated Third World people and their interests into research data in accordance with Western capitalist paradigms. Development has mostly been the Westernization of the world (Latouche 1993) and coming after the period of colonialism, it has carried on the agenda of neo-colonialism (Kothari 1988). While examining the World Bank’s perspective on development, I borrow enormously from post-development critiques in terms of considering
development as an ethnocentric, technocratic approach and as an apparatus that creates knowledge about and rules over the Third World. The World Bank, as a development institution, produces its own structure of discourse and development interventions are then arranged on the basis of that structure. Therefore, from the perspective of post-development, the World Bank produces the discursive framework of social risk management and it intervenes through the SRMP, depending on that discursive structure. Hence, the discourses created by the World Bank, like the discourse on social risk management, have significant social consequences on the ‘real world’. Among the scholars whose works are considered as examples for post-development theory, there are also those who emphasize the importance of the impact of the local context on the consequences of the development interventions (see for example Escobar 1995). Here, I argue that the development agenda of the World Bank cannot be applied without unplanned interventions and confrontations. Therefore, although the development projects of the World Bank had top-down and technocratic approaches which aimed to shape the Third World countries in certain ways, the actual results have been different from what was initially planned. The responses and interventions by different local actors have been effective in the emergence of consequences which are different from what was initially planned by the World Bank.

Although the majority of the studies on development ignore the unintended consequences of development projects, a focus on these consequences is certainly not completely absent from the literature on development. Even as early as 1980s, there were studies of rural development which evaluated the interventions of development agencies by
considering what they actually created or produced once they were implemented, rather than trying to answer the question of whether these interventions really helped the poor. In their work, *Rural Development in Tropical Africa*, Heyer, Roberts and Williams (1981) looked at the development practices of international agencies and argued that there was little foundation for the argument that the development programs of these agencies improve the living conditions of rural populations. However, they argued, this fact, in itself, was not really informative or helpful. Therefore, they suggested that it would make more sense to analyze rural development interventions as real historical events and look at their actual consequences, rather than evaluating them in terms of their own proclamations. This emphasis on studying the rural development establishment as a social institution that is influenced by different historically specific political and economic interests in each case is also present in the works of Beckman (1977), Bernstein (1979), and Williams (1976, 1985, 1986). There are also more recent case studies which focus on the unintended consequences of development programs (Pigg 1993, Brown et al. 2002, McDougall 2005, Tsikata 2005, Smith-Oka 2009). However, this work is different from those studies in its attempt to move beyond describing the intervention of specific local conditions and the resulting local social formations, and to explain how these unintended consequences enrich our explanations about global institutions like the World Bank, the relationship between the local context and the global institution, and the nature of neoliberalism. Although in terms of its focus on the local, this study is in full agreement with the works mentioned above, it does not stop there but moves on to make use of its analysis of the local to point out the gaps in the existing theories and to improve them.
Beginning from 1970s, significant transformations have taken place both in the developed countries of the West and the underdeveloped countries. With the change in the global economic conditions through the oil crisis, transnationalization of capital, increasing global competition, etc., the neoliberal ideology, which had been advocated since 1930s (Rosenzvaig 1997), became popular in the context of the late 1970s. Keynesianism, with its emphasis on state intervention and the social protections of the welfare state, was abandoned in the First World as a result of neoliberal policies (Wilterdink 2000). In a very similar way, the development paradigm for Third World countries which was dominant during 1950s and 1960s came to an end with the introduction of neoliberalism in these countries through the adoption of structural adjustment programs by the IMF and the World Bank (Bello 1994). Arguments in favor of state’s dominant role in development were replaced with ones which emphasized the key role of markets in this process. These new ideas were mainly supported and disseminated by the international agencies, IMF and World Bank, and they reflected a new approach to development, which is known as the Washington Consensus. Therefore, as maintained by Stewart and Berry (1999), through the influence of the developed countries and especially through the policies exerted by the IMF and the World Bank, the same paradigmatic shift that took place in the First World was also experienced within underdeveloped countries. Due to this major impact of neoliberal ideology and policies, it has been a major area of study for sociologists as well as other disciplines of social sciences.
According to Jessop, neoliberal projects reformulated liberalism discursively, strategically, and organizationally in response to three developments, which are increasing internationalization/ globalization of economies; the interconnected crises of the Keynesian welfare state, of the guided economy and developmental state in East Asia, and the collapse of the Soviet bloc; and the emergence of new social movements in response to the changes associated with the preceding two changes (Jessop 2002).

Neoliberalism has been a project that has had implications for the economy, politics and civil society. It has advocated a declining role for governments, decreasing social expenditures, a commitment to free market, private property and individual incentives. These have also been the fundamental principles of structural adjustment programs.

During the post-war era, beginning from 1950s until 1970s, development was the dominant paradigm especially in relation to Third World countries. Development economics first emerged as a distinct area with the decolonization of Asia, Middle East and Africa. The major goal of development economics was to discover the reasons for chronic poverty and underdevelopment of the Third World countries. This perspective also promoted discussions about the opportunities and prerequisites for economic growth in the countries which were called as ‘underdeveloped’, ‘less developed’ or ‘developing’ (Martinussen 1997, Gore 2000, Bello 1994, Kiely 1995). However, during the late 1970s and 1980s, the growth rates of most of the countries in the South sharply declined and the existing development paradigm started to be questioned. According to Toye, a ‘counter revolution’ in development theory and practice took place in this period (Toye 1987).

According to Wallerstein (2000), the oil crisis, which took place in 1973, has been a key event as it marked the beginning of the debt crisis and also the beginning of a new stage.
of capitalism. During the debt crisis in early 1980s, some Eastern European and Third World countries could not meet their debt obligations. As the banks did not have the capacity to control or regulate their debtors, the IMF and the World Bank assumed a central banking or debt manager role for the world (McMichael 1995). Although some of the countries started to apply the neoliberal measures by their own initiatives, the rise of neoliberalism in the South has mainly been enforced by the IMF and the World Bank through the structural adjustment programs imposed on the indebted countries. With the state’s regulatory functions also disappearing, these programs led to enormous harm on the economic and social conditions of especially poor people in these countries, which has been a major point that has been emphasized by the critiques of the IMF and the World Bank. However, through integrating poverty into its agenda, the World Bank found a way not only to confront these critiques but also to justify its own existence (George & Sabelli 1994).

World Bank’s interest in poverty has been an issue of concern for many scholars and the Bank’s approach to alleviate Third World poverty has been criticized on many grounds. There are scholars who argue that there is a linkage between inequality and poverty, and who find the World Bank’s focus on poverty rather than inequality problematic (Nederveen Pieterse 2004, Kiely 2004). The poverty alleviation programs of the Bank were considered as ‘strong on propaganda, but weak on results’ (NACLA Report 1996) and they were accused of reducing social policy to a question of poverty (Vilas 1996), dislocating social policy from the notion of ‘rights’ (Uga 2004). Bank’s quest for a solution to poverty within the market logic (Burkett 1990, Kirby 2002) and the links of its
theoretical framework to neoliberalism were criticized (Uga 2004). The poverty reduction strategy of the Bank was charged for systematically transforming the social relations in the Third World for facilitating capitalist accumulation on the global scale (Cammack 2004). Lastly, its proposal of empowerment as a solution to poverty was considered as depending on a limited, instrumental conception of power which is simply a means to economic efficiency (Wong 2003).

As I mentioned before, in the 2000/2001 World Development Report, the World Bank offered ‘social risk management’, which was, as they called, a wider approach that considered different dimensions of poverty and a more extensive program for poverty reduction (World Bank 2000). It is important to state that although there are many scholars who have written on the World Bank’s involvement in poverty alleviation in general, this new approach and its implications have, so far, been studied by only a few scholars. Moreover, most of the articles on the World Bank’s social risk management approach are descriptive studies written by economists. Holzmann and Jorgensen define social risk management as:

…(repositioning) the traditional areas of social protection (labor market intervention, social insurance and social safety nets) in a framework that includes three strategies to deal with risk (prevention, mitigation and coping), three levels of formality of risk management (informal, market-based, public) and many actors (individuals, households, communities, NGOs, governments at various levels and international organizations) against the background of asymmetric information and different types of risk. (Holzmann & Jorgensen 2001, p.529)

Holzmann and Jorgensen state that risk management has a double role- protecting basic livelihood and promoting risk taking. They argue that poor people are most vulnerable to risk and, at the same time, they do not have the ‘appropriate risk management instruments’. This situation leads them to be more risk averse, constraining their ability to
be involved in higher return activities and to move out of poverty. The framework of social risk management provides the poor not only a ‘safety net’ but also a ‘springboard’ ‘to bounce out of poverty’ (Holzmann & Jorgensen 1999, 2001). In fact, these arguments about ‘social risk management’ sound very much reminiscent of C. K. Prahalad’s (2006) ideas in his book *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*, where he talks about the entrepreneurial capabilities of the poor. In a similar way with Holzmann and Jorgensen, Neubourg and Weigand also emphasize the double role of social risk management: social policy not only satisfies the main needs at a certain moment but also focuses on ‘preventing contingencies to materialize, mitigating the effects before they materialize and coping’ when they materialize (Neuborg & Weigand 2000). They argue that the management of risks is not the sole responsibility of public authorities; markets and families are the other important institutions in this process. The concept of ‘vulnerability’ is also a key word in the new framework of risk management (Alwang et al. 2001, Holzmann et al. 2003). Alwang et al. (2001) mention the concept of ‘vulnerability’ as referring to the relationship between poverty, risk, and efforts to manage risk. They consider social risk management as a perspective that deals with the problem of how vulnerable households can be assisted for managing risks and becoming less prone to welfare losses.

These are descriptive studies of the World Bank’s new approach and they lack a critical perspective. Although there are a small number of articles written on the approach of ‘social risk management’, there are even fewer studies with a critical point of view. The first point of criticism about social risk management is that the role of the government is
defined in a limited way, only as a means to compensate for market failure; the balance of social risk has been shifted from state institutions onto the ‘shoulders of individuals’ (McKinnon 2004). The focus of social protection is on individual poverty alleviation and on promoting ‘self-sufficiency’ (Gutfeld 2000). Considering the neoliberal support for less state intervention and regulation, and advocacy of free market, it is easy to see the neoliberal element in this framework. George and Sabelli (1994) argue that the ‘exclusively market oriented philosophy’ of this neoliberal framework and a poverty focus which aims to be successful are in fact mutually exclusive. These poverty reduction techniques are embedded in the global political economy and they are, like micro-credit, ways for crisis management under capitalism (Weber 2004). Moreover, social protection is defined in ‘western-centric, developed country, and urban-industrial society’ focused terms within this framework (McKinnon 2004).

Another problem is about the definition of ‘risk’. Koyuncu and Senses (2004) question whether the ‘risk’ in the World Bank’s discourse refers to the risk for the society or for the smooth maintenance of the neoliberal program; they argue that the World Bank’s interest in social problems is mostly related to its efforts to preserve the neoliberal order and to protect it from the risk that can be caused by poverty. Therefore, it is really crucial to ask the question ‘risk for whom?’ (Vilas 1996). Ellis (1998) argues that there is a conceptual confusion in the World Bank’s definition of risk. While referring to ‘risk coping strategies’, the Bank’s consideration of coping as ‘an aspect of risk behavior’ is not accurate. Ellis argues that it is incorrect to use the phrase ‘risk coping strategies’ because it “…confuses voluntary with involuntary actions; planned responses to potential
threats to household wellbeing with unplanned reactions to unexpected livelihood failure…” (Ellis 1998, p.13). Lastly, Moser directs our attention to the lack of new instruments to strengthen informal risk reduction, which requires participatory approaches and locally defined tools; only through this way, ‘voices of the poor’ can move beyond complaints to commitments (Moser 2001). The World Bank’s current interest in social problems is mostly related to its efforts to preserve the neoliberal order, eliminating risks that can be caused by poverty. When the World Bank deals with poverty through the concept of social risk, poverty becomes more manageable, calculable, and finally more acceptable. Referring to the problem of poverty as social risk makes it look like a problem that does not require political but technical and managerial solutions, which the World Bank tries to find.

Although the concept of risk has been used in various different contexts with different connotations for a long time, during the last couple of decades, it has been increasingly tied up with globalization. It is increasingly argued by many scholars that globalization produces insecurities and risks (Basch 2004). Fukuda-Parr (2004) defines risks as the “…changes in the level of human well-being due to sudden changes that threaten the vital core of human lives…” and she argues that as globalization creates many instabilities, it also increases risks. Summerfield and Aslanbeigui (2001) focus on what they call the ‘systemic risks’, which are created by the global economy but constantly paid for by the less wealthy and powerless- the poor, women, children, and minorities in the developing nations. They understand risk as uncertainty, which refers to the ‘unknowability of the timing, duration, extent, or impact’ of financial crises that more frequently happen due to
Financial crises are system produced risks according to them and they cannot be eliminated as they are the side-effects of the globalization process. Therefore, risk is usually regarded as a consequence of globalization in these current discussions. Then, the SRMP with its focus on the individuals’ risk coping strategies, is not dealing with the root cause of the problem; the system produced risks, which especially emerge as a consequence of the globalization process cannot be dealt with by targeting the individuals.

For portraying the contemporary political, economic and social conditions of the world, no other concept has been as widely used as globalization. It has been a key term for describing many of the changes that took place especially within the last twenty years. It has equally been used by various disciplines such as sociology, political science, economy, and geography. However, there are a variety of positions on its nature, impact, and probable outcomes; the scholars who have been writing on globalization are far from being in agreement on these terms. Besides the skeptics who consider globalization as a myth (Hirst & Thompson 1996), many others think that it is a real process but don’t have the same opinion on the aspects of this process. There are scholars who argue that globalization is not a recent process but there have been antecedents of it in the previous history (Frank 1998, Hobson 2004, Wallerstein 2000, Nederveen Pieterse 2004). There are also scholars who agree that globalization is not a recent phenomenon, but who also assert that there is still something distinctive about the recent wave of globalization (Arrighi 1999). There are those who consider globalization as just a new phase of
capitalism (Harvey 1990, Lash & Urry 1987) and others who reject this assertion and see the shift to globalization as a major, historical one (McMichael 1996) rather than being just another stage of capitalism. Beyond all these disagreements, there is also a certain level of consensus in terms of what globalization refers to. Nederveen Pieterse (2004) lists the points of consensus as the major impact of technology, reconfiguration of states, accompanying importance of regionalization, and unevenness of globalization. Benyon and Dunkerley (2000) add to this list increasing speed of movement, shrinkage of space, permeability of borders, and increasing risks. With regard to the last one, globalization has increased risks, as each individual has become vulnerable to the impacts of developments that take place in the remote areas of the world. When Beck (1992) labels the emerging global society as the ‘risk society’ he mostly focuses on the risks associated with the global ecological threats. However, in addition to these ecological risks, there are also social risks that emerge as a result of recent interconnectedness of the world, such as the impacts of rise and fall in share prices in stock markets in global cities (Sassen 1995) which can trigger economic crises in different parts of the world and have devastating effects on the poor.

A study of the World Bank’s ‘social risk management’ framework to poverty is important for several reasons. First, the World Bank has become the most influential and powerful development institution worldwide and its theoretical frameworks, turned into projects, have a big impact on influencing social policy on areas such as poverty alleviation in many countries. Therefore, examining this new framework will give us clues on the ways that social policy in general and the policy on poverty in particular, is being shaped.
Second, studying a specific case, at different levels (international institution, state, and individual) will provide the opportunity to reflect on power relations between these different levels, based on an empirical case. And lastly, depending on the first two issues, this study may be helpful in reconsidering the impact of such projects on social processes in Turkey and in other countries, and in formulating alternative social policies.

In a different way from those scholars who consider social risk management as providing the poor ‘a springboard’ to move out of poverty, I approach risk management through the concept of neoliberal governmentality. Governmentality is a concept developed by Michel Foucault (1991) to refer to ‘governmental rationality’ or an idea of government that is not only limited to the control by states; it includes various control techniques, varying from control of the self to the ‘biopolitical’ control of the populations. For Foucault, government, in general terms, means ‘the conduct of conduct’ or “…a form of activity aiming to shape, guide or affect the conduct of some person or persons.” (Gordon 1991, p.2). Foucault also suggests that recent neoliberalism has brought a new set of notions about governing. This idea has been taken up by some political scientists and the concept of governmentality has been used with reference to neoliberal governmentality, to characterize advanced liberal societies. I will argue that it is possible to approach the World Bank’s risk management framework as a new form of neoliberal governmentality which tries to produce ‘responsible poor citizens’ during a period when neoliberalism transfers the provision of social services to the private sector and to the domestic sphere (Clarke 2004). These services are either provided in the market or becoming responsibilities of the individuals and families, who are now projected as ‘responsible
subjects’ competent in self-management of chronic conditions (Fraser 2003). The individuals try to improve their lives through making choices, under neoliberalism. The individuals are governed through the conversion of the goals of the political, economic and social authorities into their own choices. This new configuration brings new obligations and duties to the individuals (Rose 1996). In this framework, social insurance yields to the privatization of risk management; insurance against conditions of unemployment, illness, aging, etc. become private issues. Market values are extended and disseminated to all institutions and every social action (Brown 2003). In this context, poverty emerges as an essential field of government and poor as subjects to be recreated.

Poverty constitutes a development area for techniques designed to structure an organic social order which, whatever the concrete localization of the human subjects it deals with, is able to bring under its management those zones of social life which have hitherto remained formless. What is involved is the constituting of a different subject from the productive subject: a subject aware of its duties... (Procacci 1991, p.164)

Therefore, in the light of these arguments, it is possible to approach the World Bank’s risk management framework and SRMP as a new form of neoliberal governmentality, which tries to produce ‘responsible poor citizens’. Through its projects, the World Bank has promoted the provision of social services by the market and the family, reforming the social security systems according to the neoliberal framework. What the Bank has been doing is governing poverty, rather than aiming to eliminate it or rather than targeting inequality. Governing poverty requires the production of poor as subjects who are responsible from their own situation and who take the initiative to deal with the ‘risks’ that they encounter. Therefore, according to the theoretical framework of neoliberal governmentality, what the World Bank does through its projects is producing poor as self-dependent subjects. However, although the approach of neoliberal governmentality can really be useful in accounting for the production of new subjectivities and the
transformation of the local through the neoliberal principles applied by the World Bank through its projects, it ignores the ways in which the local dynamics can also have an impact on the consequences of these projects. Neoliberal governmentality, as a theoretical framework, allows us to focus on the local to see how it is being shaped by the global and macro processes. However, it neglects how the local can also have an impact in shaping the final consequences of these processes, leading to unexpected outcomes. Therefore, my aim in this research is to consider the transformation of the social security systems and creation of new subjectivities according to the neoliberal framework by the World Bank, while also taking into account the ways in which local actors and processes interfere, changing the direction and the impact of the interventions by the World Bank.

In summary, this dissertation considers the World Bank’s implementation of the ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’ by locating it at the intersection of the broad bodies of literature on development, globalization, risk, neoliberalism and neoliberal governmentality. Here, by doing an ethnographic study, I try to see what kind of activities the World Bank executes under a social risk management project, how this kind of a project is implemented, how different actors (World Bank consultants, state institutions and officials, NGOs, scholars, etc.) get involved in the implementation, what kind of power relations take place between these different actors, in which directions institutions are changed, what kind of subjectivities are formed, how local factors and processes intervene, and what kind of (especially unintended) consequences emerge as a result of project implementation. As Ferguson (1990) argues, although development interventions can fail in their own terms, they still have regular effects which may be very different
from what was initially intended. In a similar way, when I refer to the impacts, I consider both the intended and unintended impacts of the project. I will shed light on some major unintended consequences that have emerged after/due to the execution of this project in Turkey. However, what I try to do in this dissertation is not only catching all the local specificities of a World Bank project implementation case. By conducting an ethnographic research, I, on the one hand, try to provide thick descriptions of the institutions and situations that I am analyzing to provide information that cannot be captured through quantitative measures. Yet, by utilizing extended case method, I also try to reconstruct theory from the data that I collected during my research. By using this method, I am examining my site as a medium for understanding the global forces which shape that specific locale. Especially considering the fact that my research focuses on a project of the World Bank, one of the major institutions that symbolizes global forces, that is implicated in a specific locality, a method that concentrates on the linkage between the global forces and specific locales is certainly suitable for my research. In that sense, using extended case method is appropriate for the purposes of my research. In my research, I look at the macro foundations of the micro world. This also provides me the opportunity to use the social situation that I am analyzing as a way to challenge the existing theories and reconstitute those theories considering my research findings. The importance of this case study lies in what it tells about the society as a whole or about the global, rather than about other similar cases (Burawoy 1991). Using the extended case method makes it possible to pay attention to the complexity and thickness of the context that I am analyzing. I take my site as the point of empirical examination and try to understand how this site has been shaped by wider structures. These wider structures or
forces do not only refer to those at the national level in our time, as the world has become more global and interdependent at least for the last couple of decades. In demonstrating how the site that I am studying is impacted by the global forces, I am aiming to challenge the existing theories of globalization which depend on broad and abstract level generalizations. In that sense, I am conducting global ethnography (Burawoy 2000). In addition to the impact of the global forces on the local processes, I also try to understand whether the local also affects the global and if so, in what ways. Considering the unintended in addition to the intended impacts of the project provides me the opportunity to see in what ways global forces are shaped in different and unexpected directions through their encounter with the local resistances, processes and dynamics. Although I use neoliberal governmentality as my theoretical framework, my research in the site helps me to reconstitute this framework, as entailed by the extended case method. Therefore, using extended case method makes it possible for me to reconstitute the theoretical framework of neoliberal governmentality in order to recognize the impact of the local, in addition to demonstrating how the local is shaped by the global.

1.2. Research Strategy

My first field trip was in June 2007 and during my stay at that time, I established some initial contacts and made some arrangements for my field research. I went to the Public Documentation Center of the World Bank in Ankara and received both general documents on the World Bank’s work in Turkey especially in the area of social development and also specific ones on the Social Risk Mitigation Project (SRMP). I also met some professors from the Middle East Technical University, who were involved in
this project in several ways, such as doing research for determining a baseline for the
determination of the poor who would receive aid, writing impact assessment reports for
the project, or evaluating the impact assessment reports written by the others. During
those first contacts, I noticed that although the World Bank promotes itself as a
transparent organization in terms of providing documents to the public, it is not so easy to
reach those documents which might be of significant use for a critical researcher, such as
the impact assessment reports of a World Bank project.

After I came back from Turkey in July, I started reading the documents that I collected.
In August, before going back to Turkey for my research, I sent e-mails to several people
to introduce myself and my research, and to ask them their permission to have interviews
after my arrival in Turkey. My field research started at the beginning of September and
lasted for five months till the end of January. At the beginning I stayed in Ankara as the
World Bank country office, the Project Coordination Unit which implemented the
project, General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity which is the related state
institution, many other state institutions, universities and NGOs which have been
involved in this project are located in this city. One of my aims in this research is to see
how different actors (World Bank, state institutions, NGOs, beneficiaries, private sector,
scholars, etc) have been involved in the design and implementation of this project.
Therefore, I interviewed people from each of these groups.

I had over eighty interviews with people from these different groups. I had in-depth
interviews, which were semi-structured and they took between one hour and four hours.
First, I interviewed people from the World Bank project task team and also from the World Bank country office. I went to the Turkey country office several times for these interviews and during my visits, I also had a chance to have informal conversations with the support staff. Later, I also interviewed a former World Bank consultant in her current office. Second, I interviewed junior level employees and department heads working at the General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity (SYDGM), which is the state institution that is responsible for distributing aid to the poor in Turkey. The SRMP is also supposed to be administered by this institution through a Project Coordination Unit (PCU), which is in principle under the umbrella of the General Directorate. However, as I later learned from my informants and as I will explain later, the project was implemented by the PCU which became an independent body of consultants hired by the World Bank and the General Directorate was left out from the project. I interviewed the people from the General Directorate in their offices. As the PCU was closed down after the completion of the project in March 2007, the consultants and staff who were previously in PCU started to work in different organizations, some of them working for other World Bank projects. To interview some of those people who worked in PCU, I went to different state ministries. With others who did not want to be interviewed in their offices, I met in cafes or restaurants and had interviews while we were having lunch or drinking coffee. Moreover, I interviewed officials from Turkish Treasury, State Planning Institute, and Institution for Social Services and Child Protection, other state institutions which were included in the project.
As I mentioned at the beginning, academics were involved in the project in different ways and sometimes in partnership with some NGOs. I interviewed professors from the departments of labor and industrial relations, economics, political science, and sociology from Middle East Technical University and Ankara University. The ones that I interviewed had written reports on poverty for the World Bank before the implementation of the project, conducted pilot studies, done impact assessments for the project, evaluated impact assessment reports, or done research for suggesting activities that could be included in the project. I had most of these interviews in these professors’ offices in these two universities.

Several NGOs/NGO representatives also played parts in the project having different roles. Some NGO representatives took part in the Execution Committee. Some offered consulting to the beneficiaries of the local initiatives component for proposing micro credit-like projects. Others joined in impact assessments. Hence, I interviewed NGO representatives who took part in these different activities. Social Assistance and Solidarity Foundations (SYDVs) are local agencies which were established in each province and sub-province to distribute the amount gathered by the General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity to needy citizens around the country. There are 931 Foundations working in 81 provinces and 850 sub-provinces. The day-to-day activities of the SRMP were executed by these 931 Foundations at the local level. In order to have an idea about the implementation of the project on the ground at the local level, it was important for me to visit these Foundations and talk to the officials working there. I went to 9 different Foundations in Ankara, some of which are in urban and others in rural
provinces. These provinces are Çankaya, Yenimahalle, Keçiören, Mamak, Altındağ, Kızılcahamam, Polatlı, Akyurt, and Sincan. In addition to the formal, in-depth interviews I had with the administrators and officials in these Foundations, I did participant observation in two of them, namely in Mamak and Altındağ, which are the poorest provinces in Ankara especially due to migration from other provinces/cities. I spent time in the offices of these Foundations and watched the interaction between the officials working there and the poor people who come to these offices to apply for receiving aid or to make inquiries about their applications. Moreover, I joined the officials in their visits to where these poor people live. Lastly, I accompanied the officials in their visits to the small enterprises that were started by the credit that was given as a part of the SRMP project.
Towards the end of my research, I went to Diyarbakır, which is a city in the least-developed South Eastern region of Turkey. Diyarbakır has a significant Kurdish population and as the metropolitan center of South Eastern region, it has been a central point of attraction for the migrants who were forced to move from where they previously lived due to the armed conflict between the Turkish Army and the PKK (Kurdistan Workers Party). Its population doubled between 1990 and 1995. These migrants live in poverty in certain neighborhoods either in the city center or the outskirts of the city. I stayed in Diyarbakır for three weeks. During that time, I visited five Social Assistance and Solidarity Foundation offices located in the provinces of Merkez (Diyarbakır center),
Silvan, Çınar, Kulp, and Bismil. I did participant observation in Merkez province by spending time in the office and also accompanying the officials in their visits to the places where the poor people live. Depending on the list of names given to me by this Foundation, I interviewed ten beneficiaries of the Conditional Cash Transfers component of the project, and five beneficiaries of the Local Initiatives component who started their own business. In my interviews with some of the beneficiaries, the Foundation official helped me as a translator, due to the fact that some of my interviewees do not speak Turkish and I don’t speak Kurdish. I also interviewed people from some local NGOs in Diyarbakir which took part in the project.

Figure 3. Diyarbakır map
During my research, other than the interviews and participant observation, I also collected various documents and cd’s from the World Bank office and the Public Documentation Center, the General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity, university libraries, and from the people that I interviewed. Among these were the informational documents and cd’s about the components of the project prepared by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), several impact assessment reports, project information and appraisal documents, loan agreement, implementation completion report, other reports prepared by the SYDGM, State Planning Institution, and Treasury, and implementation-related forms and documents provided to me by the local SYDVs. In addition to those documents, I also collected and analyzed the newspaper articles which were about the project.

1.3. Ethnographic Reflections

Doing research on a poverty-related subject was appealing to me at the beginning. It is a crucial aspect of sociology as a discipline that it gives attention to and tries to look from the perspective of the powerless, and in that sense studying poverty or the poor seems like a very worthwhile undertaking to a socially responsible researcher. In one sense it might really be worthwhile if one can claim that s/he could actually reflect on the ‘real’ experiences of the poor as well as creating some material change in the living conditions of those people in addition to producing knowledge about them. However, in most of the other cases of research, where it is beyond the reach of the researcher to create some positive change in the lives of those people, researching the poor leads to moral and ethical concerns which cannot be calmed by the regulations of Institutional Review
Boards at universities. In an increasingly neoliberal academic environment where we, as academics, are in a position to act as entrepreneurial subjects and turn each relationship and each act of knowledge production into a positive contribution to our own academic careers, there is always that suspicion of benefiting from a voyeurism of other people’s misery without giving anything back to them. The fact that they do not face any risks as their identities are not disclosed and their confidentiality is maintained cannot be enough reason to feel relief. There is the question of what good it is to them even if their real thoughts and feelings are represented as long as there is no improvement in their lives. This certainly takes us to basic epistemological questions about the reason for producing knowledge. Producing a counter-hegemonic discourse to the hegemonic discourses on poverty produced by major neoliberal organizations (like the World Bank) might at times seem like an appropriate agenda and enough reason for producing this kind of knowledge. However, other times, the discursive nature of this struggle might lead to doubts about its impact on the reality outside this discursive universe. Throughout my research process, these questions occupied my mind. However, these were not issues that were peculiar to my research experience but rather questions that any researcher doing research on the poor/poverty will need to confront.

While I was observing the poor people in the local offices where they came to receive aid, I did not feel much uneasiness as I perceived observing this public performance less of an intrusion to their privacy. It was when I visited their houses to talk to them or to observe the conditions in which they are living I felt more like an intruder. First of all, I was brought there by the local officials and the people whose houses we were visiting
were never asked if they gave permission for my presence there. Their receiving aid from
the local agency put them in a position in which they had to open their doors to everyone
accompanying the officials or who was authorized by the agency although there was no
formal contract or agreement that says so. In that sense, I felt like I wasn’t much different
from the World Bank people or the ones from other aid-giving agencies who visit these
people’s houses to see ‘how poor they really are’. In order to stay away from a voyeurism
of poverty, I did not take any pictures when I have been to people’s houses. Also, in my
contacts with the recipients, I explained them that their identities will be kept confidential
and got their permission for asking questions and conducting interviews. However,
considering the power difference between us, I doubt whether they would reject being
interviewed even if they didn’t want to. In those cases where the living conditions were
really disturbing (no heating in the middle of winter, accommodating in non-residential
places, big families living in small single room residences, no furniture or house
appliances), the act of doing research and asking questions seemed meaningless; they
were situations which required immediate action and thinking of my own research agenda
looked as an opportunism of the worst kind. Although giving voice to the powerless
might be considered as a socially responsible objective, in those situations it just seemed
irrelevant to me. I sensed that with every question that I asked, material expectations of
those people from me increased. I was shown bodies of disabled children, unhygienic
bathrooms and toilets, or house appliances that did not work with the hope that I would
do something to improve their living conditions. However, I wasn’t in a position to meet
those expectations. I was there only as an observer and as a transmitter to an academic
audience. In some instances, when the people that I interviewed complained about the
amount they were receiving or why they did not qualify for a certain type of aid, I communicated those complaints to the administrators of the foundations. However, this wasn’t necessarily taken very positively by the administrators as I was expected not to be involved in the workings of the foundations. In some other cases, after my interviews, I went to a local shop with the official, got some snacks, and gave them to the children of the houses that we visited. Although I knew that it was a very insubstantial benefit, I still wanted to give something concrete to them.

As emphasized in the literature, the fieldworkers’ social characteristics, such as the racial status, gender, socioeconomic background, age, or even appearance have a deep impact on the kind of relationships they have in the field (Johnson 1975, p.91). Because of this impact, there are those scholars who are in favor of ‘insider research’ which is conducted by the people who have similar/same social characteristics with the people that are studied (see for example Baca Zinn 2001). In my contacts with especially the recipients of aid, I felt that our common characteristics facilitated our conversations while differences made it difficult to establish trust and to relate to each other. In most of the cases, it is women who go to the Foundation offices to apply for aid or to follow up on their applications. Therefore, the recipients that I observed in the Foundation offices were mostly women. Also, when we visited people’s houses, it was mostly the women who were at home and who I could see and talk to. The fact that I am also a woman made it less like an intrusion to their privacy when I went into their houses and the common experiences of womanhood provided us common subjects to talk about. In many cases, I wasn’t the only one who asked questions; they asked me questions about my home town,
parents, marital status, experience of marriage, or whether I have children (there was that woman who said “You should have children. It is good to have children.” while patting my back). There were those moments which remained in my mind: the proud look on the girl’s face who is a brilliant student at school and the only breadwinner at home while her father and two older brothers are unemployed; the sad manners of another one who was pulled out from school as there wasn’t enough money to support both her and also her brother’s education; the sight of five small children of a single mother who were all around me pulling my hands, clothes, and bag while I was sitting on the floor talking to their mother; a very old woman living alone in a house with almost no furniture expressing her gratitude to the official for giving her aid… These were emotional moments that definitely had an impact on my research as well as my perception of the world in general.

During my interviews with the recipients of aid, the fact that I am also from Turkey helped us to speak based on a shared ground. In Diyarbakır, although the language barrier, speaking through a translator, and ethnicity difference have been obstacles, there were those moments when a smile or a glance conveyed a lot which confirmed my long held belief that when you have a sincere interest in communicating, even body language can speak volumes. However, in Diyarbakır, when the recipients as well as the officials who were Kurdish apologized for their ‘broken Turkish’ or not speaking Turkish at all, or for the deficiency of the conditions in their city or region, it was upsetting for me as it was reminiscent of a relationship between a colonizer and a colonized, but this time not
between a ‘Western’ and an ‘Eastern’ subject. These apologies pointed out the power difference that depends on our different ethnicities.

In Ankara, I could get permission to do participant observation in two Foundations and to join the officials in their house visits but wasn’t given the names and addresses of the recipients for doing interviews with the explanation that it would be impossible for me to find the addresses in the slum (gecekondu) areas and would not be safe for me to go on my own (“There are some districts to which we do not want to send our officials alone.”). I could not do interviews when I went with the officials, either, because their workload was very heavy and they did not have time to wait for me while I was doing interviews. In Diyarbakır Merkez province, again, I could not get the names and addresses of the recipients because of similar reasons –as the street and apartment numbers have changed several times, it would be impossible for me to find the addresses, it wasn’t safe for me to go alone-.. However, they assigned two officials who would take me to the houses of the recipients of the CCT, help me as translators, and wait for me while I was doing my interviews. Although this arrangement helped me a lot for conducting my interviews, it also created its own limitations. First, the recipients that we would visit were selected by the Foundation head. Second, when I went to the people’s houses, I gave the impression that I was related to the Foundation (or to a government aid-giving agency). And third, my communication with the recipients took place in front of and with the mediation of the Foundation officials. These certainly had an impact on the kind of communication and relationship I could have with them.
At this point, it is necessary to confess that among all my interviews with different groups, interviews with the recipients were the toughest to execute for me. Both the emotional intensity of the situation and differences in social characteristics have been challenging for me as a researcher. However, it is also important to stress that doing interviews with different groups had different kinds of challenges. For instance, while interviewing the academics was mostly a very comfortable experience for me, I always felt that they were trying to understand the theoretical framework of my study and modifying their accounts accordingly. Although they were my informants and I was expecting them to talk about their experiences of doing research, at some points, they discussed the literatures on poverty, development, or the World Bank at length, which was something that I wasn’t really hoping for. In my interviews with the World Bank people (international and local staff), I did not tell them the fact that I have a critical perspective on the World Bank’s operations. Hiding my standpoint made me uncomfortable and I felt like spying especially when I had a very good interaction with one of my informants and she explained more than I thought she would. Yet, in my other interviews with the World Bank staff, they were really cautious about what they said and revealed as little as they could. With the government officials from the Treasury, DPT, SHCEK but especially the SYDGM, and also the consultants who worked for the Project Coordination Unit, things went extremely well; although many of them said they are really busy and will need to keep the interviews short when I called them to arrange interviews, our interviews lasted really long, in some cases as long as four hours. Moreover, they told me rumors and details about the conflicts which I wasn’t really expecting to hear especially from state officials. The fact that I, early on, found out about
the central conflict during the project implementation, the conflict between the SYDGM and the Project Coordination Unit, helped me a lot to learn further details about the inner workings of these institutions. However, it is also worth mentioning that in Turkey ‘political correctness’ is not an established trait and people are less eager to filter their feelings and thoughts before expressing them.

During my research, I spent more time with the Foundation officials than any other group and in addition to the interviews, we spent time together in the Foundations, drove together to the slum areas, went into people’s houses, had friendly chats, and had lunches together. Besides our informal conversations, I listened to their problems as Foundation officials related to the vagueness of their official status, lack of job security, and also related to the recipients. Regarding the last one, although I could understand that their workload was really heavy and it was exhausting and alienating to see those poverty scenes everyday, at times I felt uneasy when I heard some of the negative comments about the recipients, such as how they need to keep the windows of the Foundation open for a long time to get rid of ‘that awful smell’ caused by the people coming to the Foundation. I did not want to make judgmental statements. Yet, I was uncomfortable being in the situation of approving what they said when I remained silent. I, at other times, also felt sorry for the officials as, at least a number of them, were struggling in difficult conditions. In Diyarbakır, one of the officials who accompanied me during our house visits, was a 19-year old girl who was going to school in addition to working in the Foundation and was supporting her mother and younger siblings. While we were having lunch she said “I am so glad that you are here today. For a while, I have been feeling
terrible. This has been a different day for me thanks to you.”. Although I was the one who was taking her time and she was the one who was helping me, she thanked me just because my being there made it a different day. Moreover, having heard me talking to my brother on my cell phone who was congratulating me for my birthday, she got a birthday present for me. In almost all cases, the Foundation officials insisted that it will be their treat when we had lunch together. Knowing that they are not very well paid, I did not want to accept it but in some cases it was impossible to say no. These were all gifts given to an unknown researcher without an expectation of getting something in return.

Overall, my research experience has deeply affected not only my study but also me as a researcher and as a person. Besides the relationships that I established and all those humanly encounters, just the simple act of going to those provinces changed my perceptions a lot. Although I spent sixteen years of my life in Ankara, the capital city of Turkey, this was the first time I have been to some of the poorest districts of the city. Moreover, this was the first time I have been to a city in the Eastern part of Turkey. Being in Diyarbakır was like being in a different country within my native country. Therefore, I was like doing both insider and outsider research at the same time. The fact that the majority of the people living in Diyarbakır are Kurdish, a fact that I have known in theory but have never really comprehended with its full extent, and the implications of this fact became concrete after I have been to the city.
1.4. Outline of the Dissertation

The next chapter looks at the implementation details of the Social Risk Mitigation Project by describing the components of the project, giving details about the implementing agencies, and presenting not only those aspects that are peculiar to the Turkish case but also those other issues that are typical parts of the World Bank project implementation process. I am telling this implementation story by considering the perspectives of different groups that have been involved in the process and presenting an account which is alternative to the one created by the World Bank. By reflecting on the problems, struggles and conflicts experienced during the execution of project related activities and how these in turn had an impact on the overall implementation, I try to challenge the presentation of this project as a success story and question the criteria of success according to the World Bank people. I also contemplate on the unintended consequences that emerged as a result of the establishment of a Project Coordination Unit (PCU) by the World Bank to implement the project and demonstrate that creation of such a private body under a public institution leads to significant power struggles. This discussion of a neither-public-nor-private (or both-public-and-private) PCU makes it possible to challenge the existing binary of public-private in the literature and gives us clues about the ways in which the public might be privatized from within.

Chapter 3 presents some related processes in Turkey which have been initiated or influenced by the World Bank’s execution of the SRMP. Here, I explain how the Justice and Development Party (AKP), as a party that redefined social assistance as charity by incorporating Islamic values with neoliberalism, benefited from the SRMP for increasing
its public support and how the AKP’s use of this project for its political aims further brought about the creation and spreading of discourses about the poor, the Kurdish population, and the emergence of a culture of poverty in the country. Moreover, in this chapter, I also comment on the question of what happens to the subjectivity of the poor in this picture. While approaching the practices of the poor for which the state officials and scholars blame them, I use Asef Bayat’s concept of ‘the quite encroachment of the ordinary’ and argue that those practices are rational actions of the poor to live a decent life.

In Chapter 4, I look at the discussions on the neoliberalization of the academia in general and the role that the international institutions like the World Bank play in the neoliberalization of the university in the Third World countries. Relying on my interviews with the scholars who did research within the context of the Social Risk Mitigation Project, I look at the features of the experience of producing knowledge for the World Bank or for a World Bank project. I also elaborate on the question of whether or to what extent this experience of knowledge production plays a part in the reconstruction of scholars, or in this case Turkish scholars, as neoliberal subjects. I argue that although the researchers are in a position to act as entrepreneurial subjects in their knowledge production activities, it won’t be accurate to say that they have become entrepreneurial subjects as a result of this experience and the framework of neoliberal governmentality, although valuable in accounting for the creation of subjectivities, does not take into consideration the dilemmas that the academic subjects are facing.
In the conclusion chapter, I return to the questions of what this case tells us about the global forces, and in what ways it challenges the existing theories and helps us to improve those theories. I explain how the examples of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and Social Solidarity Foundations (SYDVs) challenge the clear-cut distinction between public and private spheres, and how these both-public-and-private institutions contribute to a more sophisticated understanding of neoliberalism. In addition to the existence of these institutions, I discuss how the articulation of neoliberalism with Islamic values of the AKP demonstrates to us the ways in which different value systems might be supporting or hindering neoliberal programs. I lastly comment on to what extent the theoretical framework of neoliberal governmentality contributes to an understanding of this case as well as how this case challenges/improves this framework.
CHAPTER 2. THE SOCIAL RISK MITIGATION PROJECT

2.1. Introduction

A critique of the World Bank would consist of a list of conventional and familiar arguments for students of neoliberalism and the World Bank. The list will include issues such as how the World Bank facilitates privatization, curtails government size, and spending, and how its projects have a negative impact on the living standards of people in underdeveloped/developing countries. Although these general arguments are well-known to most people who are critical of the Bank, most of them will find themselves quite unaware when it comes to the mechanics of these processes. For instance, not many of them will have an answer to the question of in what ways the World Bank curtails government size. Or, even before that, only a small number of critical scholars will have an idea about what a World Bank project, in fact, is or how it is actually implemented. Moreover, concepts such as ‘curtailing the size of government’ or ‘facilitating privatization’ are very general accounts which do not necessarily explain the real dynamics of the processes or the ways in which, for instance, governments are shaped. Being able to give answers to these questions is important in order to base criticisms on sound details and this becomes possible only through examining cases with all their intricacies. Therefore, the first aim of this chapter is looking at the details of the implementation of a World Bank project, the Social Risk Mitigation Project, which was put into practice in Turkey. Although some parts of this implementation story might be peculiar to the Turkish case, as will become clear later in the chapter, many other points are typical of the World Bank’s project implementation process. To cast doubt on the
World Bank’s presentation of many of its projects as successful implementation experiences that have largely increased living standards of people in several countries, it is crucial to look at a case that was portrayed as successful and to shed light on the problems and troubles related to it. Here, by doing this, I will also have a chance to challenge the definition of ‘success’ that is given to us by the World Bank. This is the first thing that I will try to do in this chapter.

At this point, it is important to stress that although the World Bank is now portrayed as ‘the Knowledge Bank’, the kind of research and knowledge that is produced by the Bank or by the researchers that are promoted by the Bank certainly does not help us in critically assessing the project. Going through the World Bank’s web site and analyzing project related documents give a very limited sense of what went on during the project implementation. Therefore, although I collected a variety of project related documents and went through them, the most important information for the purposes of my research came from my interviews with people from several different groups: officials from different state institutions, personnel of Social Solidarity Foundations (SYDV), consultants of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), NGO representatives, scholars, researchers, people who benefited from different components of the project, and people from the World Bank Ankara office. Listening to their accounts, I could not only get a more complete version of the project implementation story but also see in what different ways different groups perceived the project and its impacts. In this chapter, I also try to reflect on these differences in the perspectives of different groups.
The second aim of the chapter is very much related to the first one in the sense that not only the definition of ‘success’ but also that of ‘social impact’ will be challenged here. In a quantitative way, impacts of a certain project may be assessed by looking at whether and to what extent that project accomplished to reach the targets that was set for it at the beginning. However, a critical social science scholar does not have to feel limited by that kind of an assessment. While I was doing my field research, some state officials who are concerned about the impacts of the SRMP told me that they were curious about the impact of a certain component of a project (Did the CCT component really decrease the use of contraceptive methods?) and that they hope my research will provide answers to that kind of questions. Giving answers to such questions is, on the one hand, beyond the scope of my research and, on the other hand, not what I am interested in here. I am using a broader definition of social impacts. As Ferguson (1990) argues, although development interventions can fail in their own terms, they still have regular impacts which may be very different from what was initially intended. In a similar way, when I refer to the impacts, I consider both the intended and unintended impacts of the project. Consequently, in this chapter, my second aim is looking at the social impacts of the project considering questions such as what kind of unexpected dynamics materialized, in what ways institutions have been shaped, what kind of power relations and conflicts emerged, what kind of subjectivities were produced, and what kind of discourses it generated.

Focusing on unintended impacts reveals the fact that there might be gaps between what was initially planned or intended and what actually took place after the implementation of
the project on the ground. When the local processes and dynamics come into the picture, what emerges as a result can be quite unexpected. Recognition and exploration of these unintended consequences can be really useful for challenging an idea of neoliberal governmentality which can shape all the institutions and subjectivities according to the neoliberal agenda, and which is all-encompassing. This is similar to John Clarke’s suggestion of thinking neoliberalism as a strategy, which is a perspective that “…allows us to explore the gaps between ambition and achievement-rather than taking neoliberals’ word for it.” (Clarke 2004, p.30). What is intended by the World Bank’s project cannot directly be translated into practice; the existing institutional structures and dynamics in Turkey combined with the activities executed under this project led to the emergence of unexpected developments in the country.

2.2. Components of the Project

After I first decided to write my dissertation on the World Bank’s ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’, I did some initial search of both academic and also media resources about the project. Surprisingly, a small number of academic articles accompanied countless news stories on project implementation. The newspaper articles that mentioned the project’s name were about such a variety of activities that it was difficult for me to understand how all these unrelated activities were related to a single project that is allegedly designed to alleviate poverty. The articles about a man living in Antalya who opened a hairdresser’s salon thanks to 10 thousand YTL (New Turkish Liras) given to him by the local SYDV (Social Solidarity Foundation), the World Bank Turkey Director’s statement about computers provided to a girls’ school in Van, Turkish government’s support to NGOs for
their proposed projects, a newly opened handicrafts workshop in Hakkari, the activities of social workers who work at a Youth and Children Center in Mersin, a guest house for women that was opened in İstanbul, the sheep distributed to the villagers in Gümüşhane, the women waiting in line in Şanlıurfa for getting the cash support for education, street children who completed a vocational education program in Gaziantep and thousands of other seemingly unrelated articles were all related to the World Bank’s Social Risk Mitigation Project. How could all these diverse programs (cash support for education and health, loans for the establishment of small enterprises, various social service programs, etc.) be implemented under the same project? The simple technical answer to this question would be that the project consists of multiple components, which I will further explain in this section. However, this diversity also points out significant problems regarding the project. The state officials who were critical of the project repeatedly complained that activities which had nothing to do with poverty alleviation were included in the program and the aim of using up the loan money before the project deadline was an important motivation for the inclusion of all these activities. In any case, it is crucial to look closely at the components and details of the project to figure out the rationale behind the implementation of these diverse undertakings under a poverty alleviation project. This close examination will additionally reveal how a single World Bank project entered the lives of so many people (the ones who benefited from different components of the project, local implementers in 931 SYDVs in all the provinces and sub-provinces of Turkey, officials working in several state institutions, people working in several NGOs and research companies, scholars, etc.) and set out a lot of action and debate all over the country.
The Social Risk Mitigation Project (SRMP) was initiated after a serious economic crisis in Turkey in 2001. As the name of the project also suggests, the main aim of the project was to lessen the impact of the economic crisis on the poor people in Turkey and to help them deal with similar situations in the future. During my interviews, many state officials and the people from the World Bank who were involved in the first design stage of the project talked about the urgency of the situation and how important it was to put into practice a poverty alleviation project as soon as possible after the economic crisis. The implementation of such a project was immediately needed for preventing the potential social risk situations and a ‘social explosion’. In the aftermath of the crisis, there were a lot of heated discussions on the possibility of a social explosion and whether Turkey will be like Argentina, where there had been a lot of demonstrations after a similar economic crisis. Therefore, the rationale behind the rapid application of the project had less to do with the increasing inequalities or the worsening conditions of the lower classes. Both the state officials and the World Bank people mostly concentrated on the possibility of protests and demonstrations on the one hand, and a probable increase in criminal activities on the other hand, both of which were in fact appraised in very similar terms and under the same category of social risk.

The components of the SRMP also reflect this approach. The project was composed of four main components which were brought as a package by the World Bank. These are:

1) rapid response,
2) conditional cash transfers (CCT),
3) local initiatives (LI),
4) institutional development.

1) Rapid response, as its name also implies, was the first component that was put into practice immediately after the 2001 crisis. The amount of money allocated for the rapid response was USD 100 million. It was planned to be an aid package that would quickly be distributed to the poor and would consist of school attendance packs, pharmaceuticals, medical supplies, food and heating support. In fact, this was far from being an original program created by the World Bank. The 931 local Social Solidarity Foundations (SYDVs) which have been organized in all the provinces and sub-provinces all over Turkey since 1986 and which have also been chosen to be the local implementing agencies for the SRMP, have been giving these aids regularly since their first foundation. Therefore, what was distributed under the Rapid Response component was just another package given to the poor people, this time after an economic crisis. During my interviews with the personnel in the local Foundations, almost all the people that I interviewed told me that there was no Rapid Response component implemented by their Foundation. It was either because what the World Bank coded as rapid response was nothing different from their usual activities or as, in some cases, the local governor did not give permission for this immediate disbursement of funds. But regardless of how it turned out to be in practice, at the design stage, this rapid distribution of money and aid aimed to contain the frustration of the poor people after a crisis which might turn into a popular protest or the so called ‘criminal behaviors’. What the World Bank and the related state institutions tried to do here was giving some money or other kind of aid to
the poor people to guarantee that they will remain as law-abiding and obedient citizens in the case of an economic crisis when their livelihood is at risk. The activities under Rapid Response were completed in 2002, one year after its start.

2) Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) is a practice which was previously carried out in some Latin American countries, such as Mexico and Brazil, and regarded as having produced real successes according to the World Bank’s terms. A very recent World Bank News Release (Washington DC, February 10, 2009) also talks about the success of the CCT in several countries:

After early successes in South Asia and Latin America, CCT programs are now found on every continent. They operate in more than two dozen developing countries, as well as in several developed countries, including the United States… CCTs have also grown tremendously within countries. Mexico’s Progresa began in 1997 with 300,000 households; its successor Oportunidades now reaches 5 million households.

The World Bank introduced this component to the Turkish state officials as a very innovative and useful program during the design stage of the project, and at the very beginning of the project, groups from state institutions went to Mexico and Brazil to observe how the CCT is implemented in these countries. CCT program is composed of education, health, and pregnancy grants. It is basically a social assistance program that targets the families with children; it targets the poorest 6% of the population who have difficulty sending their children to school or having regular health controls. The families are given a certain amount of money regularly with the condition that they will keep their children at school and ensure that their children will receive timely immunization and health care, and the pregnancy grant is provided as cash assistance to the mothers on the condition that they have regular controls during pregnancy. Although the amounts were later revised, the education support per month was USD 10 for the first child, USD 9 for
the second child, and USD 8 for the third and the other children, and the health support per month was USD 9 per child. With the idea of improving the status of women, the grant amounts were transferred to the bank accounts of the mothers. The bank accounts were opened for them by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The CCT was first implemented in the six pilot sub-provinces (Merkez-Çankırı, Keçiören-Ankara, Göksun-Kahramanmaraş, Ereğli-Zonguldak, Yavuzeli-Gaziantep, Durağan-Sinop) in February 2002 and then rolled out throughout Turkey in July 2003. The applications of individuals who were not covered under any social security program were accepted by the local SYDVs. According to the final project report, as of February 2007, 2.603.816 children were benefiting from the CCT program. 67% of the beneficiaries were from the South Eastern (42%) and Eastern (25%) Anatolia Regions, which are the poorest two regions of Turkey.

Considering the CCT, the emphasis on ‘the positive behavioral changes’ that will be created through this component is crucial. In return for a small amount of money, these families are expected to solve all the problems related to the education and health care of their children on their own. All the problems related to the education and health of the poor children are reduced to the issue of whether or not their families keep these children at school. In addition to that, whether or not they keep them at school is considered as a behavioral problem, rather than as a matter of their resources. The reasons why the families make their children work, why they need the labor of their children, and whether the CCT money will cover the educational expenses of these children are not considered. Moreover, the structural problems in Turkey related to education and health, such as the
overcrowded classrooms, the schools that do not have teachers especially in the Eastern and South Eastern regions of Turkey, or the low quality of basic health services are not even mentioned. Through their access to several reports on poverty in Turkey, the World Bank people are aware of the fact that in Turkey, in crisis situations when there is a decrease in their resources, poor families withdraw their children from school both to avoid educational expenses and also to benefit from their labor, which has many long term negative consequences. The Project Information Document for the SRMP mentions a social assessment conducted previously for the SRMP whose main finding was evidence on the withdrawal of children from school in the aftermath of an economic crisis. According to the document, during the field visits in Eastern, Southern and Central Anatolia, Black Sea Region and the slums of Istanbul and Ankara, the poor stated that because of the 2001 economic crisis, they will not be able to send their children to school at the beginning of the school year although eight years of primary education is compulsory in Turkey. Therefore, the rationale behind the CCT is preventing the families from withdrawing their children from school. However, the minuscule amount of money given to the families is far from meeting the educational expenses of the children. During my interviews with the people who received money as CCT, all of them complained that the amount given to them was too low to cover their children’s expenses. Here, what is aimed is the creation of certain subjects that rationally make investments in the education and health of their children to increase their ‘human capital’. These subjects know that they have full responsibility for their conditions and learn not to depend on the state to improve the conditions in which their families are living. These are the neoliberal subjects.
3) What was aimed with the Local Initiatives (LI) component is “…turning poor citizens into economically active individuals, increasing their employability abilities and increasing the quality as well as the variety of the social services provided for disadvantageous citizens.” (Final Project Report). According to the same report, within the scope of the SRMP, 8856 sub-projects were supported and YTL 191,519,694 was transferred. LI component consists of five sub-components:

a) income generating sub-projects for the poor,
b) employability trainings for unemployed, young people and women,
c) temporary employment sub-projects for the community,
d) social infrastructure and service sub-projects,
e) community development sub-projects.

Looking at these five items, it should be apparent that local initiatives component is responsible for the diversity in activities that I pointed out at the very beginning. It covers a large spectrum, ranging from individual entrepreneurship to large scale infrastructure activities. Although all these elements are mentioned, in fact the heart of the LI component is the element of income-generating sub-projects, with almost 70% of the money allocated for Local Initiatives spent on these sub-projects. These are similar to micro credit, as through these supports poor people are provided small loans to set up their own businesses and to become small entrepreneurs. But in a different way from micro credit, they are given to both men and women, and people don’t pay any interest when they are paying back the money. For the other four elements of this component,
rather small amounts of money were spent and as many of my interviewees argued, activities that did not have much to do with poverty alleviation and that were under the authority of different state institutions were executed.

With especially the income generating sub-projects, the intention was creating small entrepreneurs who will get out of poverty and start to live on their own means by becoming the owners of their own business. In my interviews with the heads of the local Solidarity Foundations and the state officials from the General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity (SYDGM), most of them spoke very positively about the philosophy of the LI, if not about the actual implementation on the ground, all of them surprisingly repeating exactly the same phrase: “Don’t give them a fish, teach them how to fish.” Some of them also made jokes, saying that if these poor people become entrepreneurs, both parties, the Foundation personnel and the poor people themselves, will get rid of each other, as they will not be in the pool of people that the personnel are responsible for giving aid regularly. Here, they pointed out the unwanted character of this relationship for both parties. This entire discourse depends on the idea of creating responsible subjects who can live on their own without depending on state resources and the way to do this seems to be through constructing them as entrepreneurs.

4) According to the Project Information Document, the aim of the Institutional Development component is improving the capacity of those government institutions which are involved in providing aid to the poor people in the country. The SRMP would develop the capacities of SYDGM (General Directorate for Social Assistance and
Solidarity), 931 local SYDVs (Social Solidarity Foundations), TÜİK (Turkish Statistical Institute), and SHÇEK (General Directorate of Social Services and Children’s Protection) in the areas of i) management information systems and information technologies, ii) policy, research, monitoring and evaluation, iii) staff development and training, and iv) public information mechanisms. Institutional Development was somehow different form the other three components in the sense that it aimed to make investments in government institutions rather than giving aid to the individuals. However, in the end, Institutional Development turned out to be the most neglected component of the project which was still not completed nine months after the project completion date and it became mostly related to MIS and information technology development. In fact, as I will later cover in detail, the project had serious negative consequences in terms of the institutional development of SYDGM, which is a key institution for social assistance.

2.3. Project Implementation

Turkey joined the World Bank in 1947 but the Bank’s liason office in Ankara, which is responsible for following the daily activities of the World Bank headquarters in Turkey, was established in 1988. Although Turkey became a member in 1947, as there were just a couple of projects implemented between 1947 and 1988, there was no need for a liason office during that period. In the late 1980s, the World Bank sharply increased its level of lending to Turkey in response to the then prime minister Turgut Özal’s neoliberal economic reforms and by 1988, the Turkish portfolio became the fifth largest in the Bank (World Bank 2006, p.7). Since 1980s, the World Bank has had a very intensive program in Turkey with several projects implemented. As stated in the World Bank Turkey
website “Turkey is the World Bank’s largest borrower in the Europe and Central Asia Region and has been among the top three largest Bank borrowers each year over the past four years in terms of new commitments, which have totaled around USD 6 billion during this time period.”

At the time when I conducted my interviews in October 2008, there were 43 people working in the Ankara office. When we look at the organizational structure of the office, there is the county director at the top. Currently the country director is Ulrich Zachau. Then there is the Lead Operations Officer, who reports to the country director. There are four main sectors which are Economic Management, Public Sector and Finance; Human Development; Agriculture and Rural Development; Infrastructure and Energy. Some of the staff working under these sectors is resident in Turkey while others come from Washington DC every three-four months. Generally, the country director, lead operations officer, and the sector coordinators are not from the nationally hired staff. There are a total of 21 ongoing projects. The ongoing projects under Human Development are Secondary Education Project, Second Phase of Basic Education Project, Health Transition Project, and the SRMP which has been terminated but still has some of its parts incomplete.

The World Bank has a six-step standard project cycle for the implementation of its projects:

1) Country Assistance Strategy: The World Bank proposes financial, advisory, and technical services to help countries identify their priorities and reach their main development goals…

2) Identification: Ideas for creating meaningful change are discussed. Borrower and Bank representatives weigh development objectives and project impacts, risks, alternatives and timetable…

3) Preparation, Appraisal, and Board Approval: With advice and financial assistance from the Bank, the Borrower conducts studies and prepares detailed project documentation. The Bank assesses the economic, technical, institutional, financial, environmental, and social aspects of the project. When the Bank and the Borrower agree on the terms of a loan or credit, the project is presented to the Bank’s Board of Executive Directors for approval.

4) Implementation and Supervision: The Borrower implements the project, issuing contracts through a competitive bidding process that follows the Bank's procurement guidelines. World Bank staff periodically supervises the project to make sure that the loan proceeds are used for intended purposes and with due regard for economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.

5) Implementation and Completion: At the end of the loan or credit disbursement period (anywhere from 1-10 years), a completion report identifying project results, problems and lessons learned is submitted by operations staff to the Bank’s Board of Executive Directors for information purposes.

6) Evaluation: After a Borrower completes a project, the Bank's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) measures the outcomes against original objectives and assesses whether or not the project’s results can be maintained over the long term. A number of projects are further scrutinized in detailed impact evaluation reports.⁶

About the development of a project in Turkey, the World Bank Turkey website gives the information that the Bank prepares and finances a project upon the request of the Government of Turkey. After an appraisal of the project’s feasibility and the loan terms, negotiations take place. Then, it is approved by the Bank’s Board of Executive Directors and an agreement is signed. After the ratification by the Turkish parliament, the loan becomes effective⁷. One World Bank officer explained that the expression ‘World Bank project’ is in fact a misnomer; when we talk about a World Bank project in Turkey what we refer to is a project of Turkish Republic which the World Bank finances. In this situation, the implementer of each project is a government agency. She stated that if, for instance, a project is about agriculture, it is under the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture, or if it is about education, then the Ministry of Education will be responsible for that. However, she further argued, if the people who will work for the project are


selected from the personnel of the responsible Ministry, then they won’t be able to do
their own jobs and this is the reason why in every country, the Bank asks for the
implementation of the projects it is financing by a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) or a
Project Coordination Unit (PCU). Therefore, a PIU/PCU is established under the related
Ministry for each such project. In many cases, the people who work in this Unit are not
the personnel of the Ministry but are consultants who are hired only to work during the
implementation period of that specific project. A PIU/PCU is terminated at the end of a
project.

Although the explanation by this World Bank official is partly helpful, it is at the same
time misleading as well. These projects are called World Bank projects because what the
World Bank does is more than financing a certain project. Moreover, a PIU/PCU is
established not because personnel working in the responsible ministry have other
responsibilities but, as will become more clear when I talk about the SRMP, because the
World Bank handles these projects through independent units composed of consultants
who are working according to the World Bank’s procedures and principles. Therefore,
there is the appearance of implementation by a state ministry as the related PCU/PIU
seems to be under that ministry while it is operating independently from the ministry but
in coordination with the World Bank team for that project. For that reason, these projects
are not mistakenly but very accurately called as World Bank projects. George and Sabelli
(1994) also point out this difference between the definition of a project and how it turns
out to be in practice: “Theoretically, the World Bank was supposed to finance projects
requested by a borrowing government. In practice, the Bank sent out its flying squads to find bankable projects.” (George & Sabelli 1994, p.42)

In the implementation of each project, there is a World Bank team leader for the project. The PIU/PCU needs to report the information related to the project’s implementation and the use of funds to the World Bank Headquarters and this team leader is a mediator in the reporting process of the developments related to the project. Team leader, in fact, has two roles: following the progress of the project by communicating with the Turkish government and the PCU/PIU consultants, and reporting implementation-related information to the Headquarters. Therefore, team leader is the person acting between the Turkish government and the Bank. For the SRMP, the team leader was John Innes. At every stage of the project cycle, from the beginning to the end, team leader has active roles: having meetings with government officials at the design stage, monitoring daily activities in coordination with the responsible ministry, going to the field on project supervision missions, writing reports and presenting them at the Headquarters, writing the project completion report at the end of the project implementation, being involved in the evaluation activities, etc. When there is a supervision mission, experts come from the Headquarters to join the team leader and this team does the supervision by going to the field and inspecting project related activities. For the SRMP, there were three people in the core team including the project team leader. At the design stage of the SRMP, the World Bank team had several meetings with people from the Social Solidarity Fund (SYDTF) which was the state agency that was selected to implement the project or the ‘line agency’ in World Bank terms. There were also meetings with the State Planning
Institute (DPT) and the Treasury. As one World Bank official stated, it takes full agreement from at least three agencies of government, the Treasury, State Planning Institute, and ‘line agency’, and the World Bank to agree on the implementation of a project.

Figure 4. SRMP Implementation Overview

In all the project-related documents for the SRMP, SYDGM (General Directorate for Social Assistance and Solidarity), which is a state institution, is presented as the implementing agency for the project. These documents tell their readers that a Project Coordination Unit (PCU) was established under SYDGM for implementing the activities planned under the project. A researcher who limits his/her research to analyzing these
documents will have no idea that this statement is not quite accurate. After I started doing interviews, I found out that the PCU for the project which is allegedly under SYDGM was composed of consultants hired and compensated by the World Bank unlike the people working for SYDGM who are state officials, and the PCU functioned as a body independent from and rival to SYDGM. The PCU for the SRMP was a private body established by the World Bank under a government structure, SYDGM. This situation gave way to a lot of conflict between the people working for SYDGM and for the PCU. Before proceeding further to give details of these conflicts, first I will briefly talk about the foundation and structure of SYDGM. However, in order to do this, I should also explain the establishment of Social Solidarity Fund (SYDTF) and its General Secretariat.

In May 1986, Social Solidarity Fund (SYDTF) was legally established under Law 3294: “The purpose of this Act is to assist citizens in absolute poverty and need and (other) persons that have been admitted to or have entered Turkey in any way, to ensure fair distribution of income by taking measures for strengthening social justice, to promote private social assistance and solidarity.” (Article 1, amended 16 June 1989- www.sydgm.gov.tr) It is an extra budgetary fund which is financed by earmarked taxes. 1986, the year when SYDTF was established, is an important year as it is a year when a structural adjustment program was in implementation. The answer to the question of why the SYDTF was established lies here: increasing income inequalities due to the structural adjustment programs and the policies of the IMF and the World Bank created a need for the foundation of such a Fund (Hünler 2005). Although it will not be accurate to say that its establishment was imposed by the IMF and the World Bank, the social consequences
of the structural adjustment programs imposed by these international financial institutions created a need for such a social assistance institution. In fact, similar social funds were established in several countries during the same period to offset the increase in poverty brought by structural adjustment. The first social funds started in Latin America during 1980s as a temporary solution to the adverse effect of structural adjustment programs on the poor and later expanded to Africa, Eastern Europe, and Southeast Asia (Tendler 2000, p.114). As highlighted in the World Bank’s 2000/2001 World Development Report, about fifty countries, most in Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa, had social funds by that time (World Development Report 2000/2001, p.155). As Zabcı explains, “...(b)y means of institutions like the Social Assistance and Solidarity Fund in Turkey, the Emergency Social Needs Fund in Brazil, the National Renewal Fund in India and the Emergency Social Fund in Bolivia, the World Bank has implemented poverty reduction projects as a ‘complementary’ part of structural reforms.” (Zabcı 2006, p.123). Therefore, while looking at the foundation of SYDTF, it is crucial to consider it within the context of structural adjustment, neoliberal policies and the establishment of social funds in other countries. As Şenses (1999) states, SYDTF was established by a government which also put neoliberal economic policies into implementation, and its activities were put into practice top-down, without the presence of a demand from lower classes and the poor.

Starting from its first foundation until 2004, the Fund was administered by a General Secretariat under Prime Ministry, which, as many of the officials that I interviewed described, was a ‘virtual’ structure. They called it virtual because there was no legal ground for the foundation of a Secretariat or any organization for the administration of
the Fund. Therefore, General Secretariat was an office that did not legally exist. It became the implementing agency of the Fund without any legal foundation. Most of its staff was seconded from and paid by other ministries and agencies, and they did not have much background or experience in social services. The Secretariat did not have the responsibility of making policies in the area of social assistance. The money collected in the Social Solidarity Fund was to be distributed to the people by 931 Social Solidarity Foundations (Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Vakıfları-SYDV) which would be established in all the provinces and sub-provinces of Turkey. Every month, money collected in the Social Solidarity Fund has been transferred to the 931 SYDVs for dispersal to the poor people. SYDVs have provided assistance in the forms of cash benefits (grants, scholarships, emergency related assistance), food, clothing, fuel, and medicine, and also support for small projects (handicrafts, greenhouses, bee-keeping, etc.). Foundations were instituted as associations subject to private rather than public law with the idea that they would be civil and local service providers which would easily collect donations and the local people would also participate in the decisions about the distribution of aids. An important factor behind the decision to create a civil structure was the ineffectiveness of central governmental social assistance institutions, such as SHÇEK (General Directorate of Social Services and Children’s Protection). However, establishment of a board of trustees (mütevelli heyeti) in every Social Solidarity Foundation which is headed by the local governor impeded the creation of a civil organization (Şenses 1999, p.433) as the activities of SYDVs have been bound by the decision of the board of trustees and especially the local governor. SYDVs gained a vague status, being responsible for distributing the money transferred from the Fund but
having no direct relationship to the Fund’s General Secretariat. Each SYDV has been independent and had freedom in making a decision for giving social assistance. This has also been a drawback; as also stated in a World Bank document, “...there is no systematic methodology for targeting and allocation of resources, to ensure that the most needy will be the final beneficiaries.” (World Bank Project Appraisal Document for Social Risk Mitigation Project 2001, p.127). Determination of the poor has mostly been left to the subjective judgment of local governors and heads of Foundations, which has created a risk of partiality and political partisanship.

The problems with the structure of SYDTF and the Social Solidarity Foundations were well-known to the staff working at the General Secretariat for a long time. Especially the ‘virtual’ position of the Secretariat was a subject of concern. However, from 1986 until 2004, this structure remained the same and there was no significant attempt to create a formal institution for administering the Fund. In 1999, just after the earthquake in Marmara Region in Turkey, a World Bank project (Marmara Earthquake Emergency Reconstruction Project-MEERP) was put into implementation through the then existing SYDTF General Secretariat. There was an amount of USD 30,000 left from the loan for that project. That money was used for an institutional analysis of the General Secretariat which was made by the consulting company, PriceWaterhouseCoopers. The company prepared a report which explained the problems of the institution and recommended the establishment of a formal structure. When the SRMP was first being designed, SYDTF General Secretariat was selected as the implementing agency of the project depending on the Bank’s previous experience with the Secretariat during the MEERP. However, the
problems related to the Secretariat were also stated in the World Bank documents prepared at the start of the SRMP in 2001. The World Bank asked for the establishment of a General Directorate for the Fund which would have its permanent staff and put this as a condition into the loan agreement. Moreover, as one SYDGM official stated, during the implementation of the project, the World Bank put pressure for the establishment of the Directorate declaring that otherwise the loan will be suspended. Hence, in 2004, during the implementation of the SRMP, the General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity (SYDGM) was established. However, establishment of SYDGM made things even more complicated. Since 2001, the Project Coordination Unit for the SRMP was in operation, executing the project related activities and becoming more experienced in the field. When the SYDGM was established, it also got involved in similar kinds of activities. Hence, there were two seemingly related but in fact separate institutions carrying out similar assistance programs, one under the title of the World Bank’s SRMP and the other as its standard activities. Moreover, the independent status of the PCU, public visibility of its activities, and better earnings of the PCU consultants created a discontent in the staff of SYDGM, this new government institution. The personnel working at the local Social Solidarity Foundations became confused about whom to contact, PCU or SYDGM staff, when they had questions about carrying out Foundation activities. The conflicts between two institutions became worse during the closing stage of the SRMP. The World Bank team proposed a second project, Social Development and Employment Promotion Project, which would be the second stage of the SRMP. The consultants working at the PCU supported the implementation of this second project, while SYDGM personnel and officials from some other government institutions, such as
the State Planning Organization and the Treasury, were against it. Ultimately, that second project proposal was rejected. The SRMP was closed and PCU dissolved. Because of their conflictual relationship, there was not much information or experience sharing between PCU consultants and SYDGM personnel at that stage. Consequently, much of the invaluable institutional learning was lost as it could not be transferred from the PCU consultants to SYDGM personnel. Furthermore, the vague status of the Foundations still persists. Although they implement the projects of the General Directorate, they do not have a direct administrative connection to the Directorate. The local governor (vali/kaymakam) is regarded as the head of each foundation which complicates the situation of the staff working in these foundations. “Our fate is between the lips of the governors” is a statement which is repeated by many people who work in the Foundations. Several parties are involved in the administration and the inspection of the Foundations. The Foundation personnel are responsible to all of these parties which have conflicting demands at times.

2.4. A Successful Project?

One striking thing about the SRMP is the huge difference between how the World Bank team and the PCU consultants evaluate the project on the one hand, and how the state officials, SYDGM personnel and especially the local implementers evaluate it on the other hand. As emphasized in the final project report prepared by the PCU,

In the Final Aide Memoire dated 19-22 March 2007 and prepared by the World Bank Mission on SRMP, it is stated that the SRMP has been completed with all components fully finished and all targets met or surpassed. In terms of meeting the development objectives it has been rated ‘fully satisfactory’… in terms of implementation progress, the SRMP is rated as ‘highly satisfactory’ as i) the Rapid Response was extremely effective and fully disbursed to support the extreme poor during the depths of the economic recession in 2001/2002; ii) the Institutional Development component was implemented effectively with the SRMP recognized as the ‘Top Performer’ amongst Bank-supported projects in public information, and in
In addition to these facts, in a different part of the same report, it is mentioned that “…the full amount of the loan has been used which is a testimony to the efficiency and effectiveness of all of the agencies involved in the SRMP” (Final Project Report, p.18)

This last fact, namely that the World Bank loan was used up, was repeated several times especially by the World Bank officials and the PCU consultants as an indicator of the project’s success during my interviews. This is the statement of a World Bank official:

“…The loan is effectively already closed and there is just one million dollars left. With that, the whole loan amount will be disbursed which is for a huge loan, 500 million dollars, that’s big achievement in itself.” If we look closely at these facts which are used as criteria that demonstrate the SRMP’s success, we will see that they are mostly quantitative criteria which cannot necessarily be regarded as signs of success. As one high level state official argued:

33

The World Bank sends consultants from its Headquarters for the implementation of its projects. These consultants work without taking into consideration the country’s specific conditions. What they care about is demonstrating to their own Board and to their supervisors that the task has been completed and they did what they were supposed to do. The project’s success is not determined by its contribution to this country but according to the Bank’s own criteria. The important thing is whether or not it has been completed before the set deadline. As these people are mostly concerned about their own careers, they are not concerned about local impacts. It’s all about indicators such as the amount of money distributed…

The number of sub-projects or of beneficiaries and spending the full amount of the loan do not tell us much about what happened in the lives of those ‘beneficiaries’, whether the money given to them empowered them or changed their lives in a positive direction, how those sub-projects turned out to be, or what kind of problems (and burden) it created for
those people working at local Social Solidarity Foundations who were involved in the
day-to-day activities of the project and who lack social security themselves. When I
talked to people especially from this last group, what I heard was that the SRMP was far
from being successful according to this second group of criteria. Personnel working at the
Foundations, as the local implementers of the project and as the ones who were in face-
to-face contact with the poor people who received aid had a lot to say about the problems
related to the project. Therefore, I will first start with reflecting on how the Foundation
officials viewed the project.

Personnel of the Foundations, who did not have a clear status and job security due to the
vague position of the Foundations, formed their Association after the start of the SRMP.
Although the idea of founding an Association did not emerge with the SRMP, this
project’s implementation speeded up the process. The rapid increase in their workload
without a significant change in their work conditions made it even more significant to be
organized under an Association. In addition, for a training given to Foundation officials
about the SRMP, all the Foundation officials were brought together. As one official
stated, during that training the single most important subject that was debated was the
rights and status of the Foundation officials. Here, we can argue that establishment of the
Foundation Officials’ Association is a major unintended consequence of the World
Bank’s SRMP in Turkey. After the formation of this Association, Foundation officials
working in 931 Foundations all over Turkey had a chance to meet each other, share
information and their common problems, and demand their rights. As the SRMP
increased their workload significantly, the project was the most debated subject for the
Foundation officials. A lot of information and experience sharing about the SRMP especially on the web site of the Association helped the creation of a common discourse and intensified their criticisms of the project. Therefore, when I interviewed Foundation personnel, they voiced their concerns regarding several different aspects of the project and what each official told had a lot in common with what the others talked about.

The Foundation officials that I interviewed had significant problems with the government’s decision to get a World Bank loan, which will be paid back with interest, to implement a poverty alleviation project. Considering the fact that the General Secretariat’s (later SYDGM’s) annual budget was much higher than the total loan amount of 500 million dollars provided by the World Bank for the SRMP, these officials found it pointless to borrow money from the Bank. They were uneasy with the broad coverage of the SRMP activities by the media and representation of these activities as carried out by the World Bank money, while it was a loan, hence government money (and public debt) in fact.

46 They got a loan to help the poor. This is a decision that is hard to understand. Our Fund’s resources are not limited to the World Bank’s 500 million dollars. Our Fund’s resources are a lot more than that… They behave like these Foundations haven’t done anything since 1986. Take Local Initiatives sub-projects… We have been giving money for such activities since 1986. It is not a new practice. There are businesses that were opened with our support even during 1980s. The Fund was executing such activities. It doesn’t make much sense to present these practices like a big novelty.

The Foundations and Foundation personnel were in an intermediary position between the Project Coordination Unit and the people who applied for aid. This position was a difficult and troublesome one because they were the ones who had to give explanations about the decisions in which they did not have a say:
Ours is a difficult job. People submit their applications to us. For Local Initiatives, we get the applications, prepare the documents, present them to our local board of trustees (mütevelli heyeti). When they approve we send it to the PCU. Sometimes they approve, other times they don’t. But we are the only ones that those people know. Although the money is transferred by the PCU, people only know us. It is the same with the CCT. We get the applications and send them to the PCU through internet. When they don’t approve, we are the ones who tell the people that their applications are not approved. And people say it is not approved because we didn’t want. So they always blame us. In fact it has nothing to do with me. Money is transferred to people’s accounts by the PCU. Interestingly, even those bank accounts are opened by the PCU. But if there is a problem and money is not transferred to the accounts, people think that we are responsible for that. We cannot convince them that we did not make the decision. We are always in the middle.

A major problem for the Foundation officials was that they weren’t consulted before the components of the SRMP were put into operation and all the decisions were made between the World Bank people and high level government officials in Ankara. They saw it as the main cause of the implementation difficulties. They complained that they carried out the day-to-day activities of the project, dealt with thousands of applications, and their workload increased immensely due to the SRMP but in spite of all these, people in the Project Coordination Unit ignored them or did not take their opinions seriously.

Moreover, they also complained that as there was a hierarchical relationship between the PCU consultants and the Foundation officials, when they needed help or had questions about implementation issues, they called the PCU but the people in the PCU were usually very rude and did not give sufficient information to them. In addition to this disregard, Foundation officials also criticized the high amounts paid to the consultants of the Project Coordination Unit, when they themselves were significantly underpaid and did not have job security. They stated that the main reason why the PCU consultants were paid such amounts was that they are familiar with the World Bank procedures and are fluent in English which, they think, are criteria that are irrelevant in the area of social services.
They were also critical of the scholars who prepared a scoring formula\(^8\) for the
determination of the people who would benefit from the CCT, as those scholars also
closed their eyes to Foundation officials’ experiences.
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I asked a question to the professor who prepared that scoring formula. I asked why this is included
in the formula. And he said ‘regression’. I told him to go to his university and tell that to his
students. I am a man who has been working in the field for twenty years and I was speaking from
that experience. If he is acting depending on his data for 3000 households, I am speaking as a
person who has been responsible for giving aid to 30,000 households. Unfortunately, they never
paid attention to our experiences or demands.

Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) was the component that the Foundation officials
criticized most. Many officials argued that it would be more appropriate to implement the
CCT through Ministries of Health and Education, rather than through the Foundations as
CCT was an assistance program in the area of health and education. Also, although they
were the ones who received CCT applications, visited applicants’ residences to fill out
forms about their living conditions, kept track of school attendance of children and visits
to health care facilities, and responded to people’s complaints, the ‘beneficiaries’ were
determined at the central level and money was directly transferred to people’s accounts
by the PCU. This was a source of a lot of conflict between the Foundation officials and
the people who received, or could not receive, aid. They considered it as a political
maneuver to provide aid to so many people under the CCT program, which is an issue
that I will cover in detail in the following chapter. After the completion of the SRMP and
termination of the Project Coordination Unit, CCT became a program that would be
administered by SYDGM. Foundations remained as the local implementing agencies.

Some officials that I interviewed described the CCT as a big trouble for both the
Foundations and SYDGM.

\(^8\) When a person applied for the CCT, information about that person was entered into the system and a
poverty score was calculated using the coefficients of this scoring formula.
(CCT) is a big mess for our General Directorate. People at the Directorate do not know how to get out of it or what to do with it. Moreover, the CCT is politically indispensable now. If we terminate CCT, there will be a huge reaction. Just to use up the loan money, they (PCU) gave it to everyone.

The scoring formula used for the determination of the ‘beneficiaries’ that I mentioned above was a subject of concern for many.

They said they were trying to reach the poorest six percent of the population for the CCT. They brought a scoring formula. That scoring was more appropriate for the American society. Ownership of a washing machine and a car both had the same score. It might be relevant for the US because there are laundries there and many people may not have washing machines. Because they don’t need to… Therefore, having a washing machine might be an indicator of not being poor. But the situation is different in Turkey. Few people have cars but it is easy for even the poor to get a second-hand washing machine.

Many officials thought that although providing money for education and health was a good practice, the amounts given were far from meeting the needs of children or families. Moreover, even though the money was given to the mothers, officials believed that men appropriated the money and used it not for their families but for their own individual consumption. Ironically, the same officials who argued that the amount was too low also claimed that in the Eastern and Southeastern regions of Turkey, where there is a significant Kurdish population, families started to have more children just to get more CCT money and hence there has been a sharp increase in the birth rates and the population in these two regions. These same arguments were also repeated by officials from other institutions, such as SYDGM, the State Planning Institution (DPT), and the Treasury. In the next chapter, I will further explain this issue of how the SRMP gave way to the production of certain discourses about the Eastern and Southeastern regions and the Kurdish population, which intensified the existing stereotypes.

Although most of the Foundation officials that I interviewed were positive about the idea behind Local Initiatives component, which is creating small entrepreneurs, they were
critical of the way in which it was implemented. People were expected to put their ideas into a project format in order to apply for a small loan for an income generating sub-project. As most of them were not capable of doing that, Foundation officials prepared the project proposals for them. There were also cases where officials did not have time to help with project proposal writing so the ones who wanted to apply for these small loans paid other people for the writing of a proposal. The officials argued that just to increase the number of sub-projects, loans were given to all the people who came with an idea and made an application regardless of whether they were poor or not. Besides, the poor people who were given loans lacked the qualifications and training to sustain a business. The officials argued that by giving loans to these people who did not have the necessary qualifications, the project contributed to the worsening of these people’s situation as they were now in debt and lost several benefits they previously had as unemployed people when they did not belong to any social security systems. There were officials who believed that it would have been much more beneficial if factories were built and large scale employment opportunities were provided with this money instead of loans given to individuals. They weren’t in favor of encouraging people to open small shops which cannot compete with big malls. Almost all the officials that I interviewed repeated that Local Initiatives sub-projects have largely failed. People who got loans could not sustain their businesses and there were only a few people who paid the loans back. Foundation officials were faced with the problem of what to do about those people who did not pay their loans back. They were hesitant to pursue legal solutions as it would be meaningless to take legal action against poor people for an activity that is carried out as a part of a poverty alleviation project. However, they were also pressured to do something about the
money that was not paid back. Moreover, as they weren’t given clear instructions on how to deal with this situation, they were left in an ambiguous position. Some Foundation officials complained that people who received loans were also aware of this ambiguity and relied on it not to pay back the money. As a result, there were different practices in different Foundations. In some Foundations, officials went to court while in others there was no legal action.

To begin with, it is difficult to follow these. People make applications for the income generating sub-projects. Their investigations and follow-ups… In most Foundations, there was no back payment for the income generating sub-projects. There are several legal cases now and we are trying to deal with them. Some of these people have disappeared and we are now trying to find them.

Infrastructure of the Foundations was not adequate to implement the components of the SRMP. Hence, within the context of the Institutional Development, the Foundations were also to be improved. For that aim, computers and other office equipment were distributed to the Foundations. Before the SRMP was initiated, there was no standardization in the Foundations and each Foundation was using a separate program to keep the information about the people that they were giving aid. Development of software for storing and retrieving information about the applicants and recipients of different types of aid was also a part of the institutional development of the Foundations. However, most officials that I interviewed complained that the PCU did not take this seriously and left it to the end of the project implementation period. Therefore, each Foundation had to process thousands of applications without well-established software. Moreover, Foundation personnel also had to visit each applicant’s home to prepare a report about the physical conditions. With a huge increase in applications after the start of the SRMP, this became an enormously time consuming activity. Considering the fact that many Foundations did not have their own vehicles and the SRMP did not put forward purchasing of vehicles, it
should be clear that the SRMP made life extremely difficult for the people working for the Foundations with its inadequacy in institutional development.

During my interviews, SYDGM officials were the second group that was highly critical of the SRMP and their concerns had a lot in common with what the Foundation officials talked about. They were seriously skeptical of the success of the components of the SRMP and distrusted the results of the impact assessment reports. One official stated that she does not trust the findings of an impact assessment report which was ordered by the implementer of the same project, namely the PCU. The problems regarding the Institutional Development component were repeated by the SYDGM officials as a major deficiency of the SRMP. They argued that although this component was to be started at the early stages of the project, together with the Rapid Response, the PCU neglected it till the very end. For them, the reason for this disregard was the low probability of getting public attention to an investment in institutional development unlike the Rapid Response, CCT, and Local Initiatives components which included distributing money to people. Thus, they asserted, the World Bank team and the PCU attached importance to those elements of the project that they can easily ‘market’ to the general public. With the idea of quickly starting the implementation of the CCT and Local Initiatives, independent modular software was created for each component without developing a permanent program that could be transferred to SYDGM after the termination of the project. This short term thinking did not contribute to the development of the existing social assistance systems, although this is what was entailed by the Institutional Development component. When I was conducting interviews in November 2008, long after the end of the SRMP,
some SYDGM officials were still working on the establishment of a permanent program that the PCU was supposed to complete.

SYDGM officials asserted that the ‘two-headed structure’, which referred to the existence of both the PCU and SYDGM at the same time, caused enormous damage in terms of institutional development. However, they were knowledgeable of the fact that this structure was not a peculiarity of the SRMP but rather a common characteristic of the World Bank projects in general. These projects are prepared to be implemented by a certain state institution. A Project Coordination or Implementation Unit is established under that institution which is composed of people who are hired from outside based on their fluency in English and knowledge of the Bank’s procedures. A World Bank official explained this practice with reference to the capacity (or incapacity) of the existing staff: “(The World Bank) doesn’t prefer to work with consultants. It assesses first of all the capacity of the existing staff. There are very high standard requirements for procurement and for financial management. And if existing staff don’t have these, then one way of resolving that problem is hiring independent consultants.” As some officials stated, the kind of procedures and practices that the World Bank is enforcing in these PIU/PCUs is not compatible with the administrative rules and procedures in Turkey. The World Bank puts into force its own procedures with the argument that its procedures promote flexibility, while governmental procedures create inefficiency, which is obviously a neoliberal argument. To give an example, all the public purchases are normally subject to Public Procurement Law. However, when there is a World Bank project, the PCU has to follow World Bank procurement procedures for its purchases. Also, consultants who
work for World Bank projects are hired on a temporary basis, to work until these projects are completed, usually moving from one World Bank project to another. Their working principles and conditions are different, and they earn much higher than government officials. When two groups of people (government officials and consultants for World Bank officials) work under the same government institution with very different terms, this becomes a major source of conflict. This has been the case not only for SYDGM during the implementation of the SRMP but also for other government institutions and ministries throughout other World Bank projects. In addition to the emerging conflicts, another drawback of this situation is that these consultants, by shifting from one institution to another, carry all the implementation-related learning and experience with them increasing their individual ‘value’ in the consultancy market without necessarily contributing to the institutional learning or development of any of these government institutions. This is ironic because they are compensated from the World Bank loans borrowed by the state, which are government and, hence, public funds. For this reason, this structure creates a situation where public money is used for supporting private gains. The officials stated that of the total of 500 million dollars borrowed from the World Bank for the SRMP, almost 100 million dollars of the total loan amount, were paid to the consultants of the PCU and to the other consultants and researchers for the impact assessment reports. This is a point that many state officials complained about.

In a similar way with the Foundation officials but even more intensely, SYDGM officials were uneasy with the general belief that it was World Bank money that was distributed through the SRMP. They observed that not only those people who benefited form the
project but also general public and the scholars who were somewhat interested in the project were thinking that the SRMP was implemented with a World Bank grant. For these public officials, this misapprehension of public money as World Bank money and the media coverage of the SRMP as the World Bank’s helping hand reaching out to the poor in Turkey was significantly disturbing.

SRAP was implemented with funds which were borrowed by the Turkish Republic. It was not a grant by any means. It was transferred to our poor citizens with reference to the social state principle. It is this country’s money. It is my money and your money… It is not World Bank’s money.

As I mentioned before, a second project, Social Development and Employment Promotion Project- SDEP, which would be the continuation of the SRMP was proposed by the World Bank team and the PCU towards the end of the SRMP. SYDGM officials explained that their negative position together with the disapproval of other state institutions, such as the State Planning Institution and the Treasury, led to the rejection of that proposal. Their dismissal of this second project was not only a result of the problems they conceived regarding the SRMP or their reactions to the PCU but also rooted in the fact that the new project was proposed in a way which did not take into consideration the regular governmental procedures.

Typically, an institution prepares a project, presents it to the State Planning Organization (DPT), and requests it to be included in the investment program. DPT examines the proposal and tries to include it in the state budget if it seems to be worthwhile for the country. Then, DPT contacts Ministry of Finance and if it is a project that is too costly to be included in the budget and really necessary for the benefits of this country it starts to look for other sources of funding. It contacts the European Investment Bank, the IMF, the World Bank, etc. and connects the supplier to the institution that prepared the project. It remains as the bystander throughout the consultations together with the Treasury. After it comes to a certain stage, it is put into the government program and approved by the Parliament. Then, the agreements are signed. The related institution is contacted and appointed as the responsible party. This is the normal procedure. However, in the case of that second project they tried to proceed in reverse… The PCU consultants hired by the World Bank prepared a new project proposal on behalf of the Turkish Republic, which is outrageous.
When the proposal was prepared by the World Bank team and the PCU, and presented to SYDGM, it did not get support from SYDGM personnel because of the reasons stated above. During that process, there were several meetings which people from the PCU and SYDGM attended in addition to the officials from other related institutions such as DPT and the Treasury. In those meetings, in the presence of PCU consultants, SYDGM officials made clear their negative position about the implementation of a second project. The officials that I talked to argued that when they voiced their negative opinions and declared that they do not need additional funds from a World Bank loan for a second project, the PCU consultants perceived it as a threat to their own positions and jobs. When the proposal was later disapproved, already existing conflicts between these two groups intensified. Some officials claimed that at the closing stage of the SRMP, the disputes reached such extreme levels that the PCU consultants did not transfer the essential documents to SYDGM.

State Planning Institute (DPT) is a major state institution that is involved in the decision to implement a World Bank project and when a second project was proposed by the Bank, a negative institutional opinion about this proposal was presented by DPT which depends on an evaluation of the implementation of the SRMP. DPT’s assessment of the SRMP and the problem areas they pointed out had a lot in common with what the Foundation officials and SYDGM personnel talked about: SRMP’s failure to establish an IT infrastructure for SYDGM; the project’s implementation by a PCU, and how this situation created conflicts and held back institutional capacity building for SYDGM; mistaken public belief that money transfers are made from a World Bank grant; problems
in the implementation of the CCT and in the design of the scoring formula for the
determination of beneficiaries, etc. The second proposed project, which would include
Institutional Development, CCT, and Social Development and Employment Support
components, was not so much different from the SRMP and included activities which are
already carried out by SYDGM. Moreover, no solution was proposed for the major
questions of how to handle the conflicts between the PCU and SYDGM, how to involve
SYDGM in project implementation, and how to develop this institution’s capacity.

While working with these International Financial Institutions, we look at their contributions in
terms of two aspects: financing and technical contribution…In terms of technical contribution, we
consider whether there has been any sustainable capacity building in our country with the
implementation of a project. This is of major importance. Because one of the main problems of
developing countries is not having enough capacity to solve their own problems. Therefore, we
expect a certain project to create permanent benefits…In this sense, this project (SRMP) has been
highly problematic. It has failed in institutional capacity building.

Considering these, it would be wrong to come to the conclusion that these state officials
are completely against World Bank loans and projects. As also mentioned in the above
quote, their problem is rather with the violation of the state procedures and loss of control
over why and when to borrow from the World Bank. Additionally, they are critical of the
establishment of Coordination or Implementation Units for World Bank projects.

However, they are not critical of the World Bank or Bank’s projects per se but rather of
those cases where the decision to borrow from the Bank was inappropriate.

It seems meaningless to me to get a loan from the Bank to alleviate social costs after a crisis. If the
World Bank provides a loan, it should be to the Ministry of Labor and Social Security for the
regulation of working conditions and for the making of new labor policies. It will be a better and
more permanent solution for everybody.

Having said this, it is crucial to stress that the case of the SRMP led them to reconsider
their previous thoughts. Some of the officials mentioned that they have been hearing a lot
of success stories about the projects and practices of the World Bank in other countries.
However, what they experienced in the case of the SRMP was far from being a positive experience. Considering the fact that the SRMP has also been presented as a very successful project by the World Bank although their own experience tells them that it is not true, these officials started to question the truthfulness of those other success stories. Their actual lived experience made them skeptical about the self-representation of the World Bank and its projects.

18 I don’t think that this project has been constructive for Turkey. The World Bank has experiences in many countries. If you compare our case with the other country cases, I don’t know how our case will be considered. More or less successful? At the beginning of project implementation, the World Bank people were giving examples from other countries, such as Mexico and Argentina. They were saying that those have been very successful cases. I wonder if they are going to give the SRMP as an example for successful implementation when they go to other countries. I know that everywhere they tell that CCT in Turkey had been effectively implemented and had serious positive impacts. But as an insider, I know that it was far from being successful.

One official voiced his concerns regarding the application of the World Bank’s rather than public procedures by the PCU by reflecting on the use of World Bank procurement procedures. When the PCU needs to make purchases (of hardware, software, other equipment) for a project, according to the Bank’s procedures, if the total is above a certain amount, they have to open the bidding to the companies in all the countries that are members of the World Bank. However, as in many cases local companies cannot compete with the international ones, it takes the form of purchasing from outside the country.

19 Ok, there is no problem with purchasing foreign-produced equipment as they are not manufactured in Turkey. However, here, we are not purchasing directly from IBM or HP, but from a distributor. Then why are we buying them from a foreign distributor? We could get them from a local one and support that local company. But the World Bank tells us that it should be international shopping.

Here the problem is, he argues, being unable to decide when to have domestic or international bidding for purchases: “When the amount is less than USD 50,000, they let us apply ‘national shopping’. But for more significant amounts, for 5 million dollars, we
have to do ‘international shopping’.” Therefore, it is a significant problem that World
Bank loans come with the condition that the borrowing countries cannot make purchases
according to their own procedures. In the case of the SRMP, he stated that foreign
companies got all the high amount contracts. In fact, during my interviews, both SYDGM
and Foundation officials talked about these companies and the amounts paid to them with
a certain outrage. This is, in fact, a point that has been emphasized in the literature on the
World Bank. Payer (1982) explains that the loans and credits given by the World Bank
are mostly project-tied and the money is paid to the corporations that win contracts for
supplying the necessary equipment. She states that 80 percent of the funds is given out
through international competitive bidding in which corporations from the member
countries of the Bank can compete. “Because bidding on World Bank contracts is
competitive among member countries, procurement does not correspond exactly to
contributions for each member nation, and some are considered ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ in
the competition for contracts.” (Payer 1982, p.36)

Some SYDGM officials also question whether there is really a need for the World Bank
to design a social assistance project for the country. They believe that a team of public
officials could also organize social assistance efforts after communicating with NGOs,
doing research, and doing field visits to other countries which have successful social
assistance programs. They do not think that it is such a big contribution to bring the idea
of for instance the CCT. Through access to the Internet, it is possible to reach an
enormous amount of information about social assistance systems, models, and
implementation experiences and in these circumstances, there is no need for a World
Bank designed project which has conditions attached to it. These officials think that the reasons behind asking for the implementation of a World Bank project are distrust in the capacity of public officials and effectiveness of public mechanisms. They stated that during the implementation of the SRMP, this distrust was communicated to them sometimes through implicit ways but other times explicitly, which they found extremely offensive.

Here, it is crucial to also look at the other side of these controversies and reflect on how the PCU consultants assess the project and its implementation period. For these consultants, the SRMP contributed significantly to the increasing public interest in the issue of poverty. Also, a major benefit of the project has been its contribution to the development and recognition of the SYDGM and Social Solidarity Foundations. They see the termination of the unorganized structure of General Secretariat and the establishment of a General Directorate as their own achievement and the SRMP’s success. However, SYDGM personnel did not appreciate the PCU or the World Bank although they owed their positions in the General Directorate to them. The independent position of the PCU from SYDGM and SYDGM personnel’s lack of knowledge about the SRMP’s implementation was that personnel’s own fault; it was a result of both their lack of qualifications and also unwillingness to spend effort, learn new things and take responsibility. The PCU’s failure to complete the institutional development of SYDGM and SYDVs was also caused by SYDGM’s reluctance to cooperate and to communicate their own institutional needs. PCU consultants accept that they have earned much higher compared to state officials but they refused the argument that they were doing the same
job; because of the time pressure, implementing a World Bank project always necessitated working beyond regular work hours, at nights, and during weekends. Moreover, they asserted, it required being flexible and taking initiatives, characteristics that state officials do not have. Therefore, they think, they more than deserved the amounts they earned for the project.

Even two days after the completion of the SRMP, PCU personnel worked until morning to transfer the folders to SYDGM. We never worked less than twelve hours a day during the project implementation period. We never had lunch breaks. Most of the times, we did not leave work before 10 PM. Yes, we were earning more but it is not accurate to say that we were doing the same job with the SYDGM people. We were working much harder.

PCU consultants accepted the fact that a lot of problems related to project implementation were caused by the delay in the completion of the Institutional Development component of the project. They agreed to the fact that Social Solidarity Foundations lacked adequate infrastructure to execute all the project related activities. In addition, they knew there was a need to develop project related software at the very beginning. However, they said, strict deadlines of the World Bank made it necessary to start implementing Rapid Response, CCT, and Local Initiatives without waiting to complete Institutional Development. Hence, while they acknowledged time pressure as an important cause of problems they experienced, they still considered having strict deadlines as a major plus of World Bank projects. In response to my question of whether there is a need for a World Bank project to develop a social assistance system, one consultant argued that a World Bank project brings project discipline with its set deadlines which is good to get some work done. Expressions like project discipline, project mentality, and ability to put ideas into a project format were repeated several times with positive connotations. One case in point was the emphasis on how the SRMP taught project mentality to the Foundation officials who previously only had the notion of
providing social assistance. Here, Sampson’s conceptualization will be helpful to understand what kind of activities the consultants refer to when they talk about a project:

Project society entails a special kind of activity; short term activities with a budget and a time schedule. Projects always end, ostensibly to be replaced by policy, but normally to be replaced by yet another project. Project society entails a special kind of structure, beginning with the donor, the project identification mission, the appraisal, the selection of an implementing partner, the disbursement of funds, the monitoring, the evaluation, and of course, the next project. Project society is about the allocation of resources in an organized, at times bureaucratic, fashion… (Sampson 2004, p.17)

A World Bank project with its focus on quantitative criteria, short term activities, strict deadlines, and standard project cycle very much conforms to the above definition. It is this nature of a World Bank project that the PCU consultants praise, but, at the same time, it is this same structure that created a chaos and inhibited any kind of permanent improvement. As one consultant explained, at one point there were more than ten thousand Local Initiatives sub-project applications waiting to be processed and decided, and the committee was trying to finish assessing them in a narrow time period. This certainly had negative consequences in terms of the quality of those sub-projects that were approved.

PCU consultants were aware of some of the widespread arguments about the impacts of the SRMP, such as the idea that there has been a decrease in the use of contraception and high increase in population especially in the Eastern and Southeastern regions, and that people are leaving their jobs due to the money they get from the CCT. They claimed that these arguments were far from reality. In addition, they considered the implementation of the CCT as highly successful as it contributed immensely to schooling of girls and empowered women by transferring the money to women’s accounts. According to them, local Initiatives sub-projects have created many successful businesses and made it
possible for many poor people to have their own business and to live on their own resources. What’s more, other social work projects under Local Initiatives have had large scale positive social outcomes according to them. The CCT and Local Initiatives were two complementary components and they had rightly supported each other in dealing with the problem of poverty. They asserted that they have been mostly successful in reaching the target population for both the CCT and Local Initiatives. To support all their statements about the positive impacts and the success of the project components, they mentioned the World Bank team’s positive evaluations and high success ratings for the project. However, as the consultants working in the PCU of a World Bank project, their use of the World Bank’s ratings as the evidence of project success was obviously self-referential.

2.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I tried to give the details of the implementation story of the World Bank’s Social Risk Mitigation Project reflecting on the perspectives and opinions of different groups that have been involved in the process. Taking these different perspectives into account is crucial for creating an alternative account of the project, which is unlike the success story presented by the World Bank. As I mentioned at the beginning, I told this story considering the changes in institutional structures, power relations, struggles, conflicts, emerging discourses, and emerging dynamics. With the idea that while looking at social impacts, we do not have to limit ourselves to whether or not the project reached the targets that were set at the beginning, I focused my attention on the various unintended consequences of the project. This concentration is important for displaying
the gaps between what was planned and what took place due to the impact of the local processes and dynamics, and the limits of the interventions by IFIs such as the World Bank. These interventions when combined with local conditions produce unexpected outcomes. Looking at these outcomes is also of great importance for confronting the framework of neoliberal governmentality which sees everything being shaped according to the neoliberal agenda. The resulting institutions, subjectivities, and processes can be and, in fact, are different from what neoliberalism would entail.

The Social Risk Mitigation Project was a project implemented right after a serious economic crisis in Turkey to prevent the potential risk situations or, in other words, possibility of large scale demonstrations and increase in criminal activities. In spite of the World Bank’s presentation of it as a successful project, when the intention of putting the project into practice and distributing money as quickly as possible combined with the standard project mentality, short-term thinking, and strict deadlines of the World Bank, the result was a chaotic experience that intervened in the lives of many people all over the country without having much positive permanent impact. The aim of using up the loan money within the set deadlines led to the execution of a variety of unrelated activities under the project. Rapid execution without first developing the institutional infrastructure of the local implementing agencies (SYDVs) and the state institution (SYDGM) created enormous problems. Moreover, carrying out of the project through a Project Coordination Unit which works according to the World Bank’s procedures and principles caused many tensions between the Unit and the state institution.
These developments also brought several unintended outcomes that would not be foreseen by the World Bank. The conflicts between the PCU and SYDGM increased the sense of institutional loyalty among the SYDGM personnel and facilitated the strengthening of the institutional identity of SYDGM, which previously lacked even a formal structure and institutional culture. As a result of these disputes, SYDGM gave a negative opinion about a proposed second project by the World Bank and this, together with the negative opinions of other state institutions, has been highly influential on the refusal of that project proposal. SYDGM personnel have been concerned with the World Bank’s distrust in the capacity of state officials and procedures, and their experience of the SRMP as a not-so-successful project made them suspicious of the Bank’s other projects that are represented as successful. Additionally, their increasing workload due to the SRMP led the people working at the Social Solidarity Foundations to organize under an Association. The trainings executed under the SRMP for the personnel of the SYDVs also helped these people to come together, meet each other, learn about their common problems, and organize. The emergence of certain discourses about the poor especially in the Eastern and Southeastern regions of Turkey, use of this project and especially its CCT component by the Justice and Development Party (AKP) government for its political purposes, and the impact of producing knowledge for the World Bank projects on Turkish academia are the other major unintended consequences that require detailed examination. Therefore, these three subjects will be explored in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 3. INTEGRATION OF ISLAMIC VALUES WITH NEOLIBERALISM: SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS CHARITY

The large-scale social reactions to the 2001 economic crisis had an impact on the results of the 2002 general elections in Turkey and a new party, AKP (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi- Justice and Development Party) came to power after the elections getting the majority of the seats in the parliament. Many scholars and commentators interpreted this as a major turning point for Turkey’s economy and politics. The election result was significant not only because the AKP is regarded as a pro-Islamist political party, in spite of the prime minister and party chairman Tayyip Erdoğan’s identification of the party as a ‘conservative democratic’ one, but also because of the inability of the major political parties to pass the 10% electoral threshold. The most frequently mentioned reasons behind the AKP’s victory are the party’s success in establishing cross-class alliances through getting the support of both ‘winners and losers of the neoliberal globalization process’; the strong performance of the Welfare Party (RP) and the Virtue Party (FP), the predecessors of the AKP, at the municipal level (Öniş 2004, p.1); incapability of the established parties in realizing economic growth, preventing economic crises, and dealing with important political issues such as the Kurdish conflict; the party’s success at the level of grassroots organization (Somer 2004, p.9); party leaders’ positioning of the party as a centre-right formation rather than an Islamist one and their stress on democracy,

---

fairness, and social justice (Öniş & Keyman 2003, p.99). Among all these issues that are brought up, this emphasis on social justice was probably the key to AKP’s electoral success. Due to the devastating impacts of the economic crisis in 2001, the situation of the economy had moved to the center of national political debates. As Öniş and Keyman state, at the time of the 2002 election, “…the center issue was not Kurdish nationalism or political Islam, but the troubled economy.” (ibid., p.96) and hence “…the distinctive themes of the 2002 election…were society and its prosperity rather than the state and its security” (ibid., p.97). Dealing with the economic crisis required handling the problems of poverty and unemployment as well as providing economic growth. During the election campaign, poverty reduction and greater economic equality emerged as the two major promises of the AKP (Patton 2006, p.513). The AKP’s stress on social justice was really crucial and, for many, the party owed its victory primarily to the votes of the poor (see, for instance, Tuğal 2007). The AKP government, during its first tenure between 2002 and 2007, had a poor record in areas such as its dealings with the Kurdish conflict, high unemployment rate, increased crime rate, and rising foreign debt. However, as many commentators argued, the party was successful in responding to the demands of the poor. By retaining the support of the poor, the AKP won 48% of the votes and came into power second time in a row after the 2007 general elections. As Eligür states, the number of the party’s Islamist supporters was not enough to carry the party to the power and “…it was the support the party received from poorly educated low-income voters, residing in shantytowns and in rural areas, that provided it with the requisite plurality.” (Eligür 2007, p.3).
Whatever name we give to the political stance of the AKP, the central role of the Islamic references in the party’s perspective is beyond doubt. As Patton argues, although the AKP’s Islamic tendencies in its cultural policies have been the subject of many debates, the ways in which Islam might be a referent for the party for its economic policies have largely been overlooked (Patton 2008, p.3). Contrary to the belief that there are inherent contradictions between capitalism and Islam, the AKP as a ‘moderate Islamic’ party has had no problem in aggressively pursuing a neoliberal agenda. The AKP government worked with the IMF to cut public spending, privatize public enterprises and natural resources, control wages, and inhibit unionization (Tuğal 2007). While the party has faithfully stuck to the IMF’s prescriptions for economic stability and constantly followed a neoliberal path in its economic policies, these policies have not been in conflict with the party’s Islamist values. Moreover, we can also argue that the ‘mutually reinforcing role of Islam and neoliberalism’ (Buğra 2007, p.46) also helped the party to handle the problem of how to fulfill the social promises while, at the same time, abiding by a neoliberal program which necessitates minimizing social spending. The AKP government has carried out a new version of neoliberalism which is harmonious with Islamic values ¹⁰. According to Patton, the party is using a neo-communitarian neoliberal strategy which encompasses certain characteristics of an imagined Islamic moral community (Patton 2008, p.5).

“…Rather than defending entitlements, the party wants people to take more responsibility for themselves while strengthening their attachments to family. Although they believe in the common good, they have turned away from collectivist ideas of social solidarity and instead assert the importance of individual empowerment. Rather than criticizing individual interests and holding out for the arrival of social virtue, the AKP believes that the project of community building should

provide as many accommodations to individual interests as possible…communalism for the AKP emphasizes that the community depends on greater individual self-sufficiency because personal survival is a basic need for human community.” (ibid., p.13)

Hence, Patton claims, the concentration of the AKP’s social policy on education and self-help is rooted in this aim of cultivating self-sufficient individuals who will create strong communities. This emphasis on individual responsibility is also apparent in the speeches of Prime Minister Erdoğ an, who has suggested the poor to depend on themselves instead of expecting everything from the government. Buğra also mentions the appeal of communal solidarities as supporting elements of contemporary neoliberalism and how the roles of the family, voluntary initiatives and Islamic charity are repeatedly referred to in the current social policy discourse of the AKP (Buğra 2007, p.47; see also Buğra & Keyder 2006). These alternative institutions are meant to decrease the responsibilities of the state institutions in dealing with the problem of poverty. According to what Prime Minister Erdoğ an calls their ‘moralist approach to politics’, the party considers increasing welfare and providing social justice as moral issues (Coşar & Özman 2004, p.66). When defined in these terms, social issues cease to be the responsibilities of the state and are pushed to the realm of ethics, and personal and communal responsibilities.

Charity is an important feature of Islamic societies; in addition to the alms tax (zekat) which is one of the five basic requirements for being a Muslim, voluntary charity is also recommended in both Quran and also hadiths\(^\text{11}\) (Bonner et al. 2003). Currently, in the Turkish media, one can come across to frequent references to the replacement of the social state principle with a new system of social solidarity or an ‘order of charity’ (sadaka düzeni) during the AKP government. This same argument is also repeated by

\(^{11}\) Sayings and deeds of Prophet Muhammad which were collected after his death.
several Turkish scholars. Here the claim is that the resources which should be provided to
the poor as a citizenship right by the social state are distributed as if they are the
benevolent contributions of the AKP and social assistance is now defined with reference
to the notion of Islamic charity, not as a responsibility of the state. When a rights-based
assistance is substituted by the AKP by a charity-based one, the provider of which is
clearly identified, that assistance is considered by the public as the benevolence of the
AKP as a political party, not as public assistance. As the Turkish economist Ayşe Buğra
explains in an interview for a daily newspaper, not only the voluntary organizations but
also the state institutions can be providing assistance in the form of charity. If assistance
is not given regularly, is given in kind, and its provision is arbitrary, then it is charity
even if it is given by the state. Consequently, she argues, social assistance is rights-based
if it is regular, in cash, and provided according to transparent criteria. In this sense, the
AKP’s social assistance system depends on charity and it is easy to get votes in the short
term when a political party, in this case the AKP, provides resources to the people in the
form of charity (Buğra, Birgün Daily Newspaper, February 14th, 2008).

Another aspect of the AKP’s charity-based social assistance system is, what Buğra and
Keyder call, the AKP-led municipalities’ ‘brokerage in charity’ (Buğra and Keyder 2003,
p.34). Part of the social assistance activities that the municipalities organize are funded
by the municipal government’s budget. However, in the majority of the cases,
municipalities function as intermediaries between those who provide aid and the
beneficiaries by getting people to donate especially food and fuel, and then distributing
them to the poor. With reference to Islamic norms and institutions, AKP-led
municipalities can get donations from ‘good Muslims’ (Buğra & Keyder 2006, p.224). The authors also mention the cases where local businessmen make donations to the municipality and get benefits in return, such as flexibility in the application of rules in their business activities. “It may …be the case that a company’s illegal construction is overlooked, or a shop will not be closed down; instead of bribes, he will make a donation to the aid budget or give a certain amount of the goods he produces/trades in.” (Buğra and Keyder 2003, p.34) Their donations are then distributed to the poor by the municipality. This is a pretty advantageous deal for the AKP-led municipalities as they get the support of two very different socio-economic groups, local businessmen and the poor, which are at the two ends of this activity.

3.1. The AKP and The World Bank’s Social Risk Mitigation Project (SRMP)

On September 14th, 2001, the loan agreement for the Social Risk Mitigation Project was signed between Republic of Turkey and the World Bank. At the time, there was a coalition government composed of three parties, DSP (Democratic Left Party), ANAP (Homeland Party) and MHP (Nationalist Action Party). Although the project was initiated in 2001, it took a long time to put the SRMP into effect. When the SRMP was first started, the AKP was not in the government; the project was not initiated by the AKP. However, when it became the governing party, AKP saw it as a big opportunity to publicize the SRMP in order to get the support of the masses, especially of the people who are at the bottom. There were several news and stories in the media which covered this project or the components of the project (especially CCT) as an achievement of the
World Bank and the AKP government. The third international conference on CCT\textsuperscript{12} was organized by the Project Coordination Unit for the SRMP and took place in İstanbul with the participation of the Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan as well as over 350 participants from more than 40 countries. Erdogan, in several occasions mentioned the CCT and the other aids distributed by the Social Solidarity Foundations (especially coal during winter). Although the Foundations were established far back in 1986 and have been giving these aids regularly since then, many people supposed that provision of social assistance by the Foundations started during the AKP government period due to this publicity. But there certainly was a change during the AKP period; the total amount of support definitely increased and, although the party certainly has never been in favor of providing universal benefits to the people in Turkey and giving assistance depended on means-testing, the number of people who were regarded as the ‘real poor’ for the purposes of aid provision increased. Therefore, now the Foundations are giving aid to many more people compared to the previous periods.

Social assistance is not just one issue on the agenda for the AKP and it is one of the key areas to which they owe their success in the general and municipal elections. Many mayors especially in the big cities are from the AKP now and each municipality dispenses incredible amounts and variety of aid in its own region. During my field research, when I was in one of the squatter (\textit{gecekondu}\textsuperscript{13}) areas of Ankara, I saw big trucks which were sent by the municipality giving out aid packages to the people in the neighborhood. The Foundation official explained that the municipality started to give

\textsuperscript{12} The first two CCT conferences took place in Mexico (May 2002) and Brazil (April 2004).

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Gecekondu} means ‘built overnight’. It refers to those accommodations which are built illegally in the inner cities by the migrants.
even fresh fish and daily bread to the people, in addition to the regular food packages that they used to distribute. The owner of a small grocery shop that we talked to in the area complained that the poor are given so much food by the municipality that they do not buy anything from his shop any more and they are even trying to sell some of the excess food to him. In this situation, the SRMP was a boon to the AKP; through publicizing it, the party reinforced its image as a promoter of social assistance. In ways that the World Bank would not expect or intend, this Islamic party has benefited from the World Bank’s implementation of the SRMP in Turkey.

3.2. Changing Dynamics of Poverty in Turkey

An overriding theme in the literature on urban poverty in Turkey is the recent change in the nature of poverty and the coping mechanisms. In several articles written on poverty especially after 1990s, we see references to ‘new poverty’, changing dynamics of poverty, and a change in the welfare regime in Turkey (see for instance Buğra & Keyder 2003, 2005, 2006; Pınarcıoğlu & Işık 2008, Erder 1996). While considering poverty in Turkey especially after 1980s, we can talk about several reasons for its increase in this period: change in economic policies and approach, effects of neoliberalism and globalization, changing reasons of migration after 1985 and existence of less opportunities for the newcomers for survival as they have less chance to find a secure job in the public and private sectors, worsening socio-economic position of the old middle class due to the decline in the real wages, inequality in income distribution in the metropolitan centers, flexibility and irregularity in labor market and wages, and increase in informal sector jobs (Kalaycıoğlu & Rittesberger-Tılıç 2002, p.202). Pınarcıoğlu and
Işık argue that until 2000s, urban poor in Turkey had used ‘aggressive survival strategies’ by establishing networks based on religion, ethnicity, and culture, and due to these networks “Turkey never had an underclass, a hopeless mass excluded from economic, social, political, and cultural processes and the urban poor retained their hopes for upward mobility.” (Pınarçıoğlu and Işık 2008, p.1353). However, with the dissolving of these networks, what is currently experienced in Turkey is deepening of poverty and a change in its forms and dynamics. Although poverty levels have not changed significantly since the 1990s, with the decline in the informal solidarity networks, a new generation of urban poor is emerging which has “…nothing left to lose, free from the control of family and of networks, feeling excluded from any and all networks that operate in their society.” (ibid., p.1367).

Although there are differences among the countries, in most of the developed countries, subsistence of the unemployed individual is not left to the family, community, or merely to the market mechanisms even after the 1970s when the welfare state is in decline. We see regular and formal interventions of the state at least for a certain period and at a certain degree. The structure of social capital is an important determinant here, defined as the source of trust in a society. A society that has a strong social capital structure is the one that people not only trust their family or relatives but also the strangers. People trust strangers in a society in which social and economic systems are organized on the basis of citizenship rights and responsibilities. As Buğra suggests, state support provided on the basis of citizenship rights may lead to the development of awareness of citizenship and to the spreading of relations on the basis of trust to the whole society (Buğra 2001, p.24).
Scholarship on Turkey’s welfare system usually defines Turkey as a society in which the structure of social capital is weak and people only trust their family members, relatives, or the people from the same community. Turkey’s welfare system is mostly described as one that rests mostly on solidarity within the family. In Turkey, traditionally, a minor part of the state expenditures has been reserved for such areas as health, education, or social security. State hasn’t been a major actor in providing basic needs and in helping the people to cope with crisis situations. Previously, in circumstances of general economic crisis or individual poverty, family solidarity and community ties were the sole mechanisms for the survival of the individuals. Especially for the families who migrated from the rural areas to the metropolitan centers in the past, social solidarity networks played crucial roles for their survival in their new environments (Kalaycıoğlu & Rittesberger-Tılıç 2002). A significant property of urbanization and migration processes in Turkey is that they happened in an environment in which there is not a strong public administration. This lack was previously compensated by the family and kinship relationships. As Erder states, “In a family-oriented conservative society, household and kinship systems are overloaded with responsibilities, since the state and the market are equally inefficient in providing welfare services.” (Erder 2002, p.118). The absence of formal mechanisms led to the creation of urban space by informal networks. Informal housing areas were formed mostly by occupation of public land.

Although in the earlier scholarship we see a stress on the role of family and informal networks for the survival of the poor in Turkey, a more recent edited Volume, *Yoksulluk Halleri* (Circumstances of Poverty), which is composed of articles that are based on
interviews with the poor makes the claim that informal solidarity networks are not relevant for the people who are ‘the poorest of the poor’ (Şen 2002, p.165). As Çiğdem states in his article, among these people, there is minimal solidarity and mutual aid, and in some cases, it is even possible to talk about rivalry and production of new power relations among them (Çiğdem 2002, p.163). In their interviews, the authors of the volume could not see much evidence for the poor getting support from their relatives. Instead, the poor people that they talked to perceived networks of relatives as negative networks, which are external to them (Can 2002, p.127). Also, as Şen observed in his interviews with Alevi and Kurdish people, although there are strong ties in terms of their ethnic identities, the poor said that they are not supported by the communities that are formed around these identities and they do not trust these communities (Şen 2002). When asked whether their families, relatives, and neighbors help each other, most of them told that none of the people around them had any resources to help others. Therefore, there was no clue of company or solidarity (Bora 2002, p.70). These poor people compensate for being outside of solidarity networks by getting aid from multiple institutions. However, there are also ones to whom even applying for aid seems inaccessible because of the bureaucratic procedures and transportation costs. Most of them do not have any affiliations with political parties and their statements do not have any common points with the discourses of these parties (Erdoğan 2002, p.62).

Buğra and Keyder, in their report which was commissioned by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), also argue that it is no longer possible to consider poverty as a temporary incident which can be overcome by the support of family. The
conditions of urban poverty are changing and it is now harder for the migrants to be integrated to the urban setting because of problems they are experiencing in terms of employment and housing. Therefore, these recent migrants are increasingly excluded (Buğra & Keyder 2003). Migrants from Eastern and Southeastern regions, most of whom are Kurds, comprise a major part of the migrant population in the big cities. These new migrants do not have strong ties with their hometowns which, in many cases, were destroyed during the clashes between the Turkish army and the PKK (Kurdistan Workers Party). Hence, “…migrants from the Southeast are not arriving into already existing social networks and the opportunities they provide, but to the uncertainty of completely foreign surroundings.” (ibid., p.28). Buğra and Keyder add that the ‘new poor’ do not see any solution to their problems as they do not have families or social support mechanisms that can support them. They also highlight the fact that the social assistance provided by the municipalities and some NGOs is politically charged so it is really crucial for the state to be a leading actor in the area of social assistance (ibid.).

It is ironic that at a time when we can no longer see family and solidarity networks supporting the new poor, there is the new emphasis of the AKP on family and community. In this case, is the AKP pointing out institutions that have already lost their functionality in supporting the poor? Or it might be more accurate to say that what the AKP has been trying to do is reviving them in order to restore them as the fundamental institutions in the area of social security to keep away from an idea of a state that is responsible for providing assistance to its poor citizens as a citizenship right. At least at the discursive level, what we see is the AKP’s stress on family and communal
solidarities. However, when we look at the activities of the AKP especially at the level of municipalities, we see a large scale distribution of resources by the municipal governments and also by the SYDVs. This might bring to mind the question of how this assistance by the municipalities and SYDVs goes together with the AKP’s emphasis on family and community as the main institutions in supporting the poor. I think the notion of ‘charity’ plays a crucial role here. As mentioned before, the AKP distributes aid through especially local governmental channels in the form of charity rather than as a citizenship right. Consequently, it becomes possible to put emphasis on the communal solidarities as the main assistance mechanisms while also giving aid through local government channels when that aid is provided as charity. As also stated in the UNDP Report on Poverty Alleviation Programs (UNDP 2003), the resources provided through the SYDVs largely remains as charity. Interestingly, as I will discuss, although the people who get assistance cannot claim their right as citizens, they are now making a claim to their right to charity regardless of where it is coming from.

3.3. An Emerging Culture of Poverty?

When I started doing interviews, I heard some of my interviewees talking about how the poor people are getting used to living on aid thanks to especially the CCT with its more than two million beneficiaries, as well as the aid provided from other channels. The similarity between this discourse and the discourses on ‘underclass’ and ‘culture of poverty’, which blame the poor for their dependence on assistance in the US was obvious. For me it was really surprising to see that even some progressive Turkish scholars were arguing that it has become a full-time job for the poor to learn which social
assistance institution is giving what kind of aid, to periodically visit different institutions, and to collect aid from them. They were of the idea that a ‘culture of poverty’ is currently emerging in Turkey. Especially the current government and the international institutions were mentioned as the parties that are responsible from the creation of this culture:

10 What is worst about these poverty alleviation projects is that they create expectations from outside sources. I am poor; I don’t have any qualifications. I don’t have any chance. So somebody should give me a hand. With these projects, this kind of a culture is reproduced. In other words, poverty alleviation projects have been functional in creating a culture of poverty.

11 People come and say, the government is giving money so getting that money is my right. They say, you have to give it to me. Because of these policies, an unintended consequence came out. People are put into the position of professional beggars. If you think of the Turkish culture in the past, people were proud. They did not say that they were hungry or poor… And when you understand that they are poor, you do not help directly but find indirect ways not to insult them. You know, according to Islamic belief, you put something in front of a mosque so that someone in need will come and take it. However, during the last couple of years, because of the policies of the international institutions like the World Bank, people now say that it is their right to get assistance. They have become professional beggars…He goes to the governor to get something, sends his wife to the governor’s wife, goes to another institution to receive something else… So these people have become like parasites…And the prime minister had just made a public statement addressing the governors, telling them that they should distribute all the money that was sent to them. As a result, people now see it as their right to receive assistance.

What I heard during my interviews in the State Planning Institution, a central government institution, was very similar:

33 …vegetables, fish, stationery, coal, clothing… a lot of things are distributed currently (by the municipalities). Before, when the people were asked, they were embarrassed to accept that they needed assistance. There was no habit of demanding aid. However, it is now changing very fast. We are poor so the state should help us… A culture of poverty will develop soon…Social assistance should not encourage laziness…As there is no good database, same individuals get assistance from multiple sources and in a society which is getting used to this culture of poverty, this is becoming widespread. They get aid from the municipality, from the Foundation, from benevolent people, from other associations and NGOs.

34 For us, the biggest problem related to the implementation (of the SRMP) was the massive increase in the scope of the CCT component. This and the fact that the Fund’s resources are used for other purposes led us to ask the question, whether a culture of poverty is emerging. It was the fundamental question for us. Therefore, there was a need to reconsider this system of assistance…The people who are getting these aids are the ones who are out of employment. Therefore, we were concerned about whether the current assistance schemes encourage the people to be employed or inhibit them from getting a job.
A theme that was repeated as a concern by several of my interviewees, scholars as well as Foundation officials, and that is apparent in the quotes was the poor people’s perception of getting social assistance as their right.

They don’t know how much money they will get, for what reason they are given this money, and in what cases the payments will be terminated. They don’t know how much they get for a male or female child…they think that it is their right to receive this money. Everybody is getting it, so I will also get, it is my right; this is how they understand it.

This brings to mind several important questions: Why do these scholars and officials have a problem with the poor claiming it as their right to get assistance? When the poor talk about it as their ‘right’, are they referring to a notion of right based on citizenship? Or if not, with reference to what criteria do they think that it is their right to get assistance? And finally, does this claim of the poor really signal an alarming trend, a ‘corrosion of character’ on the part of the poor and emergence of a ‘culture of poverty’?

Before trying to find answers to these questions, it is crucial to recall the debates on the ‘culture of poverty’.

Oscar Lewis (1965) brought in the concept of ‘culture of poverty’ in a piece which later widely influenced the cultural explanations about the persistence of poverty. He thought of poverty and its associated characteristics as a culture, or rather as a subculture, which has its own structure and rationale, or as a way of life which is transmitted from one generation to another. It can be passed on through generations as a result of its influence on the children. The culture of poverty is both an adaptation and also a reaction of the poor to their marginal position in a class-stratified society. People who have a culture of poverty produce little wealth and also get very little in return. Their level of literacy and education is low; they do not belong to labor unions or political parties and do not use
banks, hospitals, department stores, etc. On the individual level, they are defined by feelings of marginality, hopelessness, dependence and inferiority. According to Lewis, it is much more difficult to eliminate the culture of poverty than to eliminate poverty per se (Lewis, 1965). Lewis’s culture of poverty thesis has been undertaken by other scholars, becoming an argument which blames the poor for their poverty. Another study which was released in 1965, the Moynihan Report, was also influential in fueling the debates on underclass. In this study, Patrick Moynihan argued that the breakdown of the black families would get in the way of progress towards equality (Moynihan 1965). Murray who can be regarded as an advocate of the underclass thesis, much later discussed the problem of the underclass in the US as the problem of those people who do not seek employment. According to him, work behavior refers to trying to get a job and to stay in the labor market. He argued that underclass is composed of those people for whom having opportunities does not really make much difference because they do not spend much effort to find jobs or to stay employed (Murray, 1990). Magnet is another scholar whose arguments are also on the same line. He thinks of underclass as a term which describes a state of mind and a way of life; it is a cultural condition according to him. He asserts that the members of the underclass choose not to work. Magnet thinks that the welfare system is an important factor that leads to the persistence of an underclass, as the welfare benefits encourage these people to stay out of labor market. Therefore, according to him ‘turning the welfare system inside out’ is an important step to deal with the problem of underclass. He makes a distinction between the ‘respectable poor’ and the underclass, and argues that the welfare system gives the message to all the poor people
that their poverty is someone else’s fault, without making a distinction between these two groups (Magnet, 1987, p.135).

Although the term ‘underclass’ and its Turkish equivalents were seldom used by the scholars and officials that I interviewed, a distinction was frequently made between a majority who avoid working by subsisting on assistance and those few honest people who are looking for jobs, but unemployed and poor because of some misfortune. Going back to our questions regarding the poor people’s view of getting aid as a right, we can argue that those scholars and officials are troubled with this view because they think that in the current system, what is communicated to all the poor people is that their poverty is someone else’s fault. According to this line of reasoning, poor people do not accept any responsibility for their own poverty and believe that it is the responsibility of those others, whether it is an NGO, a state institution, or better-off individuals, to provide for them. When they refer to their ‘right’ to receive aid, the argument goes, poor people are not talking about their right as citizens, but they are rather speaking of a right that is rooted in others’ responsibility for their situation. What these scholars and officials criticize is this external locus of control which goes together with their assuming no responsibility for their own actions. After hearing several of my interviewees mentioning poor’s usage of the notion of ‘right’, it has been one of the key tasks for me to make sense of this notion. Although the explanations that blamed the poor and emphasized their preference to depend on outside sources did not seem convincing or acceptable to me, the idea that their claim to right had nothing to do with the idea of citizenship was an important one. When the poor say that it is their right, they are not alluding to the
responsibilities of the Turkish state, which is a social state according to its Constitution, or to a social contract between the state and its citizens. They are aware of the fact that their situation is caused by something outside of them, but this awareness is not transformed into a structural understanding that holds certain institutions responsible from their poverty. As they do not address particular establishments, there is no common ground for them for getting together to be mobilized. Therefore, they are on their own in their struggle to survive. But they are also not the self-dependent subjects of neoliberalism, who are striving to increase their human capital. They are claiming their right to assistance from each institution that is providing aid. Or, as I mentioned before, they are claiming their right to charity.

One important difference between what is argued about the American and Turkish contexts is that the ‘undeserving poor’ as a group and a culture of poverty have recently emerged in the Turkish case unlike the American context. The claim is that this recent development has a lot to do with what the AKP government has been doing in the area of social assistance. As I proceeded with the interviews with the local Social Solidarity Foundation personnel, I heard over and over that there are currently a variety of organizations, some of which are on the state side, that distribute aid and there is almost no coordination among them.

45 We (SYDVs) are not in coordination with the other aid-giving agencies. We, unfortunately, could not do that. We tried to communicate it to the municipality, both written and verbally. We said, let’s not give assistance to the people that you are already helping. And you do the same. But it seems that it is not a problem for the municipality. Their thinking is different. Now, for instance, both we (SYDVs) and the municipality give coal to the same individuals.

Among the sources named which distribute aid besides the SYDVs are Metropolitan Municipalities, Municipalities, Red Crescent (Kızılay), Turkish Aeronautical Association
(Türk Hava Kurumu), and a variety of other NGOs the most mentioned of which are the Lighthouse (Deniz Feneri), Can Suyu and another one named ‘Is There Anybody Out There’ (Orda Kimse Var Mı). It is usually possible for the same family to get aid from multiple sources and there is some truth in the argument that it has become a full-time job for the poor to collect aid, even if I don’t agree with the value judgments attached to this statement. The people working in the local Foundations, who are in a face-to-face relationship with the poor on a daily basis, were complaining that especially the poor women are now spending their time waiting in the queues for getting assistance from different institutions.

You know what, these people, in a sense, have a job. Today, they come here; tomorrow they go to the Lighthouse; the following day they go to another NGO and another day, they go to the municipality. They spend most of their days visiting these places to apply for aid, and later to get the results of their applications. Social assistance has recently become like a new job sector in Turkey.

The officials working at the Foundations also argue that poor people have started to see it as their right to receive aid from every institution, and the SRMP, especially the CCT component of the project, contributed a lot to this understanding with more than two million people benefiting from the CCT, a number far above the initial target and the actual number of poor people in Turkey according to the statistics.

### 3.4. The Poor as Neoliberal Subjects?

This is, obviously, a very different subjectivity from the one that the World Bank intended to create. Ironically, they might on the one hand be regarded as rational, calculating subjects who try to maximize their families’ resources. It is a survival strategy for them to apply to multiple institutions for aid, to hide that they are receiving aid from other sources and, in some cases, not to tell that they are working in the informal sector.
As receiving aid is possible if they prove that they are the ‘real poor’, they learn what kind of a discourse they should employ, what to reveal, and what to withhold when they make applications to different institutions for aid. In this sense, they might look like the rational, calculating subjects, individual entrepreneurs of neoliberalism. However, interestingly in this case, the creation of the neoliberalism’s rational, calculating subjects comes together with their total dependence on social assistance which is far from being an ideal situation according to the neoliberal framework. They pursue their interests to provide a decent living for their families. However, while they are doing this, they try to get as much as they can from different governmental bodies, as well as several NGOs, benefiting from the lack of coordination among them. As I explained in the previous chapter, in the case of income generating sub-projects under the SRMP, although there is a condition of back payment attached to the loan given to the individuals, many of them do not pay it back because they think that the state will not push too hard for back-payment. And in fact, they are right. In the cases when the back-payment was due but the debtors did not make the payment, the people working in the Foundations as the local implementers of the project, did not know what to do. When they contacted the General Directorate for advice in these situations, they were told to wait and not to pursue legal solutions. The Foundation Personnel started to believe that back payment is not an important concern. If we also take into account the fact that most of these income generating projects have been failures, these projects which were initiated with the aim of creating entrepreneurs who will have their own business and who will stand on their own feet turned out to be a transfer of public resources to these people. The resulting
subjectivities are not really in line with the neoliberal aim of creating responsible subjects who depend on their resources and their own human capital.

For both their regular aids and also the SRMP assistance, the SYDV personnel visit the houses of the people who apply for receiving aid to see what kind of physical conditions they are living in and what house appliances they have in order to decide whether they can be considered as the ‘real poor’ and whether they deserve to get assistance. These evaluations mostly rely on the subjective judgments of the SYDV officials, most of whom do not have a background in social work. When I joined the SYDV officials in their house visits, there were incidents when the SYDV officials were highly critical of those people who owned what they perceived as luxurious goods in an otherwise poverty-stricken place. In those cases, the officials were questioning the people about how they got those goods. SYDVs are not the only institutions which determine whom to provide aid by going to their houses; there are several NGOs and private individuals who first go to see people’s houses before giving any kind of assistance. The poor are being continuously scrutinized by several different actors who are not knowledgeable in social policy or social assistance provision. As Buğra complains, as currently so many different individuals from a variety of institutions who are not social workers go into people’s houses to judge whether they are poor or not, the situation has become exceedingly humiliating for the poor (Interview with Buğra, Birgün Daily Newspaper, February 14\textsuperscript{th}, 2008). The poor and their lives have become objects of display for a big crowd, which has damaging effects on their pride and dignity.
With the replacement of formal mechanisms which provide assistance as a citizenship right with diverse public and private organizations which give aid on the basis of means-testing, the poor are now trying to survive by going from one door to another to get assistance and are constantly forced to prove their poverty by making their lives transparent. In fact, I, as a researcher, also faced an ethical challenge, when I was, without any difficulty and much questioning, allowed to join the Foundation officials in their visits to people’s houses and to ask questions. Although I was introduced as a researcher who is studying the social assistance systems and never asked questions about the extent of their poverty, the people whose houses we visited considered me either as someone who can give benefits to them or as a controller who is doing inspection. They constantly tried to prove to me that they are ‘really’ living in poverty telling details about their deprivation or assuring me that any aid given to them is/will be used for relevant purposes. With reference to this situation, many of my interviewees from the academia and the local Social Solidarity Foundations repeatedly talked about the emergence of a ‘culture of begging’ (dilencilik kültürü) and a process during which the poor are divested of their pride and dignity (onursuzlaştırma süreci). According to most, these two are the products of the AKP government’s policies.

At this point, it is crucial to state that although Foundation officials blame the AKP for creating these new subjectivities, they equally complain about the poor, claiming that the poor think of the Foundations as places where they can both get resources and relax by arguing with and yelling at the Foundation officials. They add that in addition to their regular conflicts with them, the poor are also hostile to each other, complaining about
others, telling rumors, telling, for instance, that a certain neighbor who got assistance is in fact well-off. They blame the poor for being greedy, lazy, and always ready to cheat and lie.

These guys cannot live only on the assistance they are getting from us (SYDV). They tell us that their neighbors are helping out. It certainly is not true. In reality, these people have jobs. But they are working in the informal sector. So they can also get aid from us. Three quarters of all the people who are getting assistance from SYDVs are, in fact, working people but they lie to us.

They gave examples of those who applied to Local Initiatives sub-projects to establish their own businesses but fled after getting the money. During one house visit to a family that was receiving aid, the SYDV official got furious when she saw that the twenty-six year old son of the family was sleeping in the afternoon. She said, “I am working at this time of the day and this guy is sleeping.” When I was in a SYDV in Ankara, one official told me that a shipping firm contacted the SYDV and asked for their help when they needed to hire workers, as the SYDV has the records of poor, unemployed people who, they thought, will be interested in the job. The official added that although they called the ones who had the qualifications for the job (mostly young males who can carry heavy boxes), of the 33 people they called, only five of them accepted to work. Actually, I had heard a very similar story in another SYDV as well. The conclusion that the officials derived from these cases was that the poor people don’t want to work any more; they are getting used to living on aid and do not have a problem with that.

Foundation officials also claim that the poor are benefiting from the lack of coordination between different aid-giving organizations; they quit their jobs or do not look for a job as several different types of benefits they get from these multiple sources are sufficient for their living.
We could not teach these people how to fish. We taught them how to avoid working… I always say this: When they get aid from here (SYDV), people stop working. There is also aid coming from the Metropolitan Municipality\(^{14}\). Currently, regardless of whether they are employed or unemployed, poor or better off, people are given aid. …People now think that there is no need for working as they are given coal, food, or even money in certain cases. They also have Green Cards\(^{15}\). They can get health benefits easily. So there is no need to work…

A couple of days ago, Metropolitan Municipality’s trucks were here. They gave five boxes to each person. I don’t know what they had in them. There were people who took cabs to come and get those boxes. If they have enough money to take a cab, they shouldn’t need to get aid… They receive assistance from us, from the Municipality, from the Metropolitan Municipality and from the Lighthouse (Deniz Feneri- an NGO). There are cases of single individuals getting so much food assistance that they have stocks in their houses. Consequently, they are getting lazy. Some of them come here and tell us that the state has to care for them. Why should the state care for you? You should take care of yourself.

The CCT is regarded by the SYDV officials as a major factor that encourages poor people to live on assistance:

Education support is something that I am absolutely in favor of… However, we should not give it like this. We should not give it in a way which discourages people from working. At present, those people who get 350-400 YTL a month from CCT do not work any more. It is a pity that our people are in this state.

About the CCT, the officials were suspicious about for what purposes the families have been using the money given to them.

People are given the CCT money for their children’s education. But we don’t know if they are really using it for that purpose. We cannot follow them… They receive the money. They might be using it for their children’s education, for utility bills, or for buying alcohol… We don’t know. We are concerned about these.

‘Everybody applies for the CCT regardless of whether they have social security or not. I believe that this CCT has to be terminated as soon as possible. These people send their children to school only for getting that money. They don’t use the money for their children, but for their own needs.

### 3.5. The CCT and Discourses on the Kurdish Population

The CCT also gave rise to heated debates, especially at the level of the Foundations, on its impact on the Eastern and Southeastern regions, and the Kurdish population. In fact,

---

\(^{14}\) Metropolitan Municipalities are established to serve the metropolitan areas. There are sixteen metropolitan municipalities in Turkey.

\(^{15}\) Green Card program was started in Turkey in 1992 for the provision of free health services to the poor.
the discourses on the culture of poverty on the one hand and on these two regions on the other hand were closely related, as what was voiced as a main concern by the Foundation officials was emergence of a culture of poverty in those two regions. Although the Kurdish question in Turkey has a long history, which goes back several centuries (Robins 1993, McDowall 1996), Kurdish ethno-nationalism became solidified during the 1980s and 1990s (İçduyuğ et al. 1999). However, as Sirkeci states, Kurdish issue in Turkey is rooted in the underdevelopment of the two regions primarily populated by the Kurds, as well as Kurdish ethno-nationalism and its denial by the Turkish state (Sirkeci 2000, p.151). Regarding the underdevelopment of the southeastern region, an article published in Christian Science Monitor claims that “…While some cities in western Turkey, where much of the country’s industry is located, have per capita incomes that rival parts of Europe, many cities in the southeast have per capita incomes more in line with parts of India.” (Schleifer 2005, p.1). Starting from 1984, there has been a struggle between the Turkish army and the PKK (Kurdistan Workers Party) for fifteen years which significantly damaged the region’s already fragile economy and social conditions. After a quite period of six years, the activities of the PKK increased again starting from 2004. Currently, on TV channels in Turkey, there is daily reporting of the numbers of ‘our martyrs’ from the Turkish army with scenes from their funerals and the ‘dead terrorists’ from the PKK, which strengthens the already existing public outrage against the Kurds on the Turkish side.

Although Kurds comprise the largest non-Turkish ethnic group in Turkey, there is limited information about the demography and socio-economic circumstances of Kurdish
population. Most studies refer to Turkey as a whole, without giving detailed information about the Kurdish population as well as the other ethnic communities. This is not surprising as the Turkish state has, for a long time, even denied the existence of Kurds. As Yeğen stresses, “…from mid-1920s until the end of 1980s, the Turkish state ‘assumed’ that there was no Kurdish element on Turkish territory.” (Yeğen 1996, p.216). While recently there have been some improvements largely due to Turkey’s endeavors to become a member of the EU, the denial of Kurdish ‘reality’ has for a long time been accompanied by restrictions on the use of Kurdish, denial of Kurdish education, and political restrictions (Yavuz 1996, İçduyuğu et al. 1999). According to a recent study sponsored by the Milliyet Daily Newspaper and conducted by the research company, KONDA, 13.4 % of the adult population in Turkey are self-identified Kurds. According to the same study, 23.8 % of the Kurds living in Turkey are in the lowest income group, which demonstrates that they are the poorest ethnic group in Turkey (Milliyet Daily Newspaper, 22nd March, 2007). Although Turkey’s Kurds are dispersed to all the regions of Turkey, they are mostly concentrated in the Eastern and Southeastern regions. When we look at the major cities in these two regions, we see that the GDP per capita is much lower than the average per capita for the whole country. It was USD 1313 for Diyarbakır in 2003, the largest city in the Southeast, whereas it was USD 2146 for the country as a whole (Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği-UNDP 2003, p.2). In these cities, population growth rates have also been high; the population growth rate for Kurds is nearly double that of Turkey in general (Mutlu 1996, p.520, Koç & Hancıoğlu 1999, p.4). The total fertility rate is 6.2 for Kurds while it is 2.7 for Turks and 3.1 for Turkey (Sirkeci 2000, p.163). However, the population growth in the major cities of Eastern and Southeastern
regions is due not only to fertility but also to flight from rural areas to these centers because of the armed conflict between the Turkish army and the PKK, and the resulting lack of security in the rural areas (ibid.).

Many Foundation officials, whether they are working in a province of Ankara where there is not a significant Kurdish population or of Diyarbakir where the majority is Kurdish, argued that especially the CCT component of the SRMP caused particularly the people in the Eastern and Southeastern regions to leave aside birth control methods and created a sudden increase in the population\textsuperscript{16}. So far there is no statistical evidence which supports this claim and higher level state officials reject the accuracy of such a statement. However, when you go to the Foundations, it is one of the first things that the employees say to you when they start complaining about the CCT.

52
You should definitely go to Diyarbakir for your research and see how much those families are getting depending on the number of their children. It is a good amount!

46
This (CCT) increased the birth rates, increased the population. Maybe not here (Ankara) but in Eastern and Southeastern regions, people are having children just to get money (from the CCT). It increased the number of births...Especially in Diyarbakir some families get considerable amounts of money from the CCT. Just think: there are families which have fifteen-twenty children. Those people now see it as a source of income.

There were also officials in Diyarbakir who repeated the same argument:

61
I agree with the argument that the population increased due to this CCT. Because of lack of education, the families see their children as capital goods. If we have more children, we can get more money...This is how they see it. This perception existed before but was declining due to family planning activities. However, this money (CCT) negatively impacted family planning.

\textsuperscript{16} In a public statement, prime minister Tayyip Erdoğan reacted in an interesting way to those who criticized the implementation of the CCT on the basis of its impact on increasing the population. He said, those who make this argument are trying to eradicate the Turkish nation. He made a very controversial statement, urging Turkish women to have at least three children to preserve the young population of Turkey.
When I mentioned the Foundation officials’ point of view about the amount of CCT money distributed in the Eastern and Southeastern regions to an official in the Treasury, this was the response that I got:

35 You know the people’s point of view…They think, three years later these children will be terrorists; why give money to potential terrorists. This is how they see it. People say this, this is what they think. With so many soldiers dying…and their families…

I heard several people who believed that the SRMP and mainly the CCT was designed by the World Bank for the Eastern and Southeastern regions.

52 I think this CCT is not a program that suits the conditions of the country in general. It was planned for the Eastern region.

46 I think this project was designed by the World Bank totally for the Eastern and Southeastern regions. They should have told this to all of us (SYDV personnel) at the very beginning…

What was implied in the officials’ statements was that the World Bank had designed this project to support the Kurds and to increase the Kurdish population in these two regions.

To accurately interpret these assertions, it is crucial to take into consideration the intensification of the confrontations between the Turkish Army and the PKK, and the resulting increase in nationalism in Turkey. Anti-Kurdish feelings are widely expressed currently. Here, it is also important to mention Yavuz and Özcan’s argument that the AKP has not only been unsuccessful in working out a coherent policy towards the Kurdish question but also exacerbated the conflicts between Turks and Kurds, creating a more divided society along ethnic lines (Yavuz & Özcan 2006, p.103). Moreover, the results of the World Values Survey 2007 show that people in Turkey do not trust the international organizations such as the United Nations, European Union, and the IMF (World Value Survey 2007). Especially about a politically sensitive issue such as the Kurdish conflict, Turks have even less trust to these institutions. In addition, partly due to
the US support for Kurdish self-determination in Iraq which, many Turks fear, might spread to Turkey, anti-Americanism is increasing in Turkey. Even a poverty alleviation project of the World Bank, which is largely considered as an institution that defends the interests of the US, can be interpreted as a secret plan to support the Kurds through supporting them and increasing their population. Especially in Ankara, Foundation officials talked about these ‘plots’ openly, without being bothered with the racist tones of their discourses.

A second concern that is extensively brought about is the fact that there are many more people who are benefiting from the CCT in the Eastern and Southeastern regions. As the recipients of the CCT are determined by the PCU, not by the Foundations, the Foundation personnel have problems with understanding the rationale for who receives and who doesn’t receive, and how many people receive the CCT. As there are many more beneficiaries in the regions mentioned above, the Foundation employees in the other regions approach this with suspicion, which becomes a fact that supports their conspiracy theory of the World Bank supporting the Kurds. Although all of them are aware of the fact that these are the poorest regions of Turkey, with employment and educational opportunities much below the average in Turkey, and terribly damaged because of the ongoing armed conflicts between the Turkish Army and the PKK, they ignore these facts. Therefore, the SRMP and the discourses about the project provided another channel for expression of hostility against Kurds in the country in a way that the World Bank would not imagine.
Having said these, some disclaimers are necessary at this point. It is necessary to recognize the fact that one reason why there are so many more recipients of the CCT in the Eastern and Southeastern regions is the AKP’s effort to get the votes of the people in these regions, who conventionally vote for the parties that represent the Kurds. A major accomplishment of the AKP in the 2007 elections was the significant increase in their share of the votes in the Eastern and Southeastern regions. The pro-Kurdish DTP’s (The Democratic Social Party) vote share fell significantly from 6.2 % in the 2002 elections to 3.0 % in 2007, by losing its votes to the AKP. Eligür argues that “…The AKP’s invocation of Islam as a basis for unity and stability in the country strongly attracted the electorate in the Eastern and Southeastern regions.” (Eligür 2007, p.5) She also reports that between the years 2003 and 2007, the AKP government and its municipalities distributed 3.3 billion YTL (new Turkish Liras- approximately 2.1 billion USD) worth of economic benefits and more than six million families were regularly given 322 million YTL (209 million USD) and 4.4 million tons of coal (ibid., p.4). Considering the fact that a major part of these benefits go to the Eastern and Southeastern regions, now it is a widespread argument that it is mostly the distribution of these benefits rather than the role of Islam that helped the AKP to get a significant share of the votes in these two regions, which are the poorest regions of Turkey. Foundation officials in Diyarbakır also believe that the extent of social assistance given by the Foundations increased during this current government and this increase is a consequence of the government’s concern for getting easy votes.

62 There are statistics about the CCT for every region. In the cities in the Eastern and Southeastern regions, so many people are benefiting from the CCT…This is a policy of divesting the poor of their pride. Especially the CCT is a part of such a policy. They aim to get votes using the Foundations. The aids increased enormously during this current government. In the last four years,
we have been exhausted especially during the times of distributing coal…For instance, before Eid (bayram), they sent additional funds to our Foundation. They don’t need to send us money; we receive our regular funds every month. They tell me to distribute the money before the Eid and to report to them filling out a form. In other words, they are forcing me to dispense this money.

Since the AKP government came into office, there has been an increase in the amount of assistance. SRAP was initiated during the previous government. But it was the AKP government that started the CCT. We used to give coal beforehand…But there has been an increase in the amount of coal with this government. Currently, we request a certain amount of coal and they send that exact amount to us. This was unheard of in the past.

Believe me, we have so far received 6-7 million New Turkish Liras (3.9-4.5 million USD) for the CCT. Since the CCT was started, 60-70% of the population in this district has been benefiting from this CCT. This is an unbelievable number, much higher than the standards and the expectations.

In some provinces of Diyarbakir, I heard Foundation personnel stating that the number of people who are given the CCT is a lot more than the number of poor people in their province.

We determined that there are around 2100 poor people in the center and 1900 in the villages in this district. Therefore, we have around four thousand poor here…Currently, eight thousand mothers are getting money from the CCT, which means almost 25 thousand children are benefiting from it…There is a discrepancy between the numbers we have and the number of people benefiting from the CCT…We had to accept everybody’s applications as long as they met the criterion of not being related to any social security program…The people in Ankara are the ones who decide about the beneficiaries of the CCT.

We are not against the CCT in principle. The problem is with the actions of local administrators. Both the mayor and the governor ask that every person who comes and applies for aid receives some assistance. This is not right…I know that what we have been doing with the CCT is not right but it was the governor who directed us to do that.

If one side of it is getting their votes, another side of it is mitigating another kind of risk, which is the possibility of more people joining the PKK.

In this region, people are really poor. However, not only those poor people but also even those few who are better off got used to getting assistance. The mentality was giving everyone assistance to guarantee that they will not become terrorists.

Six-seven years ago, we did not have much work to do here. There were few documents and applications. Nobody used to come here. After the events17, with the food boxes and other stuff, people got used to receiving assistance from here…They now perceive it as their right to receive

---

17 He is referring to the increase in the armed conflict between the Turkish military and the PKK.
aid. For instance, all over Turkey, SYDVs distribute coal to the people who are under the scope of the Law 3294\(18\). Here, in this district, we give coal even to the public employees.

The Foundation officials in Diyarbakır were also complaining about the poor people’s behaviors. But they were generally more hesitant to blame the poor for living on aids or seeing it as a full time job. They knew the extent of poverty in their region so they considered the CCT as contributing positively to the survival of the poor and did not blame them for spending the CCT money for their own needs instead of using it for their children. One Foundation official said if the people are hungry, they cannot use the money for education; they should buy something to eat first. He also stressed that, nevertheless, the poor people in the region are now working hard and doing whatever they can for their children’s education.

61 (CCT) has been really useful in our district. Because in this district, there are generally poor families. Before, when they sent their children to school, they weren’t able to buy the necessary stuff like clothing or stationery…

3.6. When the Poor ‘Speak’

Up to this point, I have mostly talked about the discourses about the people who are receiving assistance. But what about the perceptions of those people themselves? What do they think about this assistance provided to them by a loan from the World Bank or about other kinds of assistance? What kind of relationships do they have with the SYDV officials or the people from other aid-giving agencies? In order to find answers to these questions, I spent time in two different SYDV offices in Ankara and one office in Diyarbakır, observing the interactions between the people who come to these offices to apply for or to receive aid, or to make inquiries about their applications. Additionally, I joined the officials in their visits to the applicants’ houses.

\(18\) Social Solidarity Fund (SYDTF) was established under Act number 3294.
First, I would like to reflect on the process of applying for and receiving aid (CCT) for the recipients of aid. This section will be based on not only my interviews with the recipients, but also interviews with the Foundation officials and researchers who did impact assessments, and the documents prepared by the Project Coordination Unit. People first heard about the CCT usually either from their neighbors, their children’s teachers at school, head of village/district (muhtar) or from the Foundation officials when they went to the Foundation offices to follow up on their applications for other kinds of aid. They needed to fill out an application form which asked demographic questions about them, their spouses, and children. They got these forms from the Foundation offices, schools, health facilities, or from their muhtar’s office. These forms were then submitted to the Foundation officials who accepted them after checking whether each part of the application was filled out completely. In cases when the applicants were illiterate, the officials were the ones who completed the forms reading the questions to them. Normally, the applicants were expected to go to the Foundation offices by their own means of transport to submit the applications. Many of them walked to reach the offices if their house is not too far from the office, while there were also others who took a bus to get there. There were also cases when the Foundation officials got the application forms when they went to those people’s houses for giving other kinds of aid. In addition to the application forms, the applicants were also expected to provide other documents such as a document of residency, the copies of identity cards for the applicant and applicant’s children, documents which prove that their children are students, or a document of guardianship. Collecting these documents required additional trips to muhtar’s office and school.
Pieces of information provided by the applicants on the application forms were multiplied by the related coefficients of a scoring formula which is used for the determination of the recipients and a poverty score is calculated for each household. If that score was under the designated cut-off point, then that family was selected to be a beneficiary. However, in the meanwhile, for the verification of the information provided by applicants on the forms and to see their physical conditions, Foundation officials visited the applicants’ residences for a ‘social investigation’. During these investigations, the applicants were expected to let the officials in their houses, show them what kind of house appliances and furniture they have, and also answer their questions. Foundation officials, then, prepared reports depending on their impressions about whether the applicants gave correct information and whether they were really needy. After the applications were submitted, it took at least a couple of months before the applicants learned whether they were selected to get the CCT aid. For the ones who became beneficiaries after their information was verified by the officials, bank accounts were opened at the branches of Ziraat Bank, which is a state-owned bank, and ATM cards were issued. CCT money was transferred, by the Project Coordination Unit, to those accounts at certain dates. As covered in many newspaper articles, there were long lines in front of the banks and ATMs on the days when the CCT money was deposited, and there were frequent fights between the people while they were waiting. Although there might be instances when people met others and communicated to each other while they were waiting in these lines, I haven’t heard it mentioned by the people that I interviewed or they weren’t covered in the media as they would not be considered ‘news worthy’.
According to the procedures, Foundation officials were supposed to check whether money was transferred to the accounts of all the beneficiaries and let the people at the PCU know if there were people who did not receive their money. However, because of the extra workload that the implementation of the CCT brought to the Foundations, officials, in many cases, did not check whether money was deposited to the accounts of all beneficiaries. What’s more, many people did not even know that they were chosen to be beneficiaries and the CCT money was transferred to their accounts. I heard stories about money accumulating in people’s accounts when they did not even know that they had a bank account. The CCT is a conditional aid which requires the children to be sent to school and to the health facilities, or the pregnant women to see a doctor regularly if they are getting pregnancy support. Therefore, after they started getting aid, recipients were monitored to check whether they were meeting the requirements. This monitoring was carried out depending on the information that was received from the schools and health facilities. However, many times especially the schools did not send the information about children’s school attendance on time which led to the cutting off of aid to some recipients. In those cases, when those people went to the bank to withdraw their money, they saw that money wasn’t deposited to their accounts, but could not understand the reason for that. I heard many people complaining that they went to the Foundation to understand why their money was cut off but the officials did not listen to them, shouted at them, and did not explain the reasons. For that reason, they weren’t getting the money any more but did not know why it was discontinued.
One major limitation of my research was that I could interview the recipients of aid in the presence of the Foundation officials which most likely had a big influence on the ways they responded to my questions. Moreover, as some of my interviewees spoke only Kurdish, the officials were the ones who translated their responses and helped us to communicate. However, it is important to keep in mind that even if I had conducted the interviews without having the officials in the same place, I think they wouldn’t have shared all of their ‘true feelings’ with me. As I mentioned before, those people perceived me as someone who was inspecting them or the SYDVs, or as a potential provider of assistance, and there was a clear power difference between us. As James Scott warns us, we “…might not be able to take the public conduct of those over whom (we) had power at face value.” (Scott 1990, p.x). It is crucial to keep in mind his distinction between the public transcript, the open interaction between the powerful and the powerless which may not give much information about the opinions of the powerless, and the hidden transcript, “…the discourse that takes place ‘offstage’, beyond direct observation by powerholders.” (ibid., p.4). It would be too optimistic to think that if the officials weren’t present, I could have accessed the public transcript of those people that I talked to.

For these reasons, while interpreting my interviews with the recipients of the CCT, I approached the overly positive comments of some of those people about the officials, the institutions, or the assistance with some reservation. Nevertheless, some of the people that I talked to were pretty enthusiastic about complaining especially about the behaviors of the officials although there were officials with me who were listening to them. In several cases, I was told that Foundation officials yell at them and do not give clear
answers to their questions. The heavy workload on the officials who are underpaid and largely lack job security caused some of them to direct their outbursts to the people coming to the Foundations for getting assistance. In several cases, when I was in the Foundations, I observed officials responding really aggressively to the questions of the people and shouting at them for reasons such as entering a room without knocking on the door. In response to my question of whether they go to the Foundations to make inquiries when there are problems, there were people who said that their CCT money was not deposited in their accounts any more but when they went to the Foundation to learn the reason, the officials treated them in a bad way and they could not find out why the payments were suspended.

I could not learn why they are not giving me money any more. They had given me a form. It has our children’s names and ages. I showed it to him (Foundation official). He took a look at that and angrily said, why are you bringing this to me.

As some of them are illiterate, it wasn’t possible for them to get information from the written material either. In a couple of such cases, the official who was with me tried to encourage them to go to the Foundation again and talk to the right person who was dealing with the CCT payments. However, my general impression was that the poor people’s right to know was not acknowledged by the officials. One of the recipients of the CCT said “Whatever amount they give for the children, we accept. We don’t know why… We just don’t say anything.”.

The public transcript of the poor people that I interviewed included elements which, they knew, are the emphasized values or criteria of the dominant discourse on assistance provision. They were aware of the fact that the emphasis of the CCT is on children’s
education so, without being asked, they repeatedly stressed that they are using the CCT money only for their children, especially for their educational needs. Additionally, as I mentioned before, they constantly tried to provide evidence to prove that they are really poor by telling that they do not own anything, do not have a regular job, and do not receive assistance from other institutions.

69
We don’t have anything. There are two rooms here. We don’t have any machines, any house appliances, nothing…We have only this closet. Somebody else gave it to us. We don’t have anything else.

65
We aren’t receiving anything… Nobody is giving us aid. Just this Foundation gives something once in a while. Last year, they gave once. This year, we haven’t received anything for three months now.

Another important thing that I observed during my interviews with the recipients of especially the CCT was that they were confused about which aid is coming from what source. When I asked them questions about the CCT, which they know as the assistance for education or assistance for health, some of them talked about assistance given by other institutions. In one case, I realized that while the person that I was interviewing was talking about the aid coming from Kızılay (Red Crescent), he was in fact referring to the CCT money they were receiving. This lack of information and bad treatment cause the poor people to perceive the assistance they are receiving as arbitrary, which makes it more like charity than regular public assistance for the reasons discussed before. The major thing that the recipients of the CCT complained about was the amount of payments. All the people that I interviewed said that the amount is too low and it is far from meeting even their children’s basic educational needs.

69
What can we do with 30 Liras? We can buy a pair of shoes or a shirt. That’s all. It is 10 Liras per child. We cannot buy anything with 10 Liras.
But they usually added that it is still better than nothing, thanks to those who provide that aid- “God bless them!” (Allah razı olsun!). Even this response, which is typically given to the people giving charity to the poor, points out the charity-like character of this assistance.

Thanks to them, God bless them, they gave us coal. I brought the coal, then sold fifteen bags of it and got wood because the coal did not burn well. We now have only this bag remaining. But still, God bless them!

3.7. Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter, my aim was to reflect on a couple of closely related dynamics in Turkey which have been triggered or impacted by the World Bank’s Social Risk Mitigation Project. The AKP as a party that integrated its Islamist values with neoliberalism approached the issue of social assistance in the same way, emphasizing charity as an Islamic tradition that should be perpetuated and redefining social assistance with reference to communal responsibilities rather than as a responsibility of the state. While urging the poor not to expect everything from the state, the Party distributed the public resources in the form of charity by providing them arbitrarily, in addition to the ‘brokerage in charity’ of the AKP-led municipalities. In this context, it was a fortunate thing, a very good coincidence for the AKP that there was the World Bank’s already-initiated SRMP. By especially publicizing the CCT and making it available to a large population as the benevolence of the AKP rather than public assistance, the Party could increase its popular support. However, in fact, as exemplified in the speeches of Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan, party leaders have never been in favor of defining social assistance as the responsibility of the state. Moreover, at a time when the previously existing social solidarity networks are dissolving for the new poor in Turkey, they
emphasized family and community as the main social assistance mechanisms. Why the AKP has expanded the CCT to such a broad population has less to do with an understanding of governmental responsibility and more to do with keeping their electoral promises and expanding their popular support.

While the World Bank’s SRMP and especially the CCT has been utilized for its own political aims by this moderate Islamic party, this use has also led to the production and widespread dispersal of discourses about the poor, the Kurdish population, and the coming out of a culture of poverty in the country not only in the media and academia but also at the level of central governmental institutions and local implementing agencies of the SRMP, namely the Social Solidarity Foundations. The Foundation personnel argue that currently a culture of poverty is emerging in Turkey due to the widespread and unorganized dispersal of social assistance and especially provision of the CCT to a substantial population, and they hold the AKP government responsible for this development. Furthermore, they consider the CCT as a program that is put into practice specifically to support the Kurdish population in the country. Hence, the implementation of the CCT, in an unintended and unexpected way, provides a new channel for the expression of hostility against the Kurdish population.

In this picture, what is at stake is the subjectivity of the poor. On the one hand, there is a projected responsible, neoliberal poor subject that tries to increase its human capital and depends on its own resources, which is envisioned by the World Bank and also the AKP and which would also be presumed as formed by the major neoliberal actors according to
the framework of neoliberal governmentality. On the other hand, there is a lazy, hopeless, aid-dependent poor subject which is ‘divested of its pride and dignity’ portrayed by some academics and the Foundation officials. Although I will not claim that I could ‘hear the voices of the poor’ or had some kind of access to their hidden transcript with my limited research, I will make an alternative interpretation with reference to what Asef Bayat calls ‘the quiet encroachment of the ordinary’ (Bayat 1997). The CCT, together with several other kinds of aid, might have created the possibility of getting assistance from multiple sources and at least a group of people might have made the most of this opportunity. However, rather than considering it as the poor people’s opportunism or lack of pride, following Bayat, I argue that “…these practices represent the natural and logical ways in which the disenfranchised survive hardships and improve their lives.” (ibid., p.4). In the same way with the relationship of a worker with the employer, a student with the teacher, or any person from a powerless group with the powerful, the recipients of aid do not disclose all the information about their feelings, thoughts, or objective conditions to the providers of aid. As much as it is logical for those other groups to do their best to live a decent life, it is just as logical for the poor to do the same thing. In the absence of long-term jobs, connections, resources, or opportunities to reach any of them, what is remaining for these people is the aid they are receiving from these institutions, which, in fact, does not amount to much. Moreover, it is equally logical for them to refuse to get jobs which are temporary and burdensome, like carrying heavy stuff. If they get these low-paying jobs which might be detrimental for their health, they will also lose their right to aid, as getting several kinds of aid is based on the condition of being unemployed. Many of my interviewees, state officials as well as scholars, seem to believe in a mythical
and romanticized idea of poor who should be ‘proud’, meaning not demanding anything even in the case of lack of all kinds of resources. That mythical being does not exist; the poor people in real life are as rational as anybody else and they are doing their best to improve their lives.
4.1. Introduction

As the scholars writing on ‘neoliberal governmentality’ emphasize, it is inaccurate and misleading to conceptualize neoliberalism simply as a set of economic policies. Wendy Brown directs our attention to the kind of social analysis that neoliberalism entails, which, when implemented as a form of governmentality, can reach to every sphere of life. “Neoliberal rationality, while foregrounding the market, is not only or even primarily focused on the economy; it involves extending and disseminating market values to all institutions and social action, even as the market itself remains a distinctive player.” (Brown 2003, p.39-40) Different spheres of human action are reorganized on the basis of the principle of profitability and a market rationale is imposed for decision making in all these spheres. Even the individuals’ relations to their own activities and to their own selves are now given the ‘ethos and structure of the enterprise form’ (Gordon 1991, p.42). From the acts of citizens to the organization of the labor market, the workplace, and institutions in areas such as education and health are all rearranged according to the neoliberal principles. University is one such institution that has been extensively restructured according to the market logic.

Public institutions, which were regarded as vital for collective well-being before 1980s, have been reconstituted as a part of the market with the spread of neoliberalism. In many countries, at the beginning of 1980s, public sector was either privatized or transformed according to neoliberal management techniques which included increased exposure to
competition, increased accountability measures, and the implementation of performance
goals (Davies et al. 2006, p.310). The implementation of the same procedures also took
place in the universities a decade later. As neoliberalism takes different shapes in
different settings, the academics who are critical of neoliberalism and who strive to
explain the neoliberalization of public institutions regarded it as an important step to be
self-reflexive and to reflect on the ways in which academia and academics are being
affected by this trend of neoliberalization. Academia became a field of ‘urgent
anthropology’ (Hannerz 2007, p.2) to look at the workings of neoliberalism. This is
certainly not the first time the university becomes the subject of research. In fact,
questions such as the idea of the university, changes in the identity and function of the
university, the idea of academic freedom and autonomy of knowledge production, and the
identity of the academics have been subjects of very important debates in sociology and
philosophy, as well as other disciplines, for a long time (see Weber 1946, Kant 1992
Bourdieu 1988, Delanty 1998). Currently, especially in the fields of educational policy
studies and sociology of education, there is an expanding literature on the transformation
of the university according to the managerialist logic and the influence of the neoliberal
practices on the work of academics (see Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Clark 1998, Davies et
Archer 2008, Clegg 2008). This literature mainly deals with the changes in academia in
the Western countries (USA, Canada, UK, Australia, New Zealand, etc). Although some
of the specific issues that each article refers to might be peculiar to the specific country
the article is written about, when these authors speak of neoliberalization of the
university, their observations and arguments about the nature of recent changes have a lot in common with each other, which is a fact that alludes to the similarity of the pressures that the universities are facing at least in Western countries.

Having this said, it is important to stress that neoliberalization of the academia is not peculiar to the Western countries. All over the world, developing or underdeveloped countries included, universities are facing similar threats as a result of marketization. However, we can argue that international institutions such as the World Bank have a larger role in the neoliberalization of the academia in the non-Western world. As the resources for doing research are even more limited in these countries, the funds provided for research by institutions such as the World Bank gain importance for the academics. In addition to the reports that the World Bank has written on certain issues such as gender or governance, a massive amount of research is conducted by local academics for a World Bank project implemented in a certain country. Therefore, when we look at the impacts of a World Bank project which is put into operation in an underdeveloped/developing country, its role in the neoliberalization of the academia emerges as a major unintended consequence. Hence, to understand the unintended consequences of the World Bank’s Social Risk Mitigation Project in Turkey, it is crucial to examine the knowledge production activities it gives way to.

In this chapter, I will first look at the debates on the neoliberalization of academia especially in Western countries. After that, there will be a section on the position of the World Bank as a ‘knowledge Bank’ and the Bank’s impact on knowledge production in
the Third World countries. This section will be followed by a discussion on the neoliberalization of the academia in Turkey and the World Bank’s contribution to this trend. In this section, mostly focusing on the research conducted for the Social Risk Mitigation Project but also benefiting from my informants’ previous experiences doing research for the World Bank, I will demonstrate how this knowledge production experience fosters the neoliberalization of university in Turkey. Relying on my interviews with twelve professors and four graduate students who had been involved in some kind of research activity for the SRMP, I will show how these academics feel about doing research for the World Bank or for a World Bank project. I will also benefit from my interviews with people working for NGOs and research companies who conducted impact assessment studies for the project, employees of the World Bank Turkey office, World Bank international staff, and state officials. In the conclusion part, I will summarize the impacts of doing research for the World Bank and comment on what kind of new subjectivities are produced as indicated by the framework of neoliberal governmentality, looking for an answer to the question of whether Turkish scholars are recreated as neoliberal subjects during this process of knowledge production.

4.2. Neoliberalization of the Academia

With the withdrawal of public funding from universities, a need to find alternative sources of funding has emerged and the changes in universities have been largely in response to this need. The changes such as cuts in university budgets and funding, increasing student numbers, and introduction of teaching and research assessments have their consequent effects on academic workloads and the nature of academic work.
Universities, like other public entities, have become more responsible for finding resources on their own and more accountable for their ‘productivity’ and ‘efficiency’ (Lee et al. 2005, p.63). Many universities have adopted managerialist techniques and processes, resulting in increasing workloads, increasing pressures to generate funds, and a changing mentality which tries to get a certain kind of performance from the academic staff (Davies 2003, Davies & Petersen 2005). Students are now regarded as ‘consumers’ whose demands and preferences have to be served by the universities which are now defined as the ‘providers’ of educational services (Roberts 2007, p.351). Ovetz goes further to claim that especially the universities in the US have not only intensified their partnerships with business but they are becoming businesses themselves through several different profitable ventures which are based on university resources, going through the process of entrepreneurialization (Ovetz 1996, p.113). “University presidents have become chief executive officers and universities increasingly mimic large scale corporations.” (Drakich et al. 2002, p.255) Berg and Roche highlight the parallel change in the discursive construction of the university, the shift in perception of the university from ‘a community producing knowledge as a public good for community uses’ to ‘a market-led business producing knowledge as a private good for individual consumption’ (Berg & Roche 1997, p.154). The concept of ‘knowledge economy’ has been a crucial reference point which is used for defining the function of the universities. As Lock and Lorenz argue, knowledge economy does not mean the reorganization of the economy depending on scientific knowledge; quite the opposite, it refers to the economization of knowledge production. “…homo academicus is now modeled after homo economicus.” (Lock & Lorenz 2007, p.412)
What is central to these changes, as Bernstein emphasizes, is the coming out of a new concept of knowledge and the relation of this knowledge to the ones who create it (Bernstein 2000, p.86). The academic identity, which Bernstein describes by the terms ‘inwardness’ and ‘inner dedication’ and which had a humane relationship to knowledge, is now being put at risk by the recent trend of marketization (Beck & Young 2005, p.184). Although one can argue that this stress on the values of inwardness and inner dedication might be to a certain extent idealistic and the profile of academics as ascetic individuals has never been a reality, it is still important to acknowledge the kind of radical transformation that has occurred in knowledge production, knowledge becoming a product that can be bought and sold like anything else in the globalized market. This is in parallel to Lyotard’s argument, in the *Postmodern Condition*, that knowledge will increasingly be produced to be sold, its ‘exchange value’ outweighing its ‘use value’.

The old principle that the acquisition of knowledge is indissociable from the training (Bildung) of minds, or even of individuals, is becoming obsolete and will become even more so. The relationship of the suppliers and users of knowledge to the knowledge they supply and use is now tending, and will increasingly tend, to assume the form already taken by the relationship of commodity producers and consumers to the commodities they produce and consume- that is the form of value. Knowledge is and will be produced in order to be sold, it is and will be consumed in order to be valorized in a new production: in both cases the goal is exchange. Knowledge ceases to be an end in itself, it loses its ‘use value’. (Lyotard 1984, p.4)

Hassan, with the idea in the background that there are different knowledge epochs, argues that in this new knowledge epoch, the kind of knowledge being produced mirrors the imperatives of neoliberal knowledge society and wipes out old forms of knowledge (Hassan 2003, p.237). He maintains that the university is the institution where we can best observe the shift in knowledge production. On the one hand, ‘liberal education’ which was previously the main reason of existence of the university is now regarded as irrelevant, the university becoming oriented to the needs of the economy and the disciplines in social sciences and humanities being marginalized. On the other hand, the
knowledge-producing university now largely concentrates on producing extensive amounts of information, which is in fact ‘the raw material of knowledge’ (ibid., p.238-239); in these circumstances, knowledge is reduced to information. As the measure of value has shifted towards economy, the status of the work of academics that put value in social and moral domains has depreciated, while the ‘technocratic policy-oriented academics’ are being rewarded, as they are the ones who can serve the needs of the global capital (Davies et al. 2006, 312). This trend of commercialization led to increasing concerns that some areas of research will be deserted in favor of research that has commercial outcomes. Although university-business relations have existed for a long time in different forms (faculty consulting, research contracts, etc.) and social theorists like Veblen and Mills critiqued university’s emerging practicality (Veblen 1954) and its businesslike operation (Mills 1959) decades ago, the recent entrepreneurial activities are different in the sense that they are determining the kind of knowledge produced and the process of knowledge production in a way that did not exist previously (Ovetz 1996, p.130).

Presently, intrinsic purposes for doing research are rapidly being replaced by extrinsic incentives. Academics feel that they are compelled to look for external funding for their work, or when their area of interest is not likely to get external funding, they change their research subjects accordingly. Research is being reconstructed as a competitive, self-interested, and instrumental process. Therefore, it is increasingly becoming hard to say that academic curiosity determines research agendas. Academics more and more become aware of the fact that the kind of relationships in the contemporary university is quite
different from their ideal of an academic community and “…it is not that different from the commercial world” (see the interview in Archer 2008, p.273). Although most of the activities of academics and researchers are not quantifiable, the emphasis of the criteria for success is shifting from quality to quantity. Academics mostly concentrate on marketing themselves in order to increase their ‘ratings’ and their academic activities are, to a large extent, guided by these motivations. “Those who succeed in the system will become highly efficient at producing in the right amounts, with the right people, in the right places.” (Roberts 2007, p.359). The intellectual researcher is now being transformed into the ‘researcher as entrepreneur’ or researcher as the ‘research manager’ (Ozga 1998). The main interest of these research managers becomes how to organize the activities related to contract winning and maintenance. Archer’s study successfully demonstrates how especially younger academics have even embraced a managerial terminology, describing their own work in terms of ‘products’, ‘business’, ‘accountability’, etc. (Archer 2008, p.272). As Seddon rightfully states, every research process is also a learning process for the researcher which plays a key role in his/her self formation (Seddon 1996, p.202). The new research process which brings high levels of anxiety, ambivalence about the work and work culture, and excessive concern with competence and competitiveness leads to the creation of a different kind of subject/self.

This is exactly what neoliberalism has done and continues to do. It co-opts research to its own agendas, it silences those who ask questions, it whips up a small-minded moralism that rewards the attack of each small powerless person on the other, and it shuts down creativity. It draws on and exacerbates a fear of difference and rewards a rampant, consumerist, competitive individualism. (Davies 2005, p.7)

In response to the changes in financing possibilities, academics learned how to increase their chances of receiving these funds. However, it will be fair to say that the adoption of this ‘academic capitalism’ in the university has been more out of necessity rather than
being adopted by choice. Susan Marton’s interviews with researchers reveal that the reason for seeking external funds is the researchers’ perception that ‘there is no other alternative’. In fact, this is the way neoliberal governmentality works, by convincing people that there is no alternative at the structural level and they should be successful through their individual choices. While they clearly comprehend the consequences of getting external funds and how these funds are influencing the direction that their research takes, they feel that they cannot avoid it. “We were inspired to find new research questions, and listened to what could actually work. We learned to explain our research in a way that would be successful for financing.” (see the interview in Marton 2005, p.178).

Academics, who have concentrated on getting research project funding and consultancies, are limited in terms of their freedom to determine their own research agendas, as they are increasingly directed by the funding bodies. The researchers are pressured to move away from curiosity driven research. Harvie gives a list of related processes that have already started to have detrimental consequences for the academic freedom and job security of research academics. These processes are:

- the subordination of essentially unmeasurable research use-values to quantifiable ‘research value’
- the alienation… of academic researchers
- primitive accumulation and enclosure of academic commons
- the emergence of two classes of academic, a research capitalist class and a research proletariat…
- an increasing degree of specialization and division of academic research labor (Harvie 2000, p.104)

Presently, for academics, it is not sufficient to be simply engaged in research; there is extensive pressure on them to produce research output, which leads them to prefer those research subjects which are regarded as ‘safe’ and likely to produce publications. It is risky to write papers on innovative or revolutionary ideas. In this new academic environment, researchers are not only alienated from the ‘products’ of their labor but also
from their labor power. In each case when assistants and fellows are employed for doing research, their ‘employer’ is the one who owns their labor power and the product of their labor. In these circumstances, two classes of researchers emerge: on the one hand, there are research workers, who only have their ability to do research and look for employment as researchers, and on the other hand, there are the ‘research capitalists’ as Harvie calls them, who employ others to do research and have many publications to their names.

While many academics are getting devoid of ‘intellectual commons’, “…well-endowed libraries and other research facilities, combined with freedom from both material worry and onerous teaching and administrative burden…”, research capitalists gain control of the basic research resources (Harvie 2000, p.117). Academic work is more and more characterized by the presence of a gendered and classed division of labor. Male academics are the ones who mainly have the positions as the authors of knowledge in the academia; women are mainly concentrated in contract research which is regarded as the ‘housework of the academy’ (Hey 2001, p.68). Hey asserts that this casualized contract staff is emerging as a service class of the intellectuals, as subordinate academic workers (ibid., p.72). Contract staff are doing the ‘leg work’, while the ‘head work’ belongs to the established staff. This academic division of labor strengthens the division between collection of empirical data and analysis of the data. Maybe the most dangerous political implication of these developments is that while researchers now have less time for wider intellectual understanding and are alienated from societal knowledge, the groups with more political and economic power can easily interpret this knowledge according to their own interests (Harvie 2000, p.120).
The reason why so many scholars criticize the new university is not only because they do not approve of this new form but also for the reason that they believe this new university will basically not work. Although the new university is founded on the idea of translation of all values to economic goals, it simply cannot function without the presence of non-economic academic values, which it cannot reproduce. This new mentality challenges the reproduction of these values and this might pose a threat to the existence of the university in the future. As Clegg observes, there is a disjunction between the increasing managerialism in the universities and ‘creativity’ which is a key value for the academics. “The creative force is such that it cannot be constrained by out-of-date conventions, structures, and rules.” (Clegg 2008, p.219). Moreover, contrary to neoliberals’ claim, the neoliberalization of the university in the form of enforcing the logic of managerialist audit fosters bureaucratization in the university (Lock & Lorenz 2007, p.416) which is another trend that has detrimental impacts on the university. Therefore, thinking and acting in business terms might determine the future prospects of the academic community, leading to its disintegration according to some critics.

What has been discussed so far should clearly demonstrate the kind of pressures the academics are facing because of the neoliberalization of the academia. As mentioned before, neoliberal governmentality works through convincing the academics that there is no alternative and making them believe that it is their choice to work in the ways they are working. At this point, however, it is crucial to ask whether the academics are completely taken in by neoliberalism. Davies and Petersen, with reference to Althusser’s metaphor of interpellation, points out the distinction between ‘doing’ and ‘becoming’:
To suggest that an individual can both recognize themselves as being hailed and yet not take up for themselves the terms of the hailing would suggest that a clear line can be drawn between performance and performativity: we can resist becoming that which we perform as ourselves. (Davies & Petersen 2006, p.81)

Therefore, they are referring to the possibility of ‘doing’ without ‘becoming’ a neoliberal subject. Here, we can make the point that academics resist sometimes with more, other times with less success, ‘to produce moments of freedom’ and not to turn into docile neoliberal subjects even though this may not be an active resistance and those who critique neoliberal practices in public forums might at times feel themselves naïve or even ‘foolish’ because of the dominant trend in the academia (ibid., p.93). As the interviews by Davies et al. hint at, although some academics feel that the new neoliberal system is forcing them into inferior work, they overwork themselves in order to be able to produce the kind of work that they are passionate about (Davies et al. 2006, p.316). They try to preserve their sense of their self esteem, their values, and their work through several ways, by ‘playing the game’, by ‘speaking out’, etc. (Archer 2008, p.276).

What has been covered so far is mostly about the ways in which the academia has been transformed in the Western countries. However, it will be accurate to contend that most of the components of neoliberalization that have been mentioned here are also very much part of the academic experience in the Third World countries. One aspect that is not covered in the literature on Western academia because of its lesser impact in the Western context is the ways in which the international organizations such as the UN institutions and especially the World Bank is having an effect on knowledge production, which is indeed a crucial subject of inquiry if we consider the academia in the Third World. Nevertheless, in spite of its significance, there has been a limited scholarly interest in the
question of how the Third World universities and academics are affected when these academics are employed by the international organizations such as the World Bank to do research or to write reports, which is in fact a pervasive trend in the developing/underdeveloped countries.

4.3. World Bank as the ‘Knowledge Bank’

Presently, when you enter the keywords ‘World Bank’ and ‘knowledge’ into one of the academic search engines, you can easily reach several articles most of which are around the questions of whether the World Bank has become a ‘global Knowledge Bank’ as it claims to be and the consequences of the Bank’s efforts to become a knowledge agency (see Gilbert et al. 1999, Ellerman 2000, Standing 2000, Mehta 2001, King 2002, Stone 2003, Goldman 2005, Broad 2006, 2007, St Clair 2006, Plehwe 2007, Girdwood 2007). Since then—World Bank president Wolfensohn’s decision in 1996 to transform the World Bank from a ‘lending bank’ into ‘the Knowledge Bank’ increasing its role in “…creating, aggrandizing, distributing, and brokering knowledge…” (Broad 2007, p.701), there has been an emphasis on knowledge and ‘knowledge management’ in the Bank’s discourse and activities. Publication of the World Development Report on Knowledge for Development, implementation of knowledge projects, and creation of the Development Gateway, which is ‘a global knowledge hypermarket’ (King 2002, p.311), are important indicators of the Bank’s increasing stress on knowledge.

The World Bank has become the world’s main development research institution in addition to being the main lender for development. Most of the critics think that this
change does not demonstrate a significant transformation at the Bank; they criticize the knowledge agenda of the Bank in terms of several aspects: limited political and ideological scope of the World Bank’s intellectual activities (Pincus & Winters 2002, p.14), the Bank’s centralized approach to and narrow definition of knowledge, and treatment of knowledge as a commodity, its disregard for issues of power, socio-cultural issues, and political economy in its knowledge agenda, its attempts to monopolize knowledge, its representation of itself as a ‘neutral broker of knowledge’ while the knowledge it produces is based on the interests of its main sponsor, the US (Mehta 2001, p.189), the critical role the World Bank research plays in the legitimization of the neoliberal free trade paradigm (Broad 2006, 2007), the special legitimacy that the knowledge claims of the bank researchers have, the Bank’s creation of new categories of expertise and self referential nature of this expertise.

The Bank has contributed to the demands for its own expert knowledge by framing the problems of poverty and development as primarily an economic problem that requires its expertise, and reproduces its own legitimacy and power by continuing to emphasize the priority of economic science… (The Bank is) an expertised institution that has created its own expertise by defining a problem in a particular way and then closing a bureaucratic-technocratic circle around it and generating demand for its own constructed expertise (St. Clair 2006, p.88)

In the field of development, the World Bank is becoming a main source of ideas for the development community. The research department of the Bank works as a research department for other aid agencies and development banks. Moreover, policy makers all over the world use Bank research when they need some kind of information or advice. Through far-reaching media coverage, Bank research is easily distributed to the global development community. Bank publications are widely cited, which is an indicator that gives an idea about their influence on the academia. Especially for the courses on
development, World Bank publications are extensively used as reading material (Broad 2006, 396-97).

As I mentioned before, at present, there is an expanding literature on the knowledge production and management activities of the World Bank, many of which focus on the research done and knowledge produced by the Bank itself. Nevertheless, the crucial question of the Bank’s impact on the kind of knowledge produced in the academia in the underdeveloped/developing countries is not adequately addressed. When the World Bank implements a project in a country, this implementation usually triggers the production of an enormous amount of information, in the forms of background papers, project evaluation and implementation documents, etc, most of which are prepared by the local academics for the use of the World Bank and the government. Moreover, the World Bank also offers funding to the local academics for writing reports on local issues outside project implementation. Numerous academics are getting involved in the research design, research implementation, analysis, and writing stages of these reports. One major impact of this involvement is the expansion and intensification of the recent neoliberalization trends in the academia in these countries. In the following section, there will be a discussion on the kind of knowledge that is produced within the context of the World Bank’s implementation of the ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’ in Turkey, the conditions of knowledge production for local academics when they produce that knowledge for the World Bank, and the impact on Turkish academia of having World Bank funding for research.
4.4. Neoliberalization of the Academia in Turkey and the World Bank

The diffusion of neoliberal economic policies and formation of the new ideological environment in the Western countries created concurrent changes in Turkey in every sphere of life. Education in general and the university system in particular have also gone through a parallel transformation especially after 1980s. In addition to the process of privatizing public universities, the establishment of private universities and the emergence of the private university model as the dominant university model took place during 1980s (Özuğrulu 2003, p.260). In Turkey, although public has high expectations from the academics, their income levels are usually very low. Moreover, the financial problems of the public universities created a decrease in the number of academics who have job security and these academics are currently being replaced by part-time academics and graduate students. The professors who are in demand are the entrepreneurial ones who can bring projects to the university (Tekeli 2003). The adoption and internalization of market rationality in the academia and commercialization of knowledge production have become major tendencies in the Turkish university starting from 1980s. Development of projects which can further market-university relations and which can be sold in the market, evaluation of academic quality according to managerial criteria, and redefinition of being qualified as possessing technical skills which can be exchanged in the market are the trends which have existed in applied sciences for a long time. However, recently, these same trends have also spread to other academic disciplines and especially social sciences, which have detrimental effects as they hinder the development of social critique; social researchers are mostly directed to conduct market-oriented research (Ergur 2003, see also Çiğdem 2003, Cangızbay 2003, Tekin 2003).
This ‘entrepreneurialization of the university’ has significant impacts on the ‘modern university ethos’ and the values of academics, and Nalbantoğlu identifies this new university as the ‘University Inc.’ (Üniversite AŞ) and this new social type as the ‘Ersatz Yuppie Academician’ (Nalbantoğlu 2003).

Although it hasn’t adequately been studied yet, the international institutions such as the UN and the World Bank, and the funds that they provide for research contribute significantly to the transformation of the academia in Turkey. If we focus our attention on the World Bank, we should start by saying that every World Bank project gives way to the production of an enormous amount of research and knowledge. The only actors involved in this knowledge production process are certainly not the World Bank staff; there are a variety of others, such as the state institutions, local scholars, undergraduate and graduate students in social sciences, local and international research institutions, and civil society actors. In the case of the ‘Social Risk Mitigation Project’, in addition to the project-related documents produced by the World Bank in negotiation with the state officials (Agreement, Loan Agreement, Project Appraisal, and Project Information Documents, Final Report, etc.) there are a variety of other documents produced by other parties: Reports prepared by the scholars on poverty and social assistance/security systems in Turkey, analyses which proposed formulas for the determination of ‘the real poor’ or the ones which revised the formulas proposed by the others, studies which made suggestions on the kind of entrepreneurial activities that can be carried out by the poor people, various impact assessment reports which depend on field researches done for these assessments, and even reports which evaluated the impact assessments.
It is important to make distinctions among all the different kinds of reports/documents that are produced within the context of a World Bank project. The first group of documents, the reports on poverty, for instance, are directly produced for the World Bank itself. These reports might be ordered by the World Bank for internal or external consumption. An officer working in the World Bank Turkey office related the writing of these reports and the emphasis on research to the position of the Bank as a major development institution in the world.
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…For instance, education sector study…It is an 800 page, very detailed report which takes a picture of the education sector in Turkey. Or for example the report on labor market reform…These are reports prepared on the issues which the government and the World Bank mutually agree on. In the preparation of these reports, in addition to the specialists of that sector, consultants who are locally hired are also involved. Let’s think of the issue of gender. We need to prepare a report to take a picture of gender and gender discrimination in Turkey. As a matter of fact, the gender specialists from the World Bank write that report but as the people who are working on gender in Turkey will be the ones who have the foremost knowledge on gender implications in Turkey, we are in a position to hire let’s say five university professors as consultants.

However, in addition to these reports that are produced as World Bank documents, there is a second category of documents produced about/for a World Bank project such as the impact assessment studies which are done for assessing the effects of the Bank’s projects. For these studies, the correspondent of the researchers is usually a state institution which is responsible from the implementation of that World Bank project in the country and the report is submitted to that institution after completion. In some cases, the researchers have no contact with the World Bank specialists during the preparation stage of the report or its submission. Some of the scholars that I interviewed underlined this distinction, emphasizing that they only do this second kind of research, which they regard as not really producing knowledge for the World Bank but rather for a state institution.
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I did not feel like I was producing knowledge for the World Bank because my respondent was a state institution. And I did not feel uncomfortable while I was writing the report. If they had
intervened, I wouldn’t have done it. It is a totally different thing if somebody tells you to write or not to write certain things. I cannot work in that kind of a situation.

It is important for them to stress it because they don’t want to be directly associated with the Bank. One reason for this avoidance of association is the ideological position of some of these scholars as leftists. However, besides that, regardless of their ideological position, all of these scholars are also aware of the academic debates and arguments against the World Bank. Therefore, they prefer to be seen as not directly connected to the Bank. In the case of the Social Risk Mitigation Project, although impact assessments were conducted and reports were written as a condition of the World Bank loan, and they were given to the World Bank project team to provide feedback, because of this indirect relationship between the Bank and the researchers, it wasn’t possible to reach them from the World Bank web site, World Bank Turkey office in Ankara, or World Bank Public Information Center. It hasn’t been possible to get them from the state institution through formal channels, either. The officials working at the SYDGM stated that they do not have the impact assessment reports as those reports were prepared by research companies for the Project Coordination Unit. Therefore, the argument was that only the PCU has those documents. However, as the project has already been terminated and the PCU dissolved, all the documents and hence, the impact assessment reports for this project were transferred to the SYDGM. At the end, I could attain the impact assessment reports through personal contact and request from the Project Coordinator. Considering the fact that impact assessment reports are the only documents which give an idea about the implication of the World Bank project on the ground, besides the World Bank project team’s own account of the project, it is obvious how valuable they might be for a researcher. However, although all the other project documents produced by the World
Bank are easily accessible, these important reports are not easy to get to. This is really telling as it gives an idea about the fate of information that is not owned and distributed by the World Bank.

The trend of an increasing degree of specialization and division of academic research labor in the academia discussed by Harvie (2000) is also in operation in research done for the World Bank. Because of their continuous relationship for the research done in different areas (health, education, gender, etc.), the World Bank officials, as well as the officials from the other international institutions (ILO, UNICEF, etc.) know the names of those scholars who are regarded as experts in those areas. Therefore, when they need research to be done, they usually contact a certain scholar depending on their previous relationship. That scholar, the, establishes his/her team of researchers to do the actual field research. On the one hand, there are those scholars who coordinate the research and write the report in the end depending on the data collected by the others. On the other hand, there are those researchers who do the actual research by going to the field and collect the data. Sometimes, research companies or NGOs are also involved in this process. In some cases, these companies win the World Bank contract after the bidding process and employ scholars and graduate students to do the research for them. The most important drawback of this arrangement is that these researchers cannot learn much about the entire project, the broader context of the research, and their rights and responsibilities while doing the research. There are also cases when an international company wins the contract but then finds a local correspondent company to do the research and this second company also employs researchers. Therefore, the research is subcontracted at multiple
levels. For the scholars, this leads to being significantly alienated from the knowledge they are producing.

In this research company, we are six people working... Our friends have specialties in different areas such as management, sociology, economics, and environmental engineering... But for this research (impact assessment for the local initiatives component of SRMP) there was a need for more specific things. So we formed a team consisting of professors from different universities to conduct interviews, and to interpret the data derived from the survey and focus groups. For the survey, we hired another company which is specialized in surveys. In other words, we subcontracted it... They provided us support only in doing the survey and entering the data. We did the rest.

In the following case, a professor was in contact with the World Bank. The professor then established a team of researchers who would do the research. But the professor remained as the only person who knew the conditions of their agreement for the research and the other researchers did not have much information about what was required from them.

I think part of the problem in that project was rooted in the fact that we did not really know our responsibilities. For instance, after the completion of the report, they told us that we need to have meetings for getting feedback... We asked the professor if there was such a condition in the agreement that we signed. He said that there might be... I had no clue whether there was such a condition in the agreement that we had signed. The project coordinator was that professor and we, as the researchers, had no idea what conditions that agreement included.

Below is the account of a sociology graduate student who was involved in a field research for the impact assessment of the World Bank’s Social Risk Mitigation Project. It seems that for junior people in the academia, alienation is even more intense when they get involved in these projects.

We were involved in it but we have no idea about the entire project. We did not demand to be informed either... If we had really wanted to, maybe we could have been more aware of what was going on. Neither we demanded it nor did they try to inform us. Therefore, we have no clue what our work was a part of. We did what we were told to do and then we were paid a certain amount of money. We haven’t been involved in any academic debate.

Producing knowledge for the World Bank certainly has consequences especially in the long term. The scholars that I talked to mostly mentioned how it has an impact on the production of academic knowledge in general, more research being done in the areas
which are funded by the World Bank (and the other international organizations, such as the UN) even though knowledge production in other areas might be more crucial because of social problems that need urgent attention in the country. Those problem areas are regarded as worth studying only when the World Bank puts them on its agenda. This is what has happened with the subject of poverty. Although it is certainly not a problem that people in Turkey have faced recently, the research on poverty in Turkey mostly started only when it has become a key issue for the World Bank after 2000. And after it has become a key concern on the Bank’s agenda, there have been so many articles written and so many conferences organized on poverty that as one of the social science scholars that I interviewed said, “everybody got tired of listening to the talk on poverty”. It is the same with the other issues that the World Bank points out. Under the guidance of the World Bank agenda, the scholars in social sciences are led to limit their inquiries to those areas which are regarded as worth researching by the World Bank. The most commonly repeated reason for why the Turkish scholars’ research subjects are directed by the World Bank’s interests is the lack of local resources.
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…This is our problem in Turkey, the problem of people in social sciences… We usually do not have our own research agendas. Our research agendas are usually determined by the agendas of international aid institutions. For example, if we consider poverty, poverty as a problem certainly existed in Turkey twenty years ago. There was poverty to an enormous extent. However, poverty became the subject of research only after the first World Bank report on poverty was published. Didn’t we have governance problems before? We certainly did… Turkish bureaucracy has always been a highly problematic area. But previously, nobody paid attention to it. UNICEF or UNDP tells us that governance is an important issue and there should be more research on it. Then, all of us, as Turkish social scientists, start to do research on governance. Since the foundation of Turkish Republic, there have continuously been interregional differences. Nobody used to concentrate on those differences. But then it was the World Bank’s subject after poverty and they said there are serious interregional differences and inequalities in Turkey, adding that if we don’t solve this problem we cannot develop as a country and cannot find solutions to human rights-related problems. It was only then we started studying it. As a scholar who do a lot of field research, I feel like I have no control. This is the situation of social sciences in Turkey. None of us can study an original subject. First, we don’t have money. As it is where the money is coming from, you feel pressured to spend your effort in the direction that they point out to you… This is the most important point… If the World Bank has an impact on Turkey and Turkish academia, it is that they determine what we study. They tell you what is important. You are left in such a position as if
you are unaware of your own country’s problems. What they tell you, you consent that it is a more important problem. In fact, you know that there is a much more crucial problem but as they are giving you the money, you accept to study what they are telling you. Maybe you think of studying that other crucial subject later on your own. But you can never do that because you cannot really find the necessary resources. Institutions like TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council in Turkey) have recently started to gain importance in providing funds for research. We will break that dependence to a certain extent through these institutions… Second, the World Bank does not only determine the subject to study, but also dictates you what is important within that subject… They don’t only control what you will study but also how you will study it…
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I have so far been involved in four projects related to the World Bank. I did the first one in 1995… It was published as a book later. If The World Bank hadn’t provided money for the project, we couldn’t have done that study… At the time, we used to have a lot of leftist students here in the Sociology Department. When my students heard about that study, they completely turned against me. They were critical of me doing research for and giving information to the World Bank. Since then, I have been repeating the same thing. If you don’t have any other resources and if there is a really serious issue that needs to be studied, then you do it. Now, we have this information produced. Is it a bad thing?... Yes, it wasn’t my original idea. It was ordered by the World Bank. I wish I had thought of it myself. But the reason why I hadn’t considered studying it was because I did not have the funds for doing it. But then, it has become easier. The people at the World Bank think of a subject, they order, and we do the research for them. UNDP thinks of an issue, EU thinks of an issue, we study it. This is the point where we are currently at…

For some scholars, the reason why Turkish scholars follow the World Bank’s lead is mostly related to the current state of the Turkish academia and academics. Hence, according to these scholars, if we will talk about an impact of the World Bank on knowledge production, it is mostly a positive one.
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The World Bank played a major role in the recognition by the scholars and the leftists that there is widespread poverty in Turkey. As most of the people in our academia are below the standard and do not have the capacity to publish at the international level, and the ones who have a higher standard and can have Phd’s abroad choose their research subjects depending on guidance from abroad, Turkish academia did not pay attention to the issue of poverty in spite of the detrimental social consequences of the neoliberal policies. Fortunately, the World Bank, as a consequence of its own transformation, brought in the subject of poverty to rescue its own image and this initiated the interest in Turkish academia… Do not take into consideration those people’s criticisms of the World Bank who behave as if they have been interested in poverty and inequality for twenty-thirty years. Poverty definitely wasn’t on the agenda of Turkish social sciences before. With the efforts of the World Bank and to a certain extent UNDP, the subject was brought in. It came from outside...

As social science scholars, they are aware of the criticisms about the World Bank and some of them are also critical of the Institution themselves. It is hard to argue that they entirely internalized the perspective of the World Bank or a neoliberal position; their
decision to do research for the World Bank seems to be mostly a pragmatic one. Going to the field and having first-hand knowledge of the social problems in the country convinces them of the urgency of the situation, and their sense of social responsibility leads them to knock on the door of the World Bank or other international organizations or to accept their offers, as these institutions are the ones that can provide sufficient funding for these urgent social needs.

When you go to the field a lot, your perception significantly changes. I came back to Turkey in 1997. Since 1997, I have been involved in more than 25 projects related to rural development, poverty, children’s situation and the like. When you have too much contact with poverty and the poor, your whole perspective changes. I remember a time when we went to an apartment in the middle of winter. There was no fuel, no heater… Five children, all of them at home… When you see such scenes, you just think of finding a way to provide food, send them to school, or to help them benefit from health care. We would certainly prefer to help these groups using local resources, according to the principle of social state. However, when those local resources do not exist and when there is an international institution that you can reach for those purposes, then you consider them instead… To facilitate structural transformation and to reach all the people, we certainly need a more centrally organized and planned activity. We know that these are temporary solutions… I know the World Bank’s ideology and I criticize it in terms of many aspects. However, still, I feel that if we can keep one girl at school thanks to these projects, it is a huge gain.

These social science professors do not seem to be completely at ease with writing reports or doing research for the World Bank. On the one hand, they think that it is inevitable and necessary to be involved in the World Bank projects as there aren’t sufficient resources for research. On the other hand, they are aware of the drawbacks of this experience, such as not being completely independent, not being able to control the process of knowledge production or to have power over how the knowledge that they produce will be used. Although these scholars accept the fact that due to the funds by the World Bank and the other international institutions there is a significant increase in the amount of information produced, they question the relevance and usefulness of all that information that is being produced.
Poverty was first emphasized as a problem in the World Bank’s report in 1990. At that point, they organized a meeting here which we also attended and they distributed the report to us. That report introduced poverty as the next problem that should be studied. Scholars in Turkey started to study poverty especially after that meeting. The World Bank points at and people study… It became a real trend those days to do research on poverty. People both earned a lot of money and published extensively thanks to the subject of poverty… So many institutions organized conferences on poverty… There has been so much talk on poverty but we still cannot define who the poor are in Turkey. So what kind of information is this? It’s true that a massive amount of information is produced but this information does not really contribute to social sciences.

Especially at the beginning of their academic career, some scholars go through continuous self-questioning because of the discrepancy between their ideological position against the World Bank on the one hand and their practice of doing research for the World Bank on the other hand. While they feel like they are doing a bad thing or involved in something bad, it is a consolation for them that in some cases they can intervene to change the conditions in favor of the local people by being involved in World Bank research.

While we were doing that first project, there was a World Bank consultant with us; we went to the field with him. Because of our ideological position, we did not talk to him. We did not speak English. The professor who was with us communicated with him; we didn’t. In a village coffee house, while we were doing the interviews, one of the villagers asked why we brought that ‘spy’ with us. Actually, our own perspective was not much different from that villager’s. We were constantly questioning ourselves about what we were doing. Therefore, it was difficult for us to manage that situation. We took the consultant out from the coffee house and tried to calm the villagers. We tried to explain the situation to the villagers but even we, ourselves, were not convinced with those explanations… Later, we were writing our report for the World Bank. Turkey is subsidizing some crops and that project was for a decrease in those subsidies. One group is those farmers who produce hazelnut. The World Bank’s position was that there was overproduction of hazelnut so hazelnut trees should be uprooted. But after doing the research, we understood that if the trees in Ordu and Giresun are uprooted, in addition to the question of how the people will subsist, there will also be extensive landslide. It was nonsensical. But the World Bank insisted that they should be uprooted. When we went to the field we saw that in those two cities, it is not possible to uproot the trees, but the ones in Çarşamba should be uprooted… There are also hazelnut trees in Adapazari. It is low quality hazelnut. One reason why the farmers in Ordu has problems is because there is this low-quality hazelnut produced in Adapazari… We wrote these in our report. And the World Bank people were convinced. For us, it was an important achievement. We were feeling like we were doing a bad thing in general. But this was one important achievement, a good thing that we did at the same time. A second one was… They are giving direct income subsidies to the farmers. The World Bank people told us to write two dollars per decare in our report. We insisted that it should be higher so they increased that amount first to five then to ten dollars per decare… We increased it to ten dollars after a heated discussion and a lot of contestation… Sometimes, we still discuss that incident with our friends. It is a consolation for us that at least we could increase that amount that would be given to the farmers.
After I had an interview with a professor who did research within the context of the Social Risk Mitigation Project, since he interpreted my position as critical of the World Bank, he sent me to another professor whom he called as a ‘deep sociologist’ because of that professor’s refusal to be involved in any kind of World Bank research. Although he has never done research for the World Bank or other international institutions, that professor stressed how difficult it is to be outside the ‘universe of the World Bank’ even for those who are critical of the World Bank.
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I am against being directly related to the World Bank, which is an institution that has created hegemony in favor of the global capital. But it is possible that we might have indirect connections…We are inevitably a part of the universe that has been created by the World Bank. The Bank determines subjects that have priority every five years, like poverty, good governance…All the research opportunities emerge around those subjects. New concepts are invented and they are widely used. Then, on the one hand we have the mainstream approach represented by the World Bank and all the others on the other hand…Even the critical scholars are in a sense part of the World Bank’s order. The ones who produce critical knowledge see the World Bank’s position as the mainstream position so they need to keep an eye on the activities of the Bank, read its reports, and follow the change and transformation of the concepts in the Bank’s discourse…We are part of its order in this sense.

Scholars’ criticisms of the World Bank are not only limited to a general ideological criticism of the Bank’s role and activities in the world, but also depend on their concrete experiences with the World Bank consultants. These scholars criticize the perspectives and attitudes of these consultants in terms of their approach to knowledge production, social problems in general and specifically poverty, and local contexts and also their working principles, all of which in fact represent the World Bank style rather than being representative of their individual choices.

6

The World Bank people are only interested in telling everyone that they gave 500 million dollars to Turkey, that they did such and such activities to mitigate the negative impacts of poverty, they reached so many people, and spent so much money. They are only interested in looking successful. They do not have a sincere interest in understanding the poor, poverty, how to reach them, how to communicate with them…The consultants who are sent here are not people who have knowledge of poverty. They are people who had degrees in economics and who later became bureaucrats in the World Bank. They don’t know much about poverty, the context of Turkey, poverty in the Turkish context or Turkish bureaucracy. They come to Ankara, stay for three
months, five months at Sheraton or Hilton, earn fifteen thousand, twenty thousand dollars a month, contact only with the top bureaucrats in Turkey, pretend that they are doing something important, and then leave...They are all very similar, fast food guys…Let’s do something very quickly. We are successful in every case. This is their mentality.

3
I took that World Bank consultant to the squatter settlements (gecekondu) in Mamak. Her poverty conception was very different from ours. She had been to some African countries before. She had starving children in her mind. Because of that in every house we have been to, while I thought that the conditions were terrible, she thought those people weren’t really poor…Many times I tried to tell her that having a TV in Turkey does not mean that you are not poor. They might have a TV but it may be broken down…In Turkey, in most of the studies on poverty, we do not ask people whether they have a refrigerator. We used to ask that before because it was an indicator of a certain level of well-being. But now, there is almost no household that does not own a refrigerator…But that refrigerator may not be working well…Anyway, that consultant was behaving like those weren’t really poor people and we weren’t going to the right places…She had certain criteria in her mind to measure poverty…She was an economist and she seemed to believe that she had better technical knowledge than us. Not necessarily better knowledge of the situation in general but in terms of the quality of knowledge, she believed that she had better technical knowledge.

Lack of resources for doing research is definitely not the only reason why Turkish scholars do research for the international institutions. As some other professors emphasized during the interviews, doing research and writing reports for the World Bank or the other international institutions are preferred by the scholars as these activities are both prestigious and also make it possible for these scholars to earn, in some cases, good amounts of money. Considering the fact that in Turkey especially the professors who work for public universities are significantly underpaid¹⁹, these projects have become an important alternative source of income for the scholars.

4
Some of the people in social sciences are very pleased with this current situation because these World Bank projects are well-paying projects. People can earn a good amount of money for consultancy and copyright by being involved in them. This is why these World Bank projects are really sought after. And it is very prestigious to do research for the World Bank. And you don’t really feel like you are limited while you are doing your research… But after you submit your report, it is up to their decision whether they will publish it or not.

A major criticism about the research done for the World Bank or other international organizations is about the cost of the knowledge produced. This becomes an even more

¹⁹ After the increases in their salaries, full professors will be paid around 2200 USD/month after July 2009 in Turkey (http://www.zaman.com.tr/haber.do?haberno=864082&title=memur-maaslari-temmuzda-zamlilik-ne-kadar-alacak). The salary of a graduate assistant will be around 1000 USD.
important issue if we consider the fact that for the research conducted and reports written within the context of a project implemented by the World Bank, the researchers are paid from the loan borrowed by the country- which will be paid back to the Bank with interest.

In other words, high payments to the researchers which are assumed to be funded by the World Bank are in fact funded by public resources and result in higher public debts.

I observe the same thing in both the UNDP and the World Bank projects. The knowledge produced is a very costly knowledge. Yes, this knowledge might be useful to a certain extent. But they have incredible operational costs. It brings international standards but with incredible operational costs. They pay around 5000 EUR a month to the people who work in the poverty alleviation projects of the UNDP.

Below is a quote from a senior official working in the Treasury which reflects his position about the cost of impact assessments done for the Social Risk Mitigation Project:

They said that having impact assessments was necessary. But if you look at the numbers, the amount paid for the impact assessments was around USD 800,000-900,000. With USD 900,000, you can feed so many poor people. It is necessary to initially evaluate whether it will create any added value if you have impact assessments…But in this project, the World Bank people insisted that there should be impact assessments so the administration had to have them…

Among the researchers, or consultants as they are usually called, there are differences in terms of how much they will get paid depending on their nationality. The global hierarchy among the nations is also reflected in the earnings of the researchers, the ones from developed countries earning much higher for similar jobs. This hierarchy has an impact to such an extent that a senior and experienced Turkish professor is paid less than half the amount that is paid to an inexperienced newly graduate who is from a developed country.

When a Turkish consultant works for a World Bank or UNDP project, that consultant will be paid much less compared to another consultant who is from a Western country…There is a difference in terms of whether we do that project here in Turkey or abroad. There is also a difference depending on whether the consultant is American, European, or Turkish…For instance, for a project that is not in Turkey, if an American consultant gets 100, a European consultant will get 75 and Turkish one will get 50. The same Turkish consultant will get 25 if the project is in Turkey. I am telling you these ratios depending on my experiences.
We were working for a project. The daily rate for a professor was USD 308. There was a South Asian girl involved in the same project. She was at your age. While I was getting 308, she was getting 1200. There was another girl from Australia, who had just received her undergraduate degree. She was really junior and honestly, did not know much about what was going on. She was getting around USD 700 a day. And I was the one who wrote the whole project. I was the one who was telling her what to do. She was getting more than twice the amount that I was getting. But this is not only about the World Bank. This is how the market for consulting works.

Although some scholars do not think of doing research for the World Bank as a limiting experience and almost all of them emphasize that there was no substantive impact on the reports, still from their statements emerge several different restrictions that make it hard to consider their knowledge production as an independent academic activity. While some scholars interpreted ‘limitation’ basically as whether or not the World Bank tried to control what was included in the report, others considered it more generally, including all the stages of knowledge production. Besides, as stressed in the last quote below, even the simple fact that while writing for the World Bank they use the World Bank jargon is a significant constraint in itself.

On the one hand there is information produced. But on the other hand, we are aware that this is not information produced independently… Yes, as long as I am the researcher, I can consider it as independently produced knowledge. I worked totally independently during our research on health sector. I asked my own questions. But of course they always tell you to include certain questions. But we prepared our own questionnaire. We wrote our report independently and submitted it. But I don’t know who is using the report for what purposes…

There is a bidding process of the World Bank for research. If you win the contract, they tell you what they want you to include in your research report. But if you want to incorporate other things besides those requirements, that is perfectly fine. But as they are the ones who order it and give the money, their requests have a priority. At the last stage, you present your research and write the report, and they redact the text. They sometimes tell you that some issues haven’t been satisfactorily explained… In all the field researches that I have been involved in, it was the World Bank people who decided on the cities in which the field research will be conducted.

Project-based scientific practice is crucial here…The World Bank is certainly the main institution that finances and supports it. The relationship between financing and research design…This is very important…They might argue that they are giving the scholars the subject to be researched but do not dictate how they should conduct their research. Ok, but if you are writing something for the World Bank, the language you use is shaped accordingly…I think this question of how the language you use changes is fundamental…You use the concept ‘globalization’ but do not use ‘imperialism’ for instance…Ideally, we choose the subject to study and problematize it. And later,
when it comes to doing research, we do it using the existing resources…However, by the time, this has changed so that this whole process is now dominated by the financer. We have so little room to develop our research problematic independently.

Moreover, these researchers have serious doubts about the extent to which their research reports and findings are taken seriously by the World Bank people. They seem to believe that the World Bank has them write these reports only because it is a part of its own procedures. The World Bank people are well aware of the criticism that they do not take local knowledges into consideration and by having these local scholars do research and write reports, they at least give the appearance of valuing these locally produced knowledges.

Besides the World Bank, I worked as a consultant for ILO and UNICEF before for extended periods…I did not really feel like there were limitations while I was doing research. But there was another kind of problem. You spend a lot of effort and get very important findings. There are times when they do not pay attention or do not take them seriously. In other words, there is an attitude like this is just an item on the agenda. Now that it is completed, they can move on to the next one.

I don’t think that the World Bank regards itself as an institution that needs the knowledge of others. The World Bank people take it for granted that they already know everything. In their publications, you see that the World Bank consultants believe that they know everything. If they have others produce knowledge for the Bank, it is only because of their procedures.

A World Bank specialist, himself, confirmed these Turkish scholars’ suspicions about the importance of their reports. He said that he “…learned far more by going to visit people, meet with them than reading the reports”. He quoted another social scientist in the World Bank who says that when it comes to qualitative research, they prefer to do it themselves. “I am the same. I prefer to do it myself. When people write it up, I lose a lot of it if I haven’t been there.” This privileging of first-hand knowledge and confidence in one’s personal observations much more than in the research done by local researchers provide important clues about the meaning of local research for the World Bank specialists. This
comment becomes even more striking when we consider the fact that he doesn’t speak Turkish or any other languages spoken in Turkey, and most of the things that he learns when he goes to the field come to him through the translation and interpretation of the people with him. This specialist also stated that “…the World Bank was very unhappy with the quality of the impact assessments that were done. We think that the consultants in most cases did not do a good job.” At the same time, he did concede that the limited amount of time for research and the pressure to get the results quickly was an important cause of the reports’ alleged low quality.

We also get clues about the kind of knowledge expected by the World Bank. He seems to be interested in reading executive summaries and looking at pictures instead of reading a long report with a lot of details, which is the kind of report a scholar might prefer writing:
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The reports were basically, and I find this a lot in Turkey, people write very long reports but they are not very good at writing summary. So in the summary, a lot gets lost. The long report is too long. You can’t… And it is too much detail and it’s too disorderly and not arranged well. So and the summary loses a lot of it so then you can’t easily distill from it what the message is…I think I have two fundamental criticisms of the impact assessments. One, methodologically a lot of them on the local initiatives didn’t answer the question, what is the real impact of these projects. And secondly, the structure of the reports… They were not well-structured. They were too long, too discursive, going over this, going over that but not with good, solid summaries of what should be done… My overall sense is that they were indigestible, that’s the word I would use. I found it very difficult to read. Forgive me for saying it but I was bored when I read them. Therefore, I lost my way in them. Therefore, I found it difficult, I ended up hiring somebody else to read through them and write summaries of them in a way that I could understand… One thing that I suggested early on is that this is a very visual project, I am a very visual person. That’s why I don’t like reading huge reports. I like pictures.

The following quote from a professor, in parallel with what this World Bank specialist mentioned, hints at another significant problem with doing research for the World Bank, which is the excessive time pressure.

6

At the end of the project, there was intense pressure on us to complete the report and submit it. But at the same time, they were dismantling the Project Coordination Unit. In this situation, it is hard to know who really read our report, who really examined it in depth, and whether they took it as
feedback…Then this report becomes something that they order to be written only as a part of the procedures of the World Bank, to complete their project cycle…When this mentality is in effect, the World Bank people tell the government that they are giving money and this research is a condition attached to that money; they will not give approval if there is no impact assessment so they should finish it quickly. So the related ministries feel a certain pressure and they only focus on whether or not it is completed...The World Bank is only interested in whether the money is distributed, whether there is any money left, and whether all the tasks have been completed according to the schedule. They are not concerned with what is really going on but only with whether the procedures are followed.

Unrealistic deadlines and scarce time for completing the research and writing the reports result in work that is below the expectations and criteria of these scholars themselves. For the Social Risk Mitigation Project, four different impact assessment researches were conducted and reports were written by four different research teams. Later, a scholar was asked to write an evaluation of these reports. This is how he describes the process of writing of the impact assessment reports by the four research teams and his own writing of an evaluation report:

4
There is not a single way of interpreting those reports. I could interpret them in several different ways. But it wasn’t possible to do that because there was limited time. The report could have been finalized after a series of debates with bureaucrats and academics...All the impact assessment reports were in fact first final drafts, rather than completed reports…Within the existing parameters, the reports were written in the best possible way. But there was a lot of time pressure…

Another impact of this knowledge production is the spreading and gaining prominence of the World Bank terminology in social sciences. While writing reports for the World Bank, the scholars feel a certain pressure to use the World Bank concepts or to express their findings in a format that will be acceptable for the World Bank. These concepts are later started to be used in regular social science articles which are not prepared for the World Bank.

2
In those TORs (Terms of Reference), there is a heavy terminology. I remember times when we spent days to read them. They tell us that we don’t have to read but we certainly read them… But then we become familiar with their concepts and see what they emphasize, what they find important. If there is a certain situation, they use this concept not that other one to describe it. If they use ‘social protection’ repeatedly, then we also become convinced to use the same
concept…Therefore, without even recognizing, we might be adopting the World Bank’s terminology and conceptual frameworks.

14
They have limitations like…In terms of the concepts used…For instance ‘accessibility’…They use different concepts. They use concepts like user, supplier. While we were writing our report, we made a discussion on the ‘user side’. Its format might be different but you are the one who are responsible for its content…The good thing about it and its difference from the other scientific studies is that you can write your policy suggestions at the end. It is the crucial part and it is the part that distinguishes it from the academic stuff.

While the people are writing reports for the World Bank which will be used for a specific project, they are given just enough information to do their research. They do not have an entire knowledge of what the project is about, how the knowledge that they are going to produce will be used, which institution will keep the reports, and who will benefit from them. When they finish their research and submit their reports, usually their job is done. They are not later updated about how the project proceeds or in what ways their reports have been useful. The scholars in the social sciences who are supposed to be critical and who need more than partial knowledge are reduced to a cog in the machine, similar to the position of a worker in a factory who do not have access to the knowledge of the whole production process. Knowledge production becomes a commercial transaction; these scholars produce what is asked from them, they prepare and submit it under the conditions that are provided to them, get their money, and give out the entire possession of their ‘product’21.

1
We submitted the report. Maybe the Ministry is keeping it now. We don’t know whether the World Bank used it or how they used it. We have no idea what happened after we submitted it…Now that you asked it, I am reconsidering the whole incident and am questioning why neither the World Bank nor the Ministry of Health gave any feedback to us.

21 Here, it is important to stress that scholars are required not to publish any articles, for a period of two years, depending on the research they do for the World Bank. After that time, they are free to make publications using their own theoretical frameworks. However, as some of my informants mentioned, in some cases that research becomes outdated after a period of two years.
I cannot remember the exact time but in the past, they were preparing a country report on Turkey. It was a World Bank report. I wrote a section to be included in that report. There were also other sections, other reports. They asked us to write reports to form the base for the country report. The reports that we wrote were not directly included in the country report. A team edited them, used them, and then a different report was produced. When I go through that country report, I can distinguish the parts that I wrote, I can say this is the part that I wrote…When we submitted the report, they paid us for the copyright. We gave them the report so that they would use it as they wish.

After we had finished this study, we did not hear anything about how the SRMP was implemented at the later stages. We haven’t been invited to any meetings. I heard that there was an impact assessment but they did not share its findings with us. In fact, I was curious to know what the findings were. I learned that it was completed, I also heard things about how it was conducted, but don’t know the results.

We have no idea how that final report was used. It is because that stage was not included in our job description. After we submitted the report, we don’t know what kind of a process it has contributed to as an input.

As far as I can see, the World Bank uses these research reports according to its own aims. If there are ten findings and seven of them are in line with the Bank’s aims but the others are not, they disregard the remaining three and use those seven findings…I am sure the Bank used our research but I don’t know how. I don’t know what the government did either because they did not disclose anything. They did not give any information on how the project was implemented after we completed our research.

For these scholars, not having enough information on the fate of their research reports is causing suspicion that their reports are misused for political aims by the government and/or the World Bank.

We wrote a report for the World Bank about the health sector in Turkey and submitted it. At that time, the government had just changed. The new minister found our report ready on his desk when he took office. I was very disappointed because there was no holistic evaluation of the report. They pulled a few issues out… We had a lot of suggestions in that report. They ignored most of them and used only a few which were the populist ones. I was really upset because of what our report has been used for…Yes, these are well-paying and prestigious projects. But things get out of our control at the end.

After we submitted our report, they made significant transformations in the health sector. We feel like our report has been misused. Every time we hear something about the changes in the health sector, we think that we might have done something really bad and our report might have been terribly abused. But we can never be sure. We might be exaggerating the importance of our own research. They never gave us feedback on what parts they read, which ones they liked, and decided to implement. We did not get any feedback from the World Bank or the Ministry of Health…So we can never be sure whether or not they took our study as a reference for these changes in the health sector.
Almost every time when scholars write a report for the World Bank or conduct research within the context of a World Bank project, they need to have contact with state officials from different ministries at varying degrees. Scholars mention having problems more often in their contacts with these state officials compared to their relationships with the World Bank consultants. They feel like they are more constrained by the limitations of Turkish bureaucracy rather than any limitation coming from the World Bank.

Most of the times I have more problems with the state ministries rather than with the World Bank or other international institutions. We have problems with the ministries because of some politically sensitive issues. I had done a research for UNICEF about girls’ education. Of the girls who are currently outside basic education in Turkey, 70% have mothers who cannot speak Turkish. But when I tell this to the Ministry, they make a big issue out of it…They try to interfere with the contents of the report. But it is not the World Bank people who interfere here, it is one of the administrators in the Ministry of Education. They asked me to write “women who cannot speak Turkish” but these women certainly have a language, Kurdish, Arabic, etc. But the people from the Ministry didn’t want these languages to be written…Because of a controversy over a single sentence, I was about to withdraw my name from the report. Therefore, I can say that I more often have disagreements with the ministries rather than with the World Bank or ILO.

For that project, we had the first meeting with the World Bank consultant. There wasn’t anybody from the Ministry who attended the meeting. But later, we understood that our respondent was the Ministry of Health…They started to make unreasonable demands. They asked us to give the Green Card numbers of our informants so that they would test whether our informants were telling the truth. Or they asked the names of our informants for investigating. We started to have major problems after we submitted the first report…They could not find any problems with the contents of the report…However, not knowing much about research methodology, they created trouble in that sense. There were long quotes in one of the reports and the people in the Ministry of Health wrote the comment that they don’t want to read such long quotes so there should be an interpretation of it instead of the quote itself…At the very end of the project, they told us that they will not give our money if we do not give them the interview tapes. At that stage, we had to ask the World Bank people to intervene…I don’t know what the World Bank people told them and what happened after that. But they accepted our report without giving them the tapes.

In this second case, government officials made things difficult for the researchers because they were troubled by the involvement of the World Bank in the health related issues in the country. According to them, the fact that the World Bank takes part in the health sector is not in line with the principle of national sovereignty. Moreover, in the case of research being done about the health sector, they seem to be expecting those researchers to be reporting to the government officials, not to the World Bank people. They
apparently had an issue with the connection between the researchers and the World Bank, and wanted to demonstrate to the researchers that their boss is in fact the state ministry, not the World Bank. This is why they came up with unrealistic and unacceptable demands.

While we were doing our research, at some points we suggested asking some issues to the World Bank people. But the people in the Ministry of Health got furious with the idea of consulting the World Bank. They were incredibly nationalist and had significant problems with the involvement of the World Bank. They were stressing that this is not a grant but a loan which will be paid back with interest, so it was now government’s money. The people in the Ministry were behaving like everything would be done in the way they wanted. But, for instance, about the issue of the interview tapes, they ended up doing what the World Bank told them to do.

Although ideologically the World Bank is an institution which is against the big and interventionist state and is usually considered to be hostile to the government, it in fact needs to have good relationships with the governments as governments are the Bank’s clients. This is an important concern for the World Bank also when it comes to having researchers write reports; they contact those scholars who will be considered as having a good reputation by the government. However, even though a report is written by the most reputable and esteemed professors, the World Bank cannot publish it if the government does not approve the contents of the report.

Both for the UNDP and the World Bank, the priority is having good relationships with the government. As far as I could understand, when they go to the Treasury or the Ministry of National Education and tell them that they are having a certain person write a report for them, they want that person to be someone who is in good terms with the government…They are not interested in whether that scholar is independent or not…They are interested in using the name and benefiting from the reputation of that scholar who is writing the report.

It was 2003 or 2005… They were preparing a gender assessment report…There were a group of professors who were writing different sections on different subjects…So the reports of six or seven different professors were combined. The World Bank promised that it would be published. After preparing the report, we also had a workshop at the university and presented it. But then that report was not published…I don’t know the details so I don’t want to say much. But as far as I know, it was because the government did not approve its publication.
Therefore, when the scholars are doing research for the World Bank or a World Bank project, in addition to the kind of limitations related to producing knowledge for the Bank that have been mentioned, they are also subject to the restrictions from the government side.

4.5. Conclusion

The trend of neoliberalization that is experienced in all spheres of life also has its impact on the academia in the forms of managerialization and entrepreneurialization of universities, increasing workloads, increasing pressures on academics to generate funds, transformation of knowledge into a product that can be exchanged in the market, alienation of academic researchers from the knowledge they are producing, and an increasing degree of specialization and division of academic research labor in the developed and developing/underdeveloped countries alike. Especially for the second group of countries, international organizations like the World Bank indeed have a major role in the development and spread of neoliberalization in academia. Limited resources for research lead the academics to look for external funding opportunities and international organizations like the World Bank emerge as important suppliers of funds for doing research in these circumstances. Doing research and producing knowledge for the World Bank create certain outcomes both in the short and long terms for these researchers themselves and also for academia in general. More research carried out in the areas which are deemed important by the World Bank, disregard for other areas of research that are important for the country and that need urgent attention of the researchers, not being independent while doing their research, inability to control the knowledge production process and how the knowledge that they produce will be used,
producing knowledge that is below their own academic standards because of excessive time pressures, increasing influence of World Bank terminology in social sciences, and misuse of academic research for certain political purposes over which the researchers do not have control are some of the important consequences of doing research for the World Bank that are mentioned by the academics that I interviewed.

An important question that I touched upon and would like to further elaborate on here is the question of whether or to what extent doing research/producing knowledge for the World Bank/for a World Bank project contribute to the reconstruction of scholars, or in this case Turkish scholars, as neoliberal subjects. The scholars writing on neoliberal governmentality talk about the internalization of neoliberal values by the subjects and how neoliberal governmentality works through convincing the individuals that there is no alternative and that it is their choice to work in the ways they are working. In my interviews with the scholars who were involved in the World Bank research, while assessing this experience of knowledge production, they interpreted academic freedom and independence in a very limited way, mostly stressing the fact that there was no direct intervention from the World Bank while they were writing their reports. In a way that is suggested by neoliberal governmentality scholars, they argued that they did their research and wrote the report independently although many conditions of knowledge production process were provided to them either by the World Bank or the related government institution. On the other hand, there was also constant self-questioning about and uneasiness with what they have done because of the discrepancy between what they
know and believe about the World Bank at the theoretical level and what they actually do.

My interviews were full of references to the instances when these academics refused to be totally taken in by a neoliberal institution such as the World Bank and completely become neoliberal subjects. They are well aware of the impact of involvement in the World Bank research on Turkish academia and how scholars are directed to do research in certain areas, using the concepts that are used in the World Bank documents. While most of them think that it is inevitable to be involved in the research done for the World Bank and other international institutions because of lack of local resources, they are critical of the current role of these organizations in the shaping of Turkish academia. They question the relevance, usefulness, and cost of the knowledge produced for the Bank. Doing research for the Bank is a pragmatic decision for them; they don’t necessarily adopt the World Bank perspective. Although researchers are forced to act as what Ozga (1998) calls ‘researchers as entrepreneurs’, it is hard to come to the conclusion that they have in fact become entrepreneurial subjects. This is what Davies and Petersen (2006) talk about when they refer to the difference between ‘doing’ and ‘becoming’. The framework of neoliberal governmentality, while referring to the creation of neoliberal subjectivities does not really account for these discrepancies and the dilemmas that the subjects are going through.
In his “Introduction” to *Global Ethnography*, Burawoy mentions four dimensions of extended case method as i) the extension of the observer into the world of the participant, ii) extension of observations over time and space, iii) extending out from micro processes to macro forces, and iv) extension of theory (Burawoy 2000, p.26-28). It is mostly thanks to the last two dimensions that ethnography can reveal what is beyond the small scale and aim for understanding the global. Although throughout the previous chapters I tried to demonstrate the larger scale context and theoretical implications of the case that I am studying, it is here, in the conclusion part, I would like to elaborate on what the local processes that I explained in detail can tell us about the global forces that are in action. However, in a different way from Burawoy who considers the micro-macro link as a “…’structured’ one in which the part is shaped\(^{22}\) by its relation to the whole, the whole being represented by ‘external forces’…” (ibid., p.27), I think of this link as an interactional one in which the impact of the global forces is influenced by their contact with the existing local dynamics. My second aim in this last chapter is to expand upon how this study challenges the existing theories and in which ways it helps to improve them. I use my research neither as a tool to confirm a theoretical framework that I had in my mind before going to the field nor as *the* ground that makes it possible to build a theoretical framework. The data that I collected in the field helps me to extend and improve the existing theories so that they will include explanations for the variances.

\(^{22}\) My emphasis.
First, this case challenges the existing theories which make a distinction between public and private spheres. As Bailey states, the public/private distinction has been an important but rather unclarified assumption in sociological thinking. The public realm usually refers to the state, market, civil society, community, and the formal organizations, and the private refers to the individual, familial, and domestic (Bailey 2000, p.381). However, as Clarke points out, these clusters are different from the categories of social policy, which make a distinction between public/state and private/market. Therefore, the market can be classified as both public and private depending on how we make the distinction between the two spheres. “…in contrast to the private as familial/domestic, the market is part of the public domain, but in contrast to the public sector or public services, the market is understood as private (referring to the private sector, private interests and so on).” (Clarke 2004, p.28) Here, in this study, I subscribe to the social policy categorization and consider the market as a part of the private realm as it represents private interests and to judge which domain a certain institution belongs to I mainly look at whether the institution serves private or public interests.

For many people who are not critical of the World Bank, the Bank is a public institution that has the mission of fighting poverty. The Bank is categorized as a public institution depending on the claim that it is a development institution, not a bank in the common sense, which is owned by the (186) member countries. Therefore, the assertion that the World Bank is a public institution depends on the idea that the Bank serves public interests. However, as many critics of the Bank have argued and many scholars have

shown depending on research, the Bank is an institution which has “…deliberately and consciously used its financial power to promote the interests of private, international capital in its expansion to every corner of the ‘underdeveloped’ world.” (Payer 1984, p.19). Therefore, according to the social policy definition of the public and private spheres that is explained by Clarke (2004), the World Bank is an institution that serves private interests and thus belongs to the private sphere. However, for a lot of people, to which category the World Bank belongs is rather vague and this vagueness is also something that helps the Bank to expand its areas of influence and intervention. As exemplified by my interviews, the Bank consultants’ argument is that the Bank is never the implementer but there is always an implementing government agency. Therefore, they argue that these public functions are fulfilled by agencies which are accountable to the public. However, as I explained before, these projects are in fact not implemented by those agencies but by units established by the Bank. Therefore, although the Bank is a private institution, it fulfills public functions without being accountable to the public.

As Clarke suggests, the boundary between the public and private is really crucial as one is defined with reference to the boundary and in opposition to the other sphere. “This dichotomous distinction is also a relationship- the public and private are ‘mutually constitutive’. Each pole needs the other to define itself against…” (Clarke 2004, p.28). Although he argues that the boundary between the two spheres is redrawn during different periods- expansion of public sphere with welfarism in western capitalism or the movement towards an enlarged private sphere with the rise of neoliberalism-, he does not consider the possibility of those situations in which certain institutions can be considered
as both public and private at the same time, as private bodies are established under public structures. In such cases, we can talk about a blurring of the distinction between the two spheres. In my study, there are two examples of these both-public-and-private institutions. The first one is the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) established by the World Bank which is supposedly created under a government agency (SYDGM), as I explained in detail in the second chapter. By creating this unit under a government structure, the World Bank can give the impression that the project is implemented by a public institution. However, by hiring consultants who do their job according to the Bank’s working principles rather than public procedures, the Bank structures the unit as a private institution. This establishment is justified by the neoliberal argument that state structures are ineffective and inefficient so there is a need for a flexible body that can get work done by the deadlines. This is the World Bank’s practice not only in Turkey but also in other countries in which it implements projects. The second example is the establishment of local Social Solidarity Foundations (SYDVs) as associations subject to private law while they are, in fact, the local implementing agencies of the central government institution, SYDGM. Here, the rationale is the same: ineffectiveness of the central governmental institutions and the aim of creating a civil structure which can take action quickly.

These examples of institutions which are both public and private at the same time are important not only because they challenge the clear-cut distinction between public and private spheres, but they are also useful in contributing to a nuanced understanding of neoliberalism. What these examples tell us is that besides formal privatizations of the
public structures, these structures can also be privatized from within by the incorporation of private bodies and application of nonpublic procedures in these bodies. As the information about the inner workings of the institutions is not available to the public, it becomes possible to privatize from within without getting public attention and resistance. As I stated in the second chapter, the World Bank implements its projects with the argument that they are in fact the projects of Turkish Republic (or other countries in other cases) and executed by PCUs which are under certain government institutions. This type of an explanation is functional in avoiding the debates on whether the World Bank’s implementation of these projects goes against the principle of national sovereignty. However, the reality that many people are not aware of is that the World Bank implements these projects through PCUs which have their staff hired by the World Bank and these PCUs work independently from the government institutions that they are associated to. The private characteristic of these PCUs remains hidden as they are concealed under public structures. Therefore, my study of this case calls for the extension of the theories on neoliberalism to include these cases of privatization-from-within. Further research conducted in different countries might contribute more to a theorization of these both-public-and-private institutions.

The case of the World Bank’s implementation of the SRMP in Turkey during the AKP government period is also an example for the articulation of neoliberal programs with different value systems, in this case Islam. As a party that has been trying to reconcile its neoliberal orientation with its promise of social justice, the Islamic notion of charity has already been a strategic tool for the AKP for providing aid to the poor without turning it
into a responsibility of the state. When the World Bank, as a neoliberal institution which is not in favor of institutionalizing public assistance as the responsibility of governments, put the SRMP into practice, it has been extended beyond its targets and largely publicized by the AKP for its aims of getting and maintaining the support of the poor without leaving aside its neoliberal agenda. The SRMP and especially the CCT component of it, as an aid that is provided to the children and women for education and health, has been reinterpreted and represented by the AKP in the light of their understanding of Islamic charity. While criticizing the poor for their expectations from the government, the AKP distributed the CCT to many more people than the number initially targeted although it was public money that they were distributing. By presenting this aid as the AKP’s benevolence which is rooted in their respect for Islamic values, they could present it as assistance by the AKP as a party not by the government to its citizens. In this case, a neoliberal program was supported by the existing Islamic value system of a political party. Further research might be useful in demonstrating under what circumstances different value systems might be supporting or inhibiting neoliberal programs and what kinds of articulations emerge in these different contexts.

In one sense, in the case of the SRMP, the neoliberal program of a global institution was supported by the neoliberal orientation of a political party. However, in another sense, the political concerns of this local party very much changed the direction of the interventions by the global institution. While the World Bank was trying to create entrepreneurial, independent subjects who feel responsible for their own situation and who learn to depend on their own resources in order to survive in future ‘risk situations’, the AKP’s
political interests and use of this project for those interests led to the emergence of charity-dependent poor people. This is a very different subjectivity than the one that the World Bank has been trying to create. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that global organizations like the World Bank should not be considered as all-powerful and their impact on the local can be in ways which they do not plan or intend due to the interventions of local processes. One important reason why the Bank people cannot foresee the consequences that emerge is their lack of interest in an in-depth understanding of the broader social context of the country in which they are working. Although at the discursive level the Bank claims to give importance to local knowledge, in practice, there is disregard for that knowledge. The example of the World Bank official who got really interested in Turkish scholars’ argument that in the Turkish case, the families function as an important supporting mechanism in cases of economic crises suggests that the Bank officials are interested in locally produced knowledge about a local context mostly when that knowledge is in line with the kind of arguments that the Bank is promoting— in this case, transfer of social assistance functions from the public to the private sphere of the family. Ignoring the other kinds of knowledge about the local context leads to failures even in the Bank’s own terms.

This is also part of a broader discussion on what this case tells us about the relationship between the local context and the global forces. What the case of the SRMP demonstrates to us is that we cannot regard this relationship in terms of one (global) shaping the other (local) in ways that it plans to. Development interventions of global institutions like the World Bank, without doubt, have an effect on the social conditions of the countries where
those interventions take place. However, it is important to take into consideration the emergence of contingencies in many of those cases. A local context is not a tabula rasa on which these global institutions can write whatever they want. The already existing values or value systems, processes, dynamics, etc. of the local context all have an impact on the kind of consequences that come out in the end.

This brings us to the idea of neoliberal governmentality and how it also fails in recognizing the impact of the local context and the emergence of contingencies and unintended consequences. According to the idea of neoliberal governmentality, we can expect that a project of the World Bank, which is a major neoliberal institution, will affect institutions and subjectivities in a Third World country, shaping them in accordance with its neoliberal program. We can anticipate that creation of entrepreneurial subjects is a key aim of the World Bank and this project, like the other projects of the Bank, has been functional in building those subjectivities. However, my research demonstrated that the kind of institutions and subjectivities that have come out are not necessarily the intended ones and they are not necessarily in line with a neoliberal agenda. There are several examples of these unintended consequences that I found out during my research: the conflicts between the central government institution and the Project Coordination Unit that was established by the World Bank; how this conflict led to the development of a critical attitude in those officials against the World Bank; how those state officials prevented the implementation of another World Bank project; establishment of an Association by the officials working in local Social Solidarity Foundations (SYDVs), local implementers of the project, as a result of their increasing
workload due to the SRMP; use of this project by a moderate Islamic Party for its political aim of getting the support of the masses; emergence of discourses about the Kurds in the country; how the project has played a part in producing charity-dependent poor subjects contrary to its aim of creating self-dependent responsible ones. Regarding the case of the Turkish scholars who have produced knowledge within the context of the project, although we can talk about a general trend of neoliberalization of the academia as a consequence of producing knowledge for the institutions like the World Bank, it is still not possible to talk about scholars who have become neoliberal subjects.

Neoliberal governmentality was the major concept that I had in my mind before going to the field since it seemed like an appropriate theoretical tool for studying a project implemented by a major neoliberal institution. Neoliberal governmentality might indeed be a useful concept in demonstrating what kind of institutions and subjectivities the World Bank aims to produce but it does not really explain the ones that actually come out. Before going to the field, what I had in my hand was mostly the documents prepared by the World Bank, which explained the details about the project components and aims of the project. Going over them, I could see what the Bank aimed to do as a neoliberal actor with a project that intended to mitigate social risk; these aims were in line with what the neoliberal governmentality scholars have argued. However, my experience in the field demonstrated that those intentions did not turn into actual outcomes. Neoliberal governmentality gives us a portrayal of the kind of subject that the World Bank tries to create but it cannot show us the subjects that materialize in reality. It does not take into consideration that there are multiple forces, some of which are local, having an impact on those subjects and that there is also the agency of those subjects themselves. Therefore,
what I propose here is in a sense limiting the application of neoliberal governmentality, considering it as a concept that explains the intentions of the neoliberal actors but not necessarily the kind of consequences that emerge. Alternatively, its applicability can be extended by an increased consideration of the articulation of intentions of the neoliberal actors like the World Bank, the local factors that intervene, and the reactions of the subjects to all of those factors that aim to shape them in certain directions.

Throughout this study, I have argued that while looking at the projects of the World Bank, it is more fruitful to consider what broader social changes these projects have contributed to rather than concentrating on whether or not they created the changes that the World Bank consultants claimed they would. That was the main reason why I focused on and explained the unintended consequences of the Social Risk Mitigation Project in Turkey. However, it is equally important to go beyond describing these consequences and to answer the question of why these unintended consequences matter. In a similar way with Ferguson (1990), I argue that outcomes that might appear as side effects of an intervention to alleviate poverty might, according to another perspective, be considered as unintended but instrumental elements in the formation of a configuration that exerts a depoliticizing effect.

The World Bank, by presenting its poverty alleviation/social risk management projects as the cure to poverty, has already offered a managerialist approach and depoliticized poverty. In the case of the implementation of the SRMP, although the use of this project by the AKP for its political aims emerges as an unintended outcome of the World Bank’s
project, the AKP’s redefinition of social security in terms of charity furthers this
depoliticization. Depoliticization takes place not only in terms of who will be considered
as the responsible party for providing benefits to the ones in need or whether or not it is
the responsibility of the government, but also regarding the responses of the poor to their
own situation. The creation of a poor subject who developed the strategy of getting what
s/he can from all the existing aid-giving institutions is certainly not an aim of the World
Bank’s project. However, this increasing tendency to seek individual or family-based
strategies for survival and distrust in collective programs reveal that, from another
perspective, this project has reached its aim of mitigating social risk by thwarting the
collective action of the poor. In that case, these outcomes, although not planned or
intended, have all been instrumental in depoliticizing poverty and the poor in the country.

Although I am in agreement with Ferguson in his effort to see in what ways the
unintended effects of a project might form a strategically coherent or intelligible whole,
in a different way from Ferguson, I don’t see this development establishment as an
“…’anti-politics machine’, depoliticizing everything it touches…all the while
performing…its own preeminently political operation of expanding bureaucratic state
power.” (Ferguson 1990, p.xv). My study of the case of the SRMP demonstrates that
while there is depoliticization at one level, we can also see repoliticization taking place at
another level. While the consequence of the project at the level of the recipients has been
a depoliticization, what happened at the level of the state officials can be considered as an
instance of repoliticization. Both the officials working in the central government
institution, SYDGM, but especially the officials working in the local SYDVs became
resistant against the World Bank and the upper level administrators who make the
decisions to borrow from the World Bank. Their experience of being involved in the
implementation of the project gave them first-hand knowledge of the World Bank
projects and what consequences these projects create. Moreover, in the case of the SYDV
officials, we also see an increasing interaction and awareness about their common
problems, rights, and the ways to work for their rights. Therefore, this project of the
World Bank contributed to the repoliticization of these officials both as a result of the
problems and additional workload it created, and also by offering opportunities for face-
to-face contact and more interaction among these officials through trainings. What
happens here is not the expansion of the bureaucratic state power as Ferguson argues, but
rather an increasing questioning of that power and a challenge to it.

Lastly, it is important to consider what the unintended consequences of this project mean
for the World Bank. As I mentioned before, the SRMP was represented in a very positive
way in the media and the World Bank’s generosity was praised in many newspaper
articles. Additionally, the Prime Minister Erdoğan repeatedly mentioned the success of
the CCT component of the project in his public speeches. Therefore, to the general
public, the project was presented in a very positive light. If we only concentrate on these
presentations to assess whether this project has contributed to the creation of a positive
image of the World Bank in the eyes of the public, our answer might be affirmative.
However, if we consider the millions of people who were actually involved in the project
whether as implementers or recipients, the answer will be more complicated. There might
certainly be ones among the recipients who express gratitude to the World Bank as there
is additional money coming to their household thanks to this World Bank project. However, for many others, this is either money coming from a source that they do not identify or money they receive irregularly after going through a burdensome process. Not only for these recipients, but also for the local implementers of the project and the state officials who are working in the related state agencies, this project certainly has not created a positive image of the World Bank. This will, without doubt, have negative consequences for the implementation of other World Bank projects in Turkey in the future.

Having said these, it is important to stress that this negative image at the level of the local implementers and state officials in Turkey does not mean that the World Bank has become a less powerful institution at the international level. This project has been presented as a success story by the World Bank. Especially the CCT component in Turkey has become an example for successful implementation. As I mentioned before, one of the three global conferences on the CCT sponsored by the World Bank was organized in Turkey, and in the conference, there was extensive coverage of the CCT implementation experience in Turkey. Therefore, although at the level of the local implementers, the project has created a lot of resistance against the World Bank, if we look at its international presentation, it is portrayed as another achievement of the Bank. There is no channel which provides information about the experiences, complaints, and problems of the local implementers or the people who received aid. Internationally, the World Bank is most of the times the only source of information about project implementation and their version of the story becomes the truth. So, in spite of all the
problems and dissatisfaction, thanks to the Bank’s own portrayal, this project has also contributed to the image of the Bank as a development institution that achieves successes in its fight with poverty.
REFERENCES


Bonner, M., M. Ener & A. Singer (eds), 2003, Poverty and Charity in Middle Eastern Contexts, State University of New York Press, Albany.


Burkett, P., “Poverty Crisis in the Third World: The Contradictions of World Bank


Kant, I., 1992 (1979), *The Conflict of the Faculties*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London.


Kothari, R., 1988, Rethinking Development: In Search of Humane Alternatives, Ajanta, Delhi.


Lewis, O., 1965, La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty, San Juan and New York, Random House.


www.sydgm.gov.tr.


APPENDIX A. ABBREVIATIONS

AKP: Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi)
CCT: Conditional Cash Transfer
DPT: State Planning Institute (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı)
LI: Local Initiatives
PCU: Project Coordination Unit
PKK: Kurdistan Workers Party
SHCEK: General Directorate of Social Services and Children’s Protection (Sosyal Hizmetler ve Cocuk Esirgeme Kurumu)
SRMP: Social Risk Mitigation Project
SYDGM: General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity (Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Genel Müdürlüğü)
SYDTF: Social Solidarity Fund (Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışmayı Teşvik Fonu)
SYDV or Foundation: Social Solidarity Foundation (Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Vakfı)
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEWS

ANKARA

Academia

1 Recent PhD Graduate, Middle East Technical University, in the office
2 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in the office
3 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in the office
4 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in the office
5 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in the office
6 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in the office
7 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in a café at the university
8 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in the office
9 Professor, Middle East Technical University, in the office in another institution
10 Professor, Ankara University, in the office
11 Professor, Ankara University, in the office
12 Professor, Ankara University, in the office
13 Graduate Student, Middle East Technical University, in the office
14 Graduate Student, Middle East Technical University, in the office
15 Graduate Student, Middle East Technical University, in a café at the university

SYDGM

16 State official, SYDGM, in the office
17 State official, SYDGM, in the office
18 State official, SYDGM, in the office
19 State official, SYDGM, in the office
20 State official, SYDGM, in the office
21 State official, SYDGM, in the office

PCU
22 PCU consultant, in the office in a state institution
23 PCU consultant, in a café
24 PCU consultant, in a café
25 PCU consultant, in the office in a state institution
26 PCU consultant, in a café

Research Institution & NGO
27 NGO representative, NGO office
28 NGO representative, NGO office
29 Owner of a research company, in the office
30 Employee of a research company, in the office
31 NGO representative, NGO office
32 NGO representative, NGO office

DPT (State Planning Institute)
33 State official, in the office
34 State official, in the office

Treasury
35 State official, in the office
36 State official, in the office

SHCEK (General Directorate of Social Services and Children’s Protection)
37 State official, in the office
38 State official, in the office
39 State official, in the office

The World Bank
40 World Bank project team member, World Bank Ankara Office
41 World Bank official, World Bank Ankara Office
42 World Bank official, World Bank Ankara Office
43 World Bank official, World Bank Ankara Office
44 Former World Bank official, in her office

SYDV
45 Yenimahalle SYDV, Foundation official
46 Kecioren SYDV, Foundation official
47 Kecioren SYDV, Foundation official
48 Altındağ SYDV, Foundation official
49 Altındağ SYDV, Foundation official
50 Sincan SYDV, Foundation official
51 Sincan SYDV, Foundation official
52 Mamak SYDV, Foundation Official
53 Cankaya SYDV, Foundation official
54 Akyurt SYDV, Foundation Official
55 Polatlı SYDV, Foundation Official
56 Kızılcahamam SYDV, Foundation Official
57 Kızılcahamam SYDV, Foundation Official

DİYARBAKIR

SYDV
58 Merkez SYDV, Foundation official
59 Kulp SVDV, Foundation Official
60 Kulp SYDV, Foundation Official
61 Silvan SYDV, Foundation Official
62 Cınar SYDV, Foundation Official
63 Bismil SYDV, Foundation Official

Recipients- CCT
64 Recipient, in the house
65 Recipient, in the house
66 Recipient, in the house
67 Recipient, in the house
68 Recipient, in the house
69 Recipient, in the house
70 Recipient, in the house
71 Recipient, in the house
72 Recipient, in the house
73 Recipient, in the house

Recipient- Local Initiatives
74 Recipient, in his electronics store
75 Recipient, in her clothing store
76 Recipient, in her butcher shop
77 Recipient, in his cell phone store
78 Recipient, in his convenience store

NGO
79 NGO Representative, NGO office
80 NGO Representative, NGO office
81 NGO Representative, NGO office
82 NGO Representative, NGO office
83 NGO Representative, cafe