

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Heritage management at the local level: rhetoric and results in the case of Gaziantep, Turkey

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1632707> since 2017-05-08T17:25:28Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1080/10286632.2013.874419

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



**Heritage management at the local level: rhetoric and results
in the case of Gaziantep, Turkey**

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>International Journal of Cultural Policy</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | Draft |
| Manuscript Type: | Original Article |
| Keywords: | Heritage, Decentralization, Turkey, Cultural Policies |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Heritage management at the local level: rhetoric and results in the case of Gaziantep, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Following international trends, Turkey has recently introduced decentralization reforms to its highly centralized public administration system. These reforms have also applied to the cultural heritage sector, where innovative laws since 2004 have allowed local administrations and private actors to play new entrepreneurial roles. The Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality has been a pioneer in this process, promoting policies that promote cultural tourism as an engine of economic growth. Under its leadership hundreds of historic buildings have been restored, nine new museums and heritage sites opened, and museum visitors increased tenfold. These positive results make Gaziantep an interesting case of successful decentralization in heritage management. Despite these successes, however, the disconnection between rhetoric and results, and the fragmentation and ambiguity of responsibilities emerging from the decentralization process raises serious questions about its sustainability and replicability.

KEYWORDS

Heritage, Decentralization, Turkey, Cultural Policies

1. Introduction

This paper analyzes the recent decentralization process in the cultural heritage sector in Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality (GMM), a city of 1.3 million in southeastern Turkey near the border with Syria that has experienced rapid industrialization and urbanization since the 1990s (see Figure 1).¹

Insert figure 1 here

Though its position in upper Mesopotamia has left the area rich in cultural heritage, before 2004 there were only two lightly-visited heritage museums and no archaeological sites open to the

¹ Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality includes three district municipalities (*ilçe*), Şahinbey, Şehitkamil, and Oğuzeli, which are home to 74% of the population of Gaziantep province. Other municipalities in the province are Nizip (96,000), İslahiye (31,000), and Nurdağı (16,000).

1 public. In the 1990s, salvage excavations at the Roman site of Zeugma, 60 km from Gaziantep on
2 the Euphrates River, triggered changes in heritage and tourism development. Hundreds of well-
3 preserved mosaic pavements were found at the site, bringing international attention to the city and
4 sparking widespread discussions of heritage and identity ([blinded reference]; Tanaka, 2007; see
5 Figure 2). The spectacular nature of the finds led, after a complex process, to the building of a new
6 Zeugma Museum in Gaziantep that opened to the public in July 2011 and received between 60,000
7 and 80,000 visitors by that December.
8
9

13
14 Insert Figure 2 here
15

16 In parallel, decentralization in Turkey since 2003 has opened the door for local
17 administrations to play a new role in heritage management. The GMM has been a pioneer in this
18 process: since the election of a new mayor in 2004, a new municipal heritage agency (KUDEB) has
19 been established, hundreds of conservation projects have been completed, and nine new museums
20 have opened within the Metropolitan Municipality. The process has been surrounded by rhetoric
21 that connects cultural heritage to tourism development and modernization, and is seen as an
22 example for other municipalities in Turkey.
23
24
25
26
27

28 In this paper, we examine the results of Gaziantep's heritage investments in the context of
29 Turkey's public sector reforms and discuss it within two major perspectives. The first explores the
30 opportunities and risks of the decentralization process. Legislative innovation and organizational
31 implementation are quite different issues (Pollitt *et al.*, 2011; [BLINDED REFERENCE];
32 [BLINDED REFERENCE]). Public management reforms follow in fact four main steps, and the
33 route from 'talk' through 'decision', 'practice', and 'achievement' may be long and lead to
34 unexpected results (Pollitt *et al.*, 2011). Besides the analysis of the laws, to better understand the
35 meaning and significance of decentralization a focus on organizational aspects of the reform at the
36 micro level is thus required. In the case of Turkey, for instance, we must ask whether local
37 authorities and private entities are taking advantage of their new opportunities in the heritage field
38 and what are the results in terms of heritage preservation and development led by decentralization.
39 The case presented below reflects this approach. Our qualitative field research in 2010 and 2011
40 included the analysis of public and internal documents, and several in-depth interviews with key
41 figures in Gaziantep, including the Mayor of the Metropolitan Municipality, the head of the
42 municipal heritage agency, the head of the Provincial Culture and Tourism Department, staff of the
43 regional development agency, museum staff, archaeologists, and independent cultural professionals.
44 This analysis underlines both the successful achievements and the possible conflicts that might arise
45 in decentralization processes.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The second perspective explores the disconnection which emerges among the rhetoric of policies, actions and results: not only laws but also policies must be implemented. While the literature on policy implementation has already acknowledged the gap that might arise between policies and results and the importance of the implementation process (for an excursus see Matland, 1995; O'Toole, 2000; Schofield, 2001; and Saetren, 2005), the Gaziantep example constitutes an interesting case where the results of innovation in heritage conservation and development are more significant than the rhetoric surrounding it. To understand the differences between policy, actions, and results, in this paper we offer first a description of the rhetoric of heritage policy, followed by an in-depth look at activities actually implemented in the GMM and a discussion of its major results. This analysis underlines the risks for the sustainability of the Gaziantep model that emerge from the disconnection between rhetoric and results.

Reflecting this double approach to implementation (of laws and of policies) the structure of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we review major legislative developments and the introduction of decentralization in Turkey's cultural heritage sector. Section 3 will focus on the policy vision, underlining the ambitious rhetoric of heritage-led economic development at both the national and local levels. Section 4 reconstructs the actions and results in terms of heritage investments and museum projects of the major institutional actors. Section 5 comments on the risks and drawbacks inherent in the Gaziantep model based on the two perspectives, followed by a final reflection on the sustainability and replicability of the Gaziantep Model and decentralization processes as a whole (section 6).

2. New Public Management and Decentralization in Turkey

Turkey has recently joined many other countries in implementing reforms that have challenged the typical bureaucratic forms of public administration (Hood, 1991). Known as 'New Public Management' (NPM), these reforms began in the UK with the Thatcher government and aimed to increase efficiency, effectiveness, and economy in the public sector by introducing processes of outsourcing, privatization, managerialization and decentralization (Hood, 1995; Kickert, 1997, Pollitt et al, 2007; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2011; [BLINDED REFERENCE]). The (apparent) convergence of public administration around the world via NPM reforms has also been promoted by international institutions such as the EU, the OECD, the IMF and the UNDP. The EU in particular has focused on devolution – the reduction of the central state authority through the devolution of power to local administrations – as a key means of enhancing effectiveness in

1 services provision and increasing democracy and citizen participation in politics and administration
2 (Bilen, 2004).
3
4

5 Created in 1923, the Turkish Republic inherited from the Ottoman empire a highly
6 centralized state governed by bureaucratic and military élites (Göymen, 2006). Centralization was
7 seen as a means of achieving the secularization and modernization of the country, while at the same
8 time guaranteeing its unity (Kapucu and Palabiyik, 2008). This model followed a authoritarian
9 approach to local communities, and is usually referred as “Statist-Centralist” (Özcan and Turunç,
10 2008). Efforts to reform the system from the 1950s through the 1980s were basically unsuccessful
11 (Kapucu and Palabiyik, 2008; Göymen, 2006); public sector reforms and decentralization measures
12 only gained a new momentum when the Justice and Development Party (AK Parti) came to power
13 in 2002. Law 5227, passed in 2004, was a comprehensive effort to reform and modernize Turkish
14 administration (Özcan and Turunç, 2008; TGNA, 2004a). Though vetoed by the President and
15 never enacted, its contents were later implemented through other laws that all sought to redistribute
16 power from the central State to local authorities in order to raise effectiveness, transparency and
17 accountability of the State as a whole.² More recently, Law 5747 of 2008 attempts to reform the
18 organization of local administrations, reducing the number of municipalities (Tosun and Yılmaz,
19 2008; TGNA, 2008).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Despite these changes, the central administration still plays a determinative role in the
32 Turkish public administration. Turkey’s provinces [*il*] and their districts [*ilçe*] are effectively
33 Ankaras in miniature. They are not local administrations but local branches of the state: each
34 province is composed of local offices of the central ministries, while provincial governors (*Vali*),
35 administrators, and decision-making bodies (the administrative councils) are directly appointed by
36 the Council of Ministers to represent the center on the local level. Local administration, by contrast
37 is composed of the Special Provincial Administrations (*İl Özel İdaresi* or SPA; they cover the same
38 area as each province), municipalities (*belediye*; 2,105 in 2009) and villages (*köy*; 34,458 in 2007)
39 (Kapucu and Palabiyik, 2008). SPAs are a hybrid model: though the provincial council is elected by
40 citizens, the head of the SPA is the Governor of the Province, and thus is appointed directly by
41 Ankara. Municipalities (*belediye*) are the only significant venue for democratic participation, since
42 mayors and councils are directly elected. There are several different categories of municipality: the
43 largest are the 16 metropolitan municipalities, which include 54% of Turkey’s total population;
44 Gaziantep is the sixth largest of these (Kapucu and Palabiyik, 2008). Thus, although
45 decentralization and NPM reforms have conferred more power on municipalities, they must use
46 their powers in a context which is still strongly determined by the central state.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ² Including the Metropolitan Municipality Law of 2004 (TGNA 2004d), the Municipality Law of 2005 (TGNA 2005a)
60 and the Special Provincial Administration Law of 2005 (TGNA 2005c).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The cultural heritage sector is rarely approached as a field of study related to public administration, even though it is strongly shaped by administrative history and public sector reforms (for Italy see [BLINDED REFERENCE]; for the outsourcing process in Turkey see [BLINDED REFERENCE]). As in other parts of the government, heritage has historically been centralized under the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT) through its peripheral branches (Museum Directorates), with a secondary role played by the General Directorate of Pious Foundations (GDF)³, which oversees many Islamic monuments. Until 2004, local administrations played a weak or nonexistent role. However, decentralization and NPM reforms have also affected cultural heritage ([BLINDED REFERENCE]; [BLINDED REFERENCE]). Three laws in 2004 and 2005 made deep changes to the system, increasing the role of local government and the private sector, and setting the stage for important changes.

In July 2004, Law 5226 made major amendments to Turkey's Law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (TGNA, 1983, 2004b). The new law aimed to introduce conservation and site management planning at museums and archaeological sites (TGNA, 1983: Article 3, Article 17, Additional Article 2). It also gave Metropolitan Municipalities or Special Provincial Administrations a new role in managing listed monuments within metropolitan or provincial limits by allowing them to form 'Conservation Implementation and Supervision Bureaus' (KUDEB⁴ in their Turkish acronym, see TGNA, 1983: Article 10). The amendments also provided funding sources for local cultural heritage activities by setting aside 10% of local property tax revenues and 10% of loans made by the Mass Housing Administration (TOKİ)⁵ for cultural heritage restoration projects (TGNA, 1983: Article 12).

Other laws sought to incentivize private sector involvement in renovating cultural heritage reducing the role of the central State. The Law Encouraging Cultural Investment and Initiatives (TGNA, 2004c) and the Law Concerning the Conservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalization of Worn-Down Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties (TGNA, 2005b) provide a mix of tax benefits, fee waivers, and streamlined approval processes for private investors in cultural heritage projects (Pulhan, 2010).

3. The Rhetoric of Cultural Policy, identity and tourism development in Gaziantep

The reforms outlined above aimed to allow local administrations and private actors to play new entrepreneurial roles in the heritage field, representing a major change from Turkey's highly

³ *Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü*

⁴ *Koruma Uygulama ve Denetim Bürosu*

⁵ *Toplu Konut İdaresi*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

centralized state tradition. The Gaziantep area has been prominent in the course of reform: the central government has used Zeugma to advertise increased attention to heritage on the part of the central government, while the GMM was one of the first urban administrations in Turkey to embrace the new reforms and articulate a distinct policy vision that placed cultural heritage at the center of the city's economic and social development.

The Ministries of Culture and Tourism were merged in 2003 as part of the general process of public administration reform. Since then, cultural heritage has been the keystone of the Ministry's tourism strategy, which seeks to double international visitors and revenues by 2023 and thus serve as an engine of economic growth for the country as a whole (MoCT, 2007). To this end privatization and outsourcing programs at museums and archaeological sites have been implemented in order to increase visitors and ticket income, and the Ministry has increased spending on Turkish archaeological excavations ten-fold since 2003 (BLINDED REFERENCE; BLINDED REFERENCE).

Following this general policy, the Zeugma excavations have been a sort of 'model project' in southeast Turkey, receiving unprecedented amounts of funds from the central government and personal attention from Prime Minister Erdoğan, who inaugurated both the excavation (the first Prime Minister to do so since Atatürk) and the new museum (Anadolu Ajansı, 2005, 2011). These investments – both substantive and symbolic – aim to make both the site and the museum major tourism destinations, but also to foster national prestige, as Minister of Culture and Tourism Ertuğrul Günay explained during a visit to Zeugma in June 2012:

After what we have done, seen, and excavated at Zeugma I can visit museums around the world with much more self-confidence... now Turkey will Gaziantep's mayor since 2005, Asım Güzelbey, has also cast heritage as a central actor in his efforts to improve Gaziantep's economy and improve its urban image, characterizing the GMM's heritage investments as "intended to create a tourism city" (GMM, 2012:iii), a goal that is echoed in the city's strategic plan (GMM, n.d). In the absence of beaches, Gaziantep must turn to another model of tourism development: thus the mayor identifies cultural, religiousbe creating new museums that are competitive with world museum standards (Doğan News Agency, 2012).

Beyond its potential to drive tourism revenues, Zeugma's significance thus lies in its ability to position Turkey on a *global* stage.

, health, and education tourism as potential growth areas (Gaziantep Haberler, 2012). Güzelbey evokes the success of Bilbao, Spain:

1 [Bilbao] constructed the Guggenheim, and now it makes much more money from the
2 museum than from the industrial district. Zeugma Museum is not the only museum we've
3 worked on, we opened six more as a Municipality. If industry collapses we will have
4 another source [of revenue] for the city.⁶
5
6
7

8
9 The foresight is impressive (Gaziantep, far from being postindustrial, is still industrializing and
10 urbanizing) and clearly casts museums as for a major role in the economy, echoing the MoCT's
11 emphasis on tourism-driven economic growth.
12

13
14 Besides their economic benefits, Güzelbey positions cultural heritage within a discourse of
15 modernization. He notes that Gaziantep's new museums "protect history and the past but at the
16 same time project the image of a modern city looking confidently to the future" (Yavuz, 2012). His
17 comment on the addition of Zeugma and Yesemek (a Bronze Age statue quarry) to the UNESCO
18 World Heritage Tentative List in 2012, moreover, underlines the connections between modernity
19 and growth:
20
21
22
23

24
25 for our city, to take a place on the World Heritage List is to enter the modern age. After
26 this it will become easier to attract funds here. This will be a major economic
27 contribution for us, since we will be a city with the prestige of being on the Unesco List
28 (Anadolu Ajansı, 2012).
29
30
31

32 The GMM's grand visions of economic development through tourism have been adopted by
33 governments elsewhere in the province as well. In Nizip, local officials have developed
34 comprehensive tourism plan including local cuisine exhibitions, boat tours on the Birecik Dam lake
35 near Zeugma, mosaic workshops for visitors, and the development of boutique hotels (Nizip
36 Workshop, 2011). These planning efforts are an unusual example of inter-agency cooperation on
37 the local level, but assume rapid growth in visitors to Zeugma, who can potentially be enticed to
38 stop in Nizip.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **4. From policy to action: Gaziantep's heritage transformed, 2005-2012**

47

48 This rhetoric frames heritage as serving two purposes: demonstrating modernity and driving
49 economic growth. But similar rhetoric can be found in many parts of the world: the correspondence
50 between goals and reality must be confirmed by a micro analysis of actions and results. Here we
51 present the activities of the most important institutional actors in Gaziantep since 2004. Beginning
52 with the *status quo ante*, we discuss investments in historic buildings and urban fabric,
53 archeological sites, and museums over the past eight years.
54
55
56
57
58

59 ⁶ Interview with A. Güzelbey, July 19, 2011.
60

4.1 Heritage Management Before 2004

Before 2004, Gaziantep's heritage was strongly underdeveloped in many respects. Little investment was made in preservation of monuments or the historic urban fabric, leading to the decrepitude of many historic urban neighborhoods and serious conservation threats at major monuments. The museum sector was also weak, with few offerings and an outdated approach to presenting local heritage. Local administrations, moreover, were completely uninvolved, while the MoCT and the GDF made only minor investments.

Among the central administrations, the Gaziantep Museum Directorate (GMD) played the most important role. Like most other Turkish public administrations, Museum Directorates are administered directly from Ankara, without an independent budget or control over human resources. It is responsible for activities across the heritage chain (BLINDED REFERENCE), including conservation of listed sites and monuments, rescue excavations, and the management of museums and sites open to the public. Prior to 2004 the GMD operated only two minor museums, the Gaziantep Archaeological Museum (founded 1944), and the Hasan Süzer Ethnography Museum (1989). The Gaziantep Archaeological Museum's old wing was built in 1969 and displays Bronze Age and Neolithic artefacts chronologically in glass cases, plus some classical sculpture from local sites. While important scientifically, the galleries can be visited in 45 minutes and have modest visitor appeal. The modestly-sized Hasan Süzer Ethnography Museum opened in 1989 in a restored mansion in the city center, and exhibits textiles and artifacts from domestic life. Despite the presence of important archaeological sites in the region, none were open to the public at that time. In 2004, the GMD opened its first 'open-air museum' in western Gaziantep province at the remote site of Yesemek, a Hittite stone quarry featuring dozens of partially-complete statues from the late Bronze Age. Though of unique interest, the site is small in size and is located over an hour's drive on difficult roads from Gaziantep, which is itself far from major national tourist routes.

The General Directorate of Foundations is the other main arm of the central administration with responsibilities for cultural heritage.⁷ The GDF manages historic properties belonging to pious foundations (Turkish *vakıf*, Arabic *waqf*), which played an important role in creating Ottoman urban infrastructure such as mosques, medreses, fountains, hans, and bridges. However, before 2004, restoration projects of GDF in the Gaziantep area seem to have been few. The GMM and other local bodies, for their part, were not involved in cultural heritage management at all.

⁷ In effect, Turkey has two parallel heritage administrations, one for pre-Christian periods (MoCT) and the other (the GDF) for Ottoman Islamic (and to some extent Christian and Jewish) heritage.

4.2 Conservation in Gaziantep's Historic Center since 2005

The election of Mayor Güzelbey in early 2005 sparked rapid change, as historic preservation has become a policy priority for city government. Immediately after the election, the city hired billboards with the slogan “let's protect and revitalize our historical stone houses!”⁸ The administration quickly took advantage of decentralization reforms to create a municipal heritage agency, the Conservation Implementation and Supervision Bureau (KUDEB), in September 2005. The second administration of its kind in Turkey, Gaziantep KUDEB has the power to restore monuments listed for protection and design conservation interventions within the GMM boundaries, activities previously undertaken by branches of MoCT (MoCT, 2005; TGNA, 2004b: Article 4).

Part of the GMM Urbanism and Planning Department, KUDEB has 10 staff including an architect, civil engineer, restoration technician, two archaeologists, and an urban planner, and a budget averaging 6-7 million TL per year (€2.6-3.0 million). Turkey's decentralization initiatives provide KUDEB with diverse revenue streams: shares of real estate taxes and Mass Housing Administration (TOKİ) funds are set aside for local cultural heritage initiatives under Laws 5226 and 5366 (TGNA, 2004b, 2005b). Private sponsorship, incentivized under the same reforms, plays an important role, as do EU funds. Only 30% of KUDEB's budget comes directly from the GMM.⁹

Soon after its establishment KUDEB positioned itself in a leading role. As KUDEB director Mühettin Aslan noted,

after the creation of KUDEB in 2005 we prepared an action plan for 5 years. We shared the process with other stakeholders including the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the General Directorate of Foundations, civil society organizations, the chamber of architects, chamber of commerce, chamber of industry, the ÇEKUL foundation, the three [district] municipalities of Gaziantep [Şehitkamil, Şahinbey, Oğuzeli], the Metropolitan Municipality, the Governor's office, and the Special Provincial Administration. The mayor and the governor were directly involved.¹⁰

The master plan assigns specific roles and timelines to the Special Provincial Administration, General Directorate of Foundations, and Ministry of Culture and Tourism, with KUDEB serving as the lead agency. Specific restoration projects are detailed in the action plan. The KUDEB staff designs a project concept, discusses it with relevant stakeholders, prepares an architectural plan, and

⁸ Interview with A. Güzelbey, July 19, 2011.

⁹ Interview with M. Aslan and S. Cihan, July 14, 2011; Interview with A. Güzelbey, July 19, 2011. A detailed budget for KUDEB was not available.

¹⁰ Interview with M. Aslan and S. Cihan, July 14, 2011. Unfortunately we were unable to examine the plan in detail because our access to documents was limited.

1 then writes tender conditions before putting the project out to a public bid. Funding depends on the
2 project, and tenders are awarded based on time and costs.¹¹
3
4

5 Under the first five-year plan, KUDEB's restoration work focused on three areas of the city
6 center. The planning area covered 5.5 km², including the castle itself, 18 hans, 10 mosques, 4
7 hamams, and hundreds of traditional stone houses (GMM, 2011). KUDEB's planning efforts
8 included restorations for both private and publicly-owned buildings, façade improvements, and
9 streetscape redesigns organized around the concept of the "Gaziantep Culture Road", a visitor route
10 linking the castle and historic bazaar areas (see Table 1). Under consultation with MoCT and the
11 Special Provincial Administration, new design guidelines were published and private owners were
12 offered subsidies to restore storefronts and roofs, while informal construction was removed from
13 key areas.¹² These projects have led to improvements in conservation, tourist attractiveness, and
14 also public awareness of heritage. As KUDEB Director Aslan noted,
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In 2005 there was no knowledge of historic preservation among the people or
23 government. We began a campaign to raise awareness and advocacy, starting with a
24 rooftop restoration campaign supported by us. Then we moved on to the coppersmith's
25 market and other sites. We see the difference in people's consciousness and
26 awareness.¹³
27
28
29
30

31 The GMM's heritage projects were integrated with public outreach and social programs, which
32 have consumed 20-30% of KUDEB's overall spending each year. These projects included
33 rehabilitation and vocational training in traditional stonemasonry for homeless youth and business
34 development programs for women focused on traditional Gaziantep cuisine and artisanal foodstuffs.
35 These programs were co-financed by Turkish NGOs and the EU.¹⁴
36
37
38
39

40 Insert Table 1 here
41

42 GMD is responsible for over 1000 listed monuments in Gaziantep Province, but our research has
43 identified only two major investments in the province since 2004. At Gaziantep Castle, MoCT spent
44 1.2 million TL on renovation in 2006-2007, as part of the Defense and Heroism Panorama Museum
45 project (see below). The second, and more significant investment has been targeted at the Zeugma
46 excavations, where excavations resumed in 2005 under Professor Kutalmış Gökay of Ankara
47 University. MoCT granted Prof. Gökay an initial sum of 2.5 million TL in 2005 for expropriation
48 and excavation, in hopes that the site would become a tourist attraction.¹⁵ The Provincial Culture
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ¹¹ Interview with M. Aslan and S. Cihan, July 14, 2011.

57 ¹² Interview with M. Aslan and S. Cihan, July 14, 2011.

58 ¹³ Interview with M. Aslan and S. Cihan, July 14, 2011.

59 ¹⁴ Interview with M. Aslan and S. Cihan, July 14, 2011.

60 ¹⁵ Interview with K. Gökay, July 14, 2011.

1 and Tourism Directorate (another local administration of MoCT) has allocated 1.5 million TL for
2 visitor paths, toilets, interpretative signs and construction of a protective roof structure over well-
3 preserved ancient villas, in hopes that they will provide a visitor attraction similar to the famous
4 ‘terrace houses’ at Ephesus. Unlike Ephesus, however, there is little to see at the rest of the site.¹⁶
5 The GMD has also recently been involved in several rescue excavations in the province, including a
6 recent project in Nizip led by museum archaeologist Fatma Bulgan. The GMD is further responsible
7 for registering artifacts discovered in the five academic excavations and two archaeological surveys
8 carried out in Gaziantep and Kilis provinces in 2011.
9

10 Through its Gaziantep Regional Directorate, the General Directorate of Foundations
11 managed 322 listed monuments in Gaziantep province in 2010. Before 2005 restoration seems to
12 have been a low priority; between 2006 and 2010, however, 49 ‘maintenance and restoration’
13 projects of historic hans, mosques, and a synagogue were completed (Table 1). Several of these
14 were part of the ‘Culture Road’ project coordinated by Gaziantep KUDEB, including the restoration
15 of Tutun Han (1754) in 2007, the Zincirli Bedesten (1718) in 2008, and a public tender for
16 restoration of the former Jewish Synagogue in 2012 (Figure 1). Though carried out in coordination
17 with KUDEB, the GDF’s restoration activities in Gaziantep arose from centrally-established
18 priorities rather than local initiatives: nationwide, it completed over 3000 monument restoration
19 projects between 2006 and 2010 (GDF, 2010:56, 2011).¹⁷
20

21 Finally, the GMM’s activity in conservation and museums has created a climate of
22 entrepreneurship in cultural heritage that has spurred investments by many other local and private
23 entities in the city and the province. In the nearby municipality of Nizip (50km from Gaziantep,
24 near Zeugma), an inter-governmental planning group has initiated conservation efforts in order to
25 promote the city to visitors, beginning with the restoration of a 9th century Armenian church.
26 Another potential source of investment in cultural heritage emerged in 2011, when Turkey’s State
27 Planning Organization decentralized its activities by establishing Regional Development Agencies.
28 The Silk Road Regional Development Agency¹⁸ covers the provinces of Gaziantep, Kilis, and
29 Kahramanmaraş and opened its headquarters in Gaziantep in June 2011. The agency makes grants
30 to small businesses and not-for-profit organizations in strategic development areas, including
31 tourism. The SRDA spent 8 million TL on tourism projects in 2011, and cultural heritage projects
32 will be eligible to apply for these funds.¹⁹ NGOs have also been involved in heritage promotion: the
33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹⁶ Interview with S. Efiloğlu, July 18, 2011.

¹⁷ Interview with S. Bayraktaroğlu, May 26, 2011.

¹⁸ *İpekyolu Kalkınma Ajansı*

¹⁹ Interview with F. Barutçu and H. Doğan, July 18, 2011.

1 Southeast Anatolian Heritage Project, for instance, secured EU funds to produce guidebooks and
2 promotional materials highlighting the region's historical resources (SAHP, 2011).²⁰
3
4
5
6

7 *4.3 Gaziantep as 'Museum City'*

8
9
10 Rapid change has also taken place in the museum sector, where nine new institutions opened within
11 GMM between 2007 and 2011. These institutions recorded over 500,000 museum visits in 2010, an
12 unprecedented number for an Anatolian city with little foreign tourism. Though central
13 administrations and private actors have played an important role in realizing Mayor Güzelbey's
14 goal of transforming Gaziantep into a 'museum city', the GMM itself has made the largest
15 investments and played a catalytic role, opening four new institutions between 2007 and 2009.
16
17 Three museums are operated by the GMM Department of Culture and Social Services. The
18 Gaziantep Defense and Heroism Panorama Museum, located in galleries within Gaziantep Castle,
19 tells the story of local resistance to French occupation in 1919-1920. The Emine Göğüş Kitchen
20 Museum focuses on local culinary traditions with exhibits of cooking implements, ingredients, and
21 recipes. Located in a historic house, this small museum can be visited in about an hour. The
22 Bayazhan Gaziantep City Museum, located in a historic han, is the largest of the GMM museums,
23 requiring 2 hours or more for a complete visit. It offers a chronological display of Gaziantep's
24 history from the Neolithic period to the present, with sections on local politicians, local commercial
25 and artisanal activities, and cultural life. The museum cost 5.4 million TL, with funds from the
26 GMM itself and the heritage fund of the Mass Housing Administration (TOKİ) established by the
27 2003 legal reforms (GMM, 2011; Şahinbey Municipality, nd).²¹ The Şahinbey War Museum
28 (operated by GMM's Şahinbey district municipality) explores the Turkish resistance to the French
29 occupation of 1919-1920 with 12 rooms displaying weapons, dioramas, and informational panels.
30 In the short term the city museums have been a resounding success, receiving over 440,000 visitors
31 in 2010 (Table 2). The Panorama Museum's 189,000 visitors in 2010 place it among the top 20
32 most-visited museums in Turkey.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Central administrations have also been involved in museum planning: the new Zeugma
48 Mosaic Museum opened in July 2011 near Gaziantep's city center and now displays the second
49 largest collection of mosaic pavements in the world. Though it is a unit of the MoCT's Gaziantep
50 Museum Directorate, even here the development was initiated by GMM, which built the structure at
51 a cost of \$25 million and then sold it to MoCT (see discussion below). The new facility displays the
52 mosaics in reconstructions of their original domestic contexts, accompanied by large touchscreen
53
54
55
56
57

58 ²⁰ Interview with F. Hoşukoğlu, June 18, 2011.

59 ²¹ Interview with M. Aslan and S. Cihan, July 14, 2011.

1 displays, and includes a children's multimedia area and film screening room, features found at no
2 other MoCT museum. In March 2007, the GDF also opened the Mevlevihane Foundation Museum
3 in a former dervish lodge dating to 1636. The museum displays works of Turkish and Islamic art
4 (*Yeni Asya*, 2007). As in the case of restoration, the new museum is part of a national effort: six
5 new foundation museums were opened in 2007 (Istanbul 2010 Agency, 2009), and GDF hopes to
6 eventually one for in each of its 25 regional units.²²
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert Table 2 here

Private entities²³ were allowed to open museums in Turkey in 1984; the sector grew rapidly during the 2000s with a major role played by Turkey's major industrialist families. Three private museums have opened in Gaziantep since 2004. At Gaziantep University, the Gaziantep Culture History Museum displays a small collection of ethnographic and craft items. The Medusa Glass Museum is a large private collection of ancient Roman glass and other artifacts over three floors of a historic house near Gaziantep Castle. The Saklıkonak Copper Works Museum, also located in a historic Gaziantep house, displays a private collection of artisanal copper wares. Several more private museums are currently under construction or in concept phase: an Islamic Works Museum (under construction in February 2012), a Toy Museum, a Hamam Museum, and an Atatürk House Museum commemorating Atatürk's brief residence in Gaziantep. The museums open so far are all small (visitable in 30-45 minutes) and like the GMM museums are focused on local history and culture.

In the western part of Gaziantep Province near İslahiye, archaeologists from the University of Bologna established two 'archaeo-parks' between 2009 and 2011 by installing visitor routes and interpretative signs on two small bronze age tells, Tilmen Höyük and Taşlı Geçit Höyük (Marchetti, 2008; Musso, 2008; Rossi Pisa et al, 2008). Though interpretive material is professionally designed, the sites are small (about 300m in diameter) and isolated: for instance Taşlı Geçit is located inside a dam lake, and becomes an island ten months per year when the reservoir is full.²⁴ New excavations (beginning 2012) at the Bronze Age citadel of Karkamış on the Syrian border by the same Bologna team, in cooperation with Turkish archaeologists, present the potential for the creation of another such 'archaeopark'.

5. Decentralization and Rhetorics of Heritage and Tourism in the New Gaziantep

²² Interview with S. Bayraktaroğlu, May 26, 2011.

²³ The Turkish word *özel* ('private' or 'special') is used to refer to any institution not dependent on the central state, thus including entities that might be considered 'public' in the Anglo-American context, such as universities and city governments. Cf. BLINDED REFERENCE.

²⁴ A new bridge has recently been built (summer 2012), making the site accessible for the majority of the year.

1 The changes in Gaziantep's cultural heritage scene since 2004 are impressive by any measure:
2 GMM has implemented a wide-ranging conservation program for historic structures in the city
3 center, museum offerings have become more numerous and more focused on local history and
4 culture, and significant archaeological excavations have begun or resumed at Zeugma, Karkamiş,
5 and other sites. As Table 2 shows, museum visits increased over 10-fold between 2006 and 2011.
6 Funding sources have expanded along with the number of institutions involved in cultural heritage.
7 This is an impressive result for any urban area, and even more so in Turkey where museums and
8 archaeologists have rarely actively engaged local publics (Unsal, 2010). However, a closer look
9 reveals two major issues: a disconnection between rhetoric and the real potential of Gaziantep's
10 heritage, and the institutional conflicts that can arise from an ambiguous decentralization.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **5.1 Rhetorics and Results**

22 While the rhetoric of heritage development has focused on turning Gaziantep into an
23 international tourism destination, the nature of its heritage has implications that do not necessarily
24 align with claims of the national and local administrations. The Zeugma Mosaic Museum, with its
25 new facility and superb collection, is indeed a prime attraction that can draw domestic and
26 international tourists to Gaziantep. If the visitor inflow set in late 2011 continues, it can expect to
27 draw 200,000 visitors a year, placing it among Turkey's top 25 museum and site destinations.
28 Gaziantep's other museums, however, are unlikely to draw international visitors on a large scale.
29 The new GMM and private museums are small: they can all be visited in one hour or less, with the
30 exception of the City Museum, and none have significant collections. All of the new museums
31 (with the exception of the Medusa Glass Museum) also share a strongly local content, highlighting
32 local events and cultural features such as the War of Independence, local cuisine, and the history of
33 the city. The local focus, small size, and lack of 'star' objects makes these museums of limited
34 interest to foreign visitors, who anyhow make up only 10% of Gaziantep's small tourism base (only
35 295,000 visitors in 2008, Gaziantep Chamber of Commerce, 2009:20).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Investments in other aspects of heritage suffer a similar problem. Since the 1990s, the
48 spectacular finds at Zeugma led to expectations of mass tourism at the site; the reality, however, is
49 that the site is difficult to reach and most of the 1990s excavations were covered by the Birecik
50 Dam reservoir. A roof structure was constructed in 2011 to allow visitors to tour a well-preserved
51 residential complex with intact wall frescos. While this is comparable to Terrace House 2 at
52 Ephesus, there is nothing else for visitors to see besides a few excavation trenches: Zeugma lacks
53 evocative monumental architecture. As the excavation director reflected:
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 I was at the gate [to the site] one day and a family was there. The man asked, “why
2 don’t you put a sign up saying there was nothing to see here?” He was angry because
3 there is nothing to see and they had driven a long way.²⁵
4
5
6

7 The reality that Zeugma is not touristically attractive is a disaster for Nizip’s tourism strategy,
8 which is premised on exploiting visitors to the site. Nizip is starting, moreover, from zero: no
9 foreigners stayed in the town in 2009, it lacks basic facilities for visitors, and it has an unattractive
10 urban fabric (GMM, nd:61).
11
12

13
14 Archaeological investments in the western part of the province also have limited tourism
15 potential. Yesemek attracts a small number of visitors (Table 2), largely due to its remote location.
16 The Tilmen Höyük and Taşlı Geçit Höyük archaeological parks successfully leveraged European
17 funds to create attractive walking paths and interpretive signs, but the sites consist mostly of low
18 stone walls that present little of interest to the non-specialist. They are even more difficult to reach
19 than Yesemek, and are also administratively ambiguous: though the Provincial Culture and Tourism
20 Directorate includes Tilmen Höyük in brochures, the MoCT does not issue tickets to either site or
21 collect visitor statistics.²⁶
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Finally, investments in urban conservation projects have certainly increased the appeal of
29 Gaziantep’s city center. However, the city lacks monuments of major architectural or cultural
30 importance even compared to other Anatolian centers (compare the Mevlana Museum in Konya,
31 Diyarbakır’s walls and Ulu Camii, or the sacred fish pool and Ulu Camii in Şanlıurfa)
32
33
34

35 A comparison of Gaziantep’s rhetoric and results thus presents a paradox: in an inversion of the
36 usual situation, GMM and KUDEB heritage programs seem to be more effective than the rhetoric
37 that surrounds them. The establishment and attraction of 500,000 visitors to museums focused on
38 Gaziantep’s history and culture is an unprecedented milestone in Turkey for local involvement in
39 heritage. KUDEB’s investments in conservation, moreover, have dramatically improved the quality
40 of life in the city center. Besides the aesthetic improvements resulting from the renovation of
41 buildings, façades, and streetscapes, KUDEB invested in a variety of social programs targeted at
42 historic areas. One of these provided rehabilitation and training centers for drug-addicted street
43 children, many of whom were squatting in historic buildings. Another targeted underemployed rural
44 migrant women in the historic Bey neighborhood with education programs, social centers, and the
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 ²⁵ Interview with Kutalmış Görkay, July 16, 2011

58 ²⁶ The site guard estimates approximately 5,000 visitors to Tilmen in 2010 (interview with N. Hacıoğulları, August 26,
59 2010).
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

creation of women-run business cooperatives focused on traditional Gaziantep cuisine and foodstuffs.²⁷

However, these positive contributions risk being overlooked precisely because the rhetoric of public administrations focuses on other aspects, such as attracting international tourism and promoting economic development through cultural heritage. Because Gaziantep has only one attraction of international interest, it is thus at a major competitive disadvantage compared to the established tourist regions of Turkey, which offer multiple significant attractions (Istanbul, Cappadocia) and/or nearby beaches (Antalya, Ephesus, the Lycian coast). Given this situation, the promises of tourism development and heritage-driven economic growth that are so prominent in the rhetoric of GMM, MoCT, and Nizip are unlikely to be fulfilled.

Ultimately, the risk behind the rhetoric is one of disillusionment: if millions of tourists do not arrive, museum and conservation programs may be perceived as “failures”, leading to the withdrawal of interest and investments. The challenge for Gaziantep in the future, then, is to highlight its achievements within realistic measures of success, perhaps including non-financial aspects of heritage values.

5.2 *The Risks of Decentralization: the Case of the Zeugma Mosaics*

As the case of Gaziantep illustrates, the number of institutions and funding sources involved with heritage has increased. However, it is important to note that Turkish devolution does not imply a real shift from the state to local administrations: rather than devolving responsibilities and functions among different administrative levels, it has *added* new functions to local entities without questioning or clarifying the role of the previously existing centralized ones (the exception to this is the Regional Development Agencies, which have replaced the State Planning Organization). As a result, KUDEBs in cities such as Gaziantep have not replaced the functions of the MoCT but rather work parallel to them. This can be a positive development: increasing the number of actors has also increased the amount of investment. The overlap between different administrative levels, however, can also create conflicts that raise concerns about sustainability.

The case of Zeugma and the new Zeugma museum illustrate these risks. The discovery of huge numbers of mosaics at Zeugma during the 1999-2001 salvage excavations created conflicts and competition among local authorities. Nizip municipality, the closest town to the site, strongly protested when the mosaics were taken to the museum in Gaziantep in 2000, and still feels a sense

²⁷ Interview with M. Aslan, July 14, 2011.

1 of ownership over the mosaics.²⁸ Controversy continued in 2004, when the MoCT proposed to
2 temporarily exhibit the mosaics at Topkapı palace in Istanbul. A group of civil society organizations
3 in the GMM organized protests and sued to stop the move, fearing that the mosaics would never
4 return to Gaziantep. Ultimately the MoCT cancelled its plans and decided in 2005 to build a new
5 wing of the Gaziantep Archaeology Museum to show some of the mosaics (Tanaka, 2007; Bulgan,
6 2005). This solution was unsatisfying to the excavation team at Zeugma, who still hoped to build a
7 museum and conservation laboratory project at the site itself. In 2006 an area on site was set aside
8 and an architectural firm from Istanbul was hired to prepare a preliminary design, still visible on the
9 project website (Zeugma Archaeological Project, 2012). The construction of the new Zeugma
10 Mosaic Museum, however, has effectively cancelled any possibility of a museum on-site at Zeugma
11 or in Nizip.²⁹ Though the GMM ‘won’ the contest, the conflict has not been resolved since many
12 actors continue to lobby for the creation of a mosaic museum in their own jurisdiction. More in
13 general, the presence of more actors in heritage and the unclear definition of their roles and
14 responsibilities is likely to continue to generate conflicts and ambiguities around heritage issues.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 The unusual and opaque role played by the GMM in building the new museum illustrates
27 one such ambiguity (Figure 3). Instead of working through the MoCT, the GMM designed and
28 construct the museum building on its own initiative: it selected the site, hired an architectural firm
29 from Ankara to design the structure, and funded construction through the Department of Technical
30 Services of the municipality, which issued the construction tender.³⁰ The MoCT was not involved
31 “until the museum was 99.9% finished” in 2009, and then was convinced to accept the building and
32 turn it into a new mosaic museum.³¹ Apart from the opaqueness of the process, the issue has also
33 consequences in substantive terms: if the Ministry was unwilling to accept the building as a
34 museum, the GMM’s backup plan was to use the building as a conference center. Thus, the building
35 was conceived as a generic space rather than purpose-built as a museum. Museum staff, in fact,
36 were not consulted about architectural design or museum contents, leading to protests from the
37 GMD and eventual changes to the design.³² Besides the architecture, the GMM also claims credit
38 for “planning the academic side of the museum”, including the idea to add a conservation
39 laboratory and training center to the building.³³ However, it is unclear whether the conservation lab
40 will be funded and by whom – especially given that the already existing laboratory in the Gaziantep
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 ²⁸ Interview with K. Gökay, August 30, 2010.

56 ²⁹ Interview with K. Gökay, July 14, 2011.

57 ³⁰ Interview with S. Cihan, July 14, 2011.

58 ³¹ Interview with I. Evrim, July 19, 2011.

59 ³² Interview with A. Beyazlar, August 28, 2010.

60 ³³ Interview with I. Evrim, July 19, 2011.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Archaeological Museum has been closed because it was not allocated any staff or funding by the MoCT.³⁴

Insert Figure 3 here

In this case, the lack of coordination between MoCT and GMM was not fatal to the basic success of the museum: it was constructed, staffed, opened to the public, and is receiving large numbers of visitors. But the lack of agreement around the conservation lab and the failure to coordinate investments are also missed opportunities that suggest the problems inherent in the situation of institutional overlap that Gaziantep faces.

Success in the museum project has given the municipal administration a measure of false confidence in proposing further projects in areas traditionally in the competence of MoCT. In 2012 excavations restarted at the important Bronze Age site of Karkamış, near a small town of the same name on the Syrian border, sparking interest from the GMM:

We [the GMM] are planning to be involved in the management of Karkamış site. We don't want the objects discovered to go somewhere else, we want them to stay where they are. We want to construct a new Karkamış open-air museum, build 5 star hotels, swimming pools, and tourist infrastructures... Karkamış is so important, it will become the new Efes [Ephesus]. It will be the most prestigious archaeological work after the sites in Egypt.³⁵

This quote vividly represents the GMM's sense of empowerment vis-à-vis cultural heritage, which however hides a number of incongruities. Comparisons with Egypt or Ephesus are exaggerated, given that the site – even when excavated – is not likely to reveal monumental architecture. Since it lies far outside of the city's jurisdiction, the GMM has no legal authority to promote development interventions there, again highlighting how the unclear distribution of responsibilities has opened the way for unrealistically grandiose projects and possible conflicts among administrations. In addition, since the archaeological site is a military zone (and partially covered in land mines until 2012), the Ministry of Defence must give permission for development in the area. Moreover, the vision of luxury hotels and waterparks – quite apart from their dubious economic viability – presents a possible threat to archaeological landscapes. This is all quite apart from the ongoing crisis in Syria, which has closed the border and made Karkamış a major center for refugees from the conflict – and made any such proposed development moot for the foreseeable future.

³⁴ Interviews with M.S. Yılmaz, August 30, 2010 and K. Görkay, July 17, 2011.

³⁵ Interview with I. Evrim, July 19, 2011.

6. Conclusion: the Sustainability and Replicability of the Gaziantep Model of heritage development

The Gaziantep case is, overall, a quite successful story of heritage preservation and value enhancement in which local administrations play a new engaged and effective role. The achievements in the area – both in protection and heritage presentation – were made possible by laws on decentralization that affect Turkish public administration as a whole, reflecting general trends at the international level. While many Turkish professionals and local administrations are aware of Gaziantep’s vanguard role in decentralized heritage management (the Gaziantep KUDEB team has been in high demand as speakers and trainers in other municipalities, see Çekül Vakfi, 2011), this is the first work that analytically studies and reports it to a wider audience both of professionals and academics.

Positive results and potential problems have been underlined in the case discussion. Most prominent among the latter is the idea – present also in central administrations but exacerbated at the local level – that heritage tourism will serve as an engine for economic development. Accompanying the economic growth argument is the notion that preserving heritage – and especially entering the World Heritage List – is part of a process of modernization and internationalization that can lead to ‘world city’ status. This rhetoric is unfortunate because it misunderstands the real potential of heritage, allowing local actors to create sometimes unrealistic visions for local identity and development. This is most evident in the case of Nizip, but also true in part for GMM, for the archeological teams, and the Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism. Given that the whole promotional activity of local administration and a conspicuous amount of investment (in infrastructure, hotels, etc.) is built around a potentially false image of Gaziantep as a world tourist city, this raises questions of sustainability: what happens to heritage if it is ultimately unsuccessful in attracting economic development? Will funding for conservation be withdrawn? Will new museums have enough resources for effective management?

A more realistic approach, and more sustainable in the long term, might be to appeal to the other potential values of cultural heritage, such as aesthetics, identity, or education (cf. Smith et al, 2010). Though Gaziantep is unlikely ever to be sufficiently integrated into international networks to be a ‘world city’, its focus on (and investment in) local culture has increased the quality of life of their citizens and their awareness of heritage: the results actually achieved in Gaziantep are much more interesting and sustainable than the goals discussed in official rhetoric. In a sense, the emerging policy (or “emerging strategy” in managerial terms, see Mintzberg, 1973 and 1978) seems in this case more effective than the deliberate one.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The replicability of the Gaziantep model is also questionable. Decentralization in local administration has affected every Turkish locality to one extent or another, and over 20 provinces now have a KUDEB. Yet Gaziantep has a number of unique features that cast into doubt its ability to serve as a model for other municipalities. First, the discovery of the Zeugma mosaics provided unique visibility and publicity for the Gaziantep area. Without a “star” attraction, none of these developments would have been possible. Second, the city government's active and entrepreneurial approach has been crucial in transforming cultural heritage in the city center. Finally, the whole region is experiencing a moment of tremendous economic growth, strongly related to major infrastructural investments by the state (most significantly the Southeast Anatolia Project's system of hydroelectric dams), a welcoming attitude toward foreign investment, and a large, young, recently urbanized workforce.

All these elements are difficult to find elsewhere, at least contemporaneously. It is plausible that areas characterized by lack of an international attraction, absence of strong leadership, and slower economic growth would develop in a different way. In these situations, decentralization could reduce attention from the center, without providing new resources at the local level. The risk is that the Ministry would concentrate on important sites and locations with tourism potential, while abandoning less profitable areas to local administrations.

In areas with major heritage attractions and perceived tourism potential, by contrast, the concentration of too many efforts could also cause problems. In the case of Gaziantep, institutional fragmentation and multiplication of responsibilities emerge. Though local authorities gained more freedom of action, a real decentralization of power from center to the local authorities did not actually occur: rather, cultural heritage is now managed by the state (MoCT, GDF, and their local branches in the provincial administration), *and* multiple local authorities (GMM, Nizip), *plus* several other actors (archeological expeditions, regional development agencies, private entities).

In this fragmented situation, duties and rights are not clearly defined, leading to potential conflicts and impasses when interests diverge. This emerged most clearly in the clash of interests surrounding the creation of the Zeugma Mosaic Museum. A similarly fragmented situation is also clear when looking at planning: despite the coordinating role of KUDEB, each institution has its own vision and internal logics, with duplication of efforts and possible conflicts.

In Gaziantep, mainly thanks to the positive relationships between the mayor and the government in Ankara, major collisions have been avoided so far. Yet if one of these factors were

to change – such as the local government electing a mayor from the opposition party – the risk of impasse would be high.³⁶

To conclude, while decentralization can lead to positive results and an increase in resources invested, management capability and local awareness, it is clear - as the Gaziantep story has demonstrated - that excessive enthusiasm should be avoided (also see Tosun and Jenkins, 1996). This is particularly true in countries such as Turkey where – given the presence of important ethnic minorities – decentralization could lead to the emergence of greater conflicts, especially in the field of heritage where the identity issue is particularly sensitive. Similarly, given the high level of corruption of the country (Acar and Emek, 2008, Memişoğlu and Durgun, 2008, Okuyucu Ergün, 2007), decentralization could be particularly dangerous for cultural heritage, in terms of infrastructure investments and the illicit antiquities trade. There are some conditions for successful decentralization that should be met. One is the maturity of local administrations, which should avoid naïve approaches to heritage and its economic potential. The other, paradoxically, is a “stronger” state, at least in terms of modern administrative culture and ethical values.

References

- Acar M, & Emek U, 2008, “Building a clean government in Turkey: pillars, perils, and prospects” *Crime, Law, and Social Change* 49 (3): 195-203
- Anadolu Ajansı*
- 2005, “Başbakan, Zeugma’da sonuç istedi! [The Prime Minister wants results at Zeugma!]”, 9 March, <http://arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/312994.asp>
- 2011, “‘Çingene kızı’ bugün resmen ziyaretçi önünde [The ‘Gypsy Girl’ officially opens to visitors today]”, 9 September, <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/ShowNew.aspx?id=18685126>
- 2012, “Gaziantep Dünya Kültür mirası aday listesine girdi [Gaziantep has entered the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List]”, 20 April, <http://www.haber7.com/haber/20120420/Gaziantep-Dunya-Kultur-mirasi-aday-listesine-girdi.php>
- Bilen G, 2004, “Novel Regional Policy of Turkey in line with EU Standards”, Development Bank of Turkey, Ankara, <http://www.deu.edu.tr/userweb/sedef.akgungor/dosyalar/bilen.pdf>
- Çekül Vakfı, 2011, “Gaziantep teknik destek ekibi Urfa’da tecrübelerini paylaştı [Gaziantep technical assistance team shares its experiences in Urfa]”, Cultural and Natural Resources Protection and Publicity Foundation (Çekül Vakfı), Istanbul, <http://www.cekulvakfi.org.tr/haber/gaziantep-teknik-destek-ekibi-urfada-tecrubelerini-paylasti/>

³⁶ Something similar happened in Selcuk Municipality, near Ephesus, where local government was frozen out of the heritage planning process due to its affiliation with the opposition party CHP.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Doğan News Agency* 2012, “Dünya müzelerini gezdiğimde kıskanıyordum [I was envious when I visited world museums]”, 21 June, <http://www.haberler.com/dunya-muzelerini-gezdigimde-kiskaniyordum-3723480-haberi/>
- Gaziantep Chamber of Commerce, 2009, “Gaziantep Turizm Raporu [Gaziantep Tourism Report]”
Gaziantep Chamber of Commerce, Gaziantep
- Gaziantep Haberler* 2012, “Gaziantep'te ‘kültür ve turizm’ toplantısı [A ‘culture and tourism’ meeting in Gaziantep]”, 21 February, <http://www.gaziantephaberler.com/gaziantep-te-kultur-ve-turizm-toplantisi-haberi-21301.html>
- Gaziantep Life*, 2005 “The New Goals of the Museum, with Gaziantep Archaeology Museum Assistant Director Fatma Bulgan” *Gaziantep Life* 3(17) 42-44
- GDF, General Directorate of Foundations
2010, *Activity Report 2009*. Ankara: General Directorate of Foundations.
2011, “Restoration of Cultural Heritage Owned by Foundations” Online resource.
<http://vgm.gov.tr/sayfa.aspx?Id=25/>
- GMM, Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality, Gaziantep
no date *Stratejik Planı 2010-2014 [Strategic Plan 2010-2014]*
2011, “Gaziantep City of History and Culture”, presentation prepared by GMM Urbanism and Planning Department
2012, “2011 Faaliyet Raporu [2011 Activity Report]”
- Göymen K, 2006, “Dynamics of changes in Turkish local governance” *Society and Economy* 28(3) 245-266
- Hood C, 1991, “A Public Management For All Seasons?” *Public Administration* 69 3-19
- Hood C, 1995, “Emerging Issues In Public Administration” *Public Administration* 73 165-183
- Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture Agency, 2009, *Management and operations Model for Turkish Museums Advisory Report Project: Situation Analysis Report*. Istanbul: Istanbul 2010 Agency.
- Kapucu N, & Palabıyık H, 2008 *Turkish Public Administration. From Tradition to the Modern Age* (USAK Derneği, International strategic research Organization, Ankara)
- Kickert WJM, 1997, “Public Governance in the Netherlands: An Alternative to Anglo-American Managerialism” *Public Administration* 75(4) 731-752
- Marchetti N, 2008, “ARCHAIA: From Excavation Strategies to Archaeological Parks” in *ARCHAIA: Case Studies on Research Planning, Characterisation, Conservation, and Management of Archaeological Sites* Eds N Marchetti, I Thuesen, BAR International Series 1877 (Archaeopress, Oxford) pp 11-14

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Matland. R. E. 1995. Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, Vol. 5, No. 2. pp.145-174.
- Memişoğlu D, & Durgun A, 2008, “Public administration reforms and corruption in Turkey” paper presented at the conference Current Issues in Emerging Economies in Global Perspective, Tirana, Albania, 28-29 March
- Mintzberg H., 1973, "Some distinguishing characteristics of managerial work", chap. 3, in Mintzberg H., *The nature of managerial work*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Mintzberg H., 1978, “Patterns in Strategy Formation”, *Management Science*, XXIV, 9, 934-48
- MoCT, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ankara
2005 Regulation 25842 concerning the founding, authorization, and working methods and principles for Conservation, Implementation, and Inspection Bureaus (KUDEB), Project Bureaus, and Education Sections (Koruma, Uygulama ve Denetim Büroları, Proje Büroları İle Eğitim Birimlerinin Kuruluş, İzin, Çalışma Usul ve Esaslarına Dair Yönetmelik)
2007 Tourism Strategy of Turkey – 2023
- Musso S, 2008, “Low Impact Restoration Techniques, Coverings and Fixed Devices in an Archaeological Park: A Case Study at Tilmen Höyük in Turkey” in *ARCHAIA: Case Studies on Research Planning, Characterisation, Conservation, and Management of Archaeological Sites* Eds N Marchetti, I Thuesen, BAR International Series 1877 (Archaeopress, Oxford) pp 319-329
- Nizip Workshop, 2011, “Nizip economic affairs working group tourism action plan 2011-2023”, Nizip Workshop, Nizip
- O'Toole L. J. Jr. 2000. Research on Policy Implementation: Assessment and Prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10:2, pp.263-288.
- Okuyucu Ergün G, 2007, “Anti-corruption legislation in Turkish law” *German Law Journal* 8 903-914
- Özcan G B, & Turunç H, 2008, “The Politics of Administrative Decentralization in Turkey Since 1980” in *Handbook of Administrative Reform. An international Perspective* Eds J Killian, N Eklund (Auerbach Publications/Taylor and Francis Group, Boca Raton, FL) pp 177-193
- Pollitt C & Bouckaert G, 2011 *Public Management Reform. A comparative analysis of New Public Management, Governance and the neo-Weberian state* 3rd edition (Oxford University Press, Oxford)
- Pollitt C, van Thiel S, Homburg V (eds.), 2007 *New Public Management in Europe: adaptations and alternatives* (Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke)
- Panozzo F, 2000, “Management by decree. Paradoxes in the reform of the Italian public sector” *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 16, 357-373

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Pulhan G, 2010, "Cultural heritage reconsidered in the light of recent cultural policies" in *Introduction to Cultural Policy in Turkey* Eds A Serhan, H Ayça Ince (Istanbul Bilgi University Press, Istanbul) pp 137-158
- Rossi Pisa P, Bitelli G, Bitelli M, Speranza M, Ferroni L, Catizone P, & Vignudelli M, 2008, "Environmental Assessment of an Archaeological Site for the Development of an Archaeological Park" in *ARCHAIA: Case Studies on Research Planning, Characterisation, Conservation, and Management of Archaeological Sites* Eds N Marchetti, I Thuesen, BAR International Series 1877 (Archaeopress, Oxford) pp 273-283
- Saetren H. 2005. Facts and Myths about Research on Public Policy Implementation: Out-of-Fashion, Allegedly Dead, But Still Very Much Alive and Relevant. *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 4.
- Şahinbey Municipality, no date, "Bayazhan Gaziantep Kent Müzesi [Bayaz Han Gaziantep City Museum]" Şahinbey Municipality, Gaziantep, <http://www.sahinbey.bel.tr/tr/icerikdetay/96/101/bayazhan-gaziantep-kent-muzesi.aspx>
- Schofield, J. 2001. Time for a revival? Public policy implementation: a review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 3 (3) 245–263
- Smith G S, Mauch Messenger P, & Soderland H A (eds), 2010 *Heritage values in contemporary society* (Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA)
- SAPP, Southeast Anatolia Promotion Project. 2011. "About project". Online resource. <http://seanatolianheritage.org/eng/?sf=2> Gaziantep Chamber of Commerce, Gaziantep.
- Tanaka E, 2007, "Protecting one of the best Roman mosaic collections in the world: Ownership and protection in the case of the Roman Mosaics from Zeugma, Turkey" *Stanford Journal of Archaeology* 7 <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/archaeology/journal/09Tanaka.pdf>
- TGNA (Turkish Grand National Assembly)
- 1983 Law 2863 on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (*Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarını Koruma Kanunu*)
- 2004a Law 5227 on the fundamental principles and restructuring of public administration (*Kamu Yönetiminin Temel İlkeleri ve Yeniden Yapılandırılması Hakkında Kanunu*)
- 2004b Law 5226 Concerning Changes in the Law for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage and Other Laws (*Kültür ve tabiat varlıklarını koruma kanunu ile çeşitli kanunlarda değişiklik yapılması hakkında kanunu*)
- 2004c Law 5225 Encouraging Cultural Investment and Initiatives (*Ku□ltu□r Yatırımları ve Girişimlerini Teşvik Kanunu*)

1 2004d Law 5216 the Metropolitan Municipality Law (*Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kanunu*)

2 2005a Law 5393 the Municipality Law (*Belediye Kanunu*)

3 2005b Law 5366 Concerning the Conservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalization of
4 Worn-Down Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties (*Yıpranan Tarihi ve Kültürel Taşınmaz*
5 *Varlıkların Yenilenerek Korunması ve Yaşatılarak Kullanılması Hakkında Kanun*)

6 2005c Law 5302 the Special Provincial Administration Law (*İl Özel İdaresi Kanunu*)

7 2008 Law 5747 Concerning the Establishment of Districts within the Borders of Metropolitan
8 Municipalities and Changes to be Made to Other Laws (*Büyükşehir Belediye Sınırları İçerisinde İlçe*
9 *Kurulması ve Bazı Kanunlarda Değişiklik Yapılması Hakkında Kanunu*)

10 Tosun M S, & Yılmaz S, 2008, "Decentralization, Economic Development, and Growth in Turkish
11 Provinces", WPS 4725, The World Bank Sustainable Development Network - Social Development
12 Department, Washington, D.C.

13 Tosun C, & Jenkins C L, 1996, "Regional Planning approaches to tourism development: The case of
14 Turkey" *Tourism Management* 17(7) 519-531

15 Turkish Statistical Institute, 2011. Cultural Statistics 2010. Ankara: TUIK

16 Turkish Statistical Institute, 2010. Cultural Statistics 2009. Ankara: TUIK

17 Turkish Statistical Institute, 2009. Cultural Statistics 2008. Ankara: TUIK

18 Unsal D, 2010, "Museum Establishments and Cultural Policy in Turkey" in *Introduction to Cultural Policy*
19 *in Turkey* Eds A Serhan, H Ayça Ince (Istanbul Bilgi University Press, Istanbul)

20 Yavuz Y, 2012, "Tarihi ve kültürü ile barışık modern kent: Gaziantep [A peaceful modern city with history
21 and culture: Gaziantep]" *Yeni Şafak* 9 March,
22 <http://yenisafak.com.tr/YurtHaberler/Default.aspx?i=371749>

23 *Yeni Asya* 2007, "Antep'e İslâm eserleri müzesi [An Islamic works museum for Antep]", 30 May,
24 <http://www.yeniasya.com.tr/2007/05/30/kultur/butun.htm>

25 Zeugma Archaeological Project, 2012, "Müze ve araştırma merkezi [Museum and research center]" Online
26 resource. <http://www.zeugmaarchproject.com/index.php/turkce/muze-arastirma-merkezi/> Zeugma
27 Archaeological Project, Ankara.

Table 1 - Major Actions in Cultural Heritage Since 2004

| Entity | | Monument and urban center restoration | Archeological Sites | Museums | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Central State | MoCT | Gaziantep Castle | Development of Zeugma (excavation and facilities) Rescue excavations in Nizip Opening Yesemek to visitors | Opening of Zeugma Museum | |
| | GDF | 49 projects | | Opening of Mevlevihane Foundation Museum | |
| Metropolitan Municipality | GMM | Gaziantep Castle | | Opening of Şahinbey War Museum | |
| | | 18 hans | | Opening of Emine Göğüş Kitchen Museum | |
| | | 10 mosques | | Opening of Gaziantep Defense and Heroism Panorama Museum | |
| | | 4 hamams | | Opening of Bayazhan Gaziantep City Museum | |
| | | traditional stone houses Gaziantep culture road | | Construction of the Zeugma Museum building | |
| Others | Nizip Municipality | Armenian church | | Opening of Gaziantep Culture History Museum | |
| | | | Gaziantep University | | Opening of Medusa Glass Museum |
| | | | | Private actors (various) | |
| | | Islamic Works Museum (under construction) | | | |
| | | Toy Museum (under construction) | | | |
| | | Hamam Museum (under construction) | | | |
| | University of Bologna | | Tilmen Höyük archeopark | Atatürk House Museum (under construction) | |
| | | Taşlı Geçit Höyük archeopark | | | |

Source: authors' elaboration

Table 2: Visitors to Museums and Ruins, Gaziantep Province, 2006-2010*

| Administrative Body | Name | Year | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| MoCT | Archaeology Museum | 40.713 | 55.393 | 203.198 | 125.697 | 180.970 | 13.803 |
| | Hasan Suzer Ethnography Museum | | 10.947 | 16.447 | 12.511 | | 8.609 |
| | Zeugma Mosaic Museum | | | | | | 79.311 |
| | Yesemek Open-Air Museum | | | | 9.866 | | 5.644 |
| | MoCT Total | 40.713 | 66.340 | 228.971 | 192.811 | 207.487 | 107.367 |
| Gaziantep MM | Defense and Heroism Panorama Museum | | | | | 189.371 | 129.130 |
| | Bayazhan Gaziantep City Museum | | | | | 97.785 | 26.178 |
| | Emine Göğüş Kitchen Museum | | | | | 106.698 | 82.942 |
| Şahinbey Municipality | Şahinbey War Museum | | | 133.347 | 85.268 | | 205.406 |
| | Total City Museums | | | 133.347 | 85.268 | 393.854 | 443.656 |
| University | Gaziantep Culture History Museum | | | 133.347 | 85.268 | 393.854 | 443.656 |
| Private | Medusa Glass Museum | | | 65000** | | | 48.000 |
| | Saklıkönak Copper Works Museum | | | | | | 1.000 |
| GD Foundations | Gaziantep Mevlevi Lodge Foundation Museum | | 12.000 | 21.000 | 20.520 | 32.022 | 35.103 |
| | Total Other Museums | | 12.000 | 86.000 | 85.520 | 97.022 | 84.103 |
| | Total Gaziantep | | 78.340 | 448.318 | 363.599 | 698.363 | 635.126 |

*All 2011 numbers and most numbers from non-MoCT museums are from Chamber of Commerce sources. Subtotals and MoCT museum numbers are from MoCT sources. Since sources do not agree, the numbers may not add up correctly.

** Total visitors for 2008 and 2009 combined.

Sources:

Gaziantep Chamber of Commerce, 2009

<http://www.gto.org.tr/sayfa.php?page=TUR%DDZM&parent=1&altmenuId=41>

Dösım, 2010. *Activity Report 2009*, p.62

Istanbul 2010 Agency 2009, Table 133

http://www.gaziantep-bld.gov.tr/haber-buyuksehir-muzeleri-19-mayista-Ucretsiz_695.html

<http://www.haberler.com/gaziantep-arkeoloji-muzesi-ziyaretci-sayisinda-haber/>

Turkish Statistical Institute, 2011, p.23, 32-33

Turkish Statistical Institute, 2010, p.32-33, 38

Turkish Statistical Institute, 2009, p.32-33, 38

GMM 2012, p. 128



Figure 1. Gaziantep and Turkey.

Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 2. The mosaics of Zeugma have become an emblem of Gaziantep’s identity (photo: authors).

Review Only



Figure 3. The new Gaziantep Mosaic Museum, July 2011 (photo: authors).