

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN AND NATURE
-AS CONCEPTIONALIZED BY THE REPRESENTATIVES
OF
THE SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL NGOS IN TURKEY**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
BY**

ZEYNEP İDİL AKMAN

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE PROGRAM OF SOCIAL POLICY**

DECEMBER 2011

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpinar
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör (METU,SPL) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu (METU, SOC) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç (METU, SOC) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Zeynep İdil, Akman

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN AND NATURE -AS CONCEPTIONALIZED BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL NGOS IN TURKEY

Akman, Zeynep İdil

M.S., Department of Social Policy

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu

December 2011, 93 pages

This thesis studies the perceptions of the selected representatives of environmental non-governmental organizations' (NGO) about the human and nature relationship in Turkey. The representatives of the NGOs' perceptions about human-nature relationship are studied referring to four dimensions, Production and Consumption processes, Energy Production, role of Science and Technology, and the concept of Sustainability. Approaches of the NGOs about Policies and the Activities of Environmental NGOs in Turkey are also examined. The perceptions of the NGO representatives have been evaluated according to Pepper's comparison of 'conventional' versus 'green' values regarding the differences between the national, international and public NGOs.

Keywords: Non-governmental organizations, Environment, Nature, Social Policy, Turkey.

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE'DE ÇEVRE İLE İLGİLİ SİVİL TOPLUM KURULUŞLARI ARASINDAN SEÇİLEN KURUMLARIN TEMSİLCİLERİNİN İNSAN VE DOĞA İLİŞKİSİNİ KAVRAMSALLAŞTIRMALARI

Akman, Zeynep İdil

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyal Politika

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu

Aralık 2011, 93 sayfa

Bu tez Türkiye'den seçilmiş çevre sivil toplum kuruluşları (STK) temsilcilerinin insan-doğa ilişkisini kavramlaştmalarını çalışmaktadır. Sivil toplum kuruluşları temsilcilerinin insan-doğa ilişkisini algılayışları, üretim ve tüketim süreci, enerji üretimi, bilim ve teknolojinin rolü, ve sürdürülebilirlik kavramı olmak üzere dört boyutta çalışılmıştır. Seçilen STK temsilcilerinin Türkiye'deki politikalar ve çevre alanında çalışan STKlar hakkındaki görüşleri de incelenmiştir. STK temsilcilerinin algıları, Pepper'in 'Geleneksel' ve 'Yeşil' değerleri karşılaştırması üzerinden, ulusal, uluslararası ve kamu STKları olarak değerlendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları, Çevre, Doğa, Sosyal Politika, Türkiye

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu for her support, suggestions, guidance and encouragements.

I am also thankful to my jury members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör for their support.

I am grateful to my mother for her support. I am also thankful to my friends Canan and Derya for their academic and emotional support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	4
2.1. History of Nature in Social Theory.....	4
2.2. Nature in Environmental Ethics.....	10
2.3. The Relationship of Human and Nature.....	14
2.3.1. Human and Nature.....	14
2.3.2. Science and Technology.....	17
2.3.3. Production and Economics.....	17
2.3.4. Politics.....	18
2.4. Environmental Sustainability.....	18
2.5. Global Environmental Policies.....	20
3. APPROACHES TO ENVIRONMENT IN TURKEY.....	22
3.1. Environmental Studies in Turkey.....	22
3.2. Environmental NGOs in Turkey.....	26

4.	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	28
4.1.	Methodology.....	28
4.2.	Sampling.....	31
4.3.	Limitations of the Research.....	35
5.	DIMENSIONS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN AND NATURE.....	37
5.1.	General Evaluation of Relationship between Human and Nature.....	38
5.2.	Perception of Human-Nature Relationship focusing on Production and Consumption processes.....	41
5.3.	Perception of Human- Nature Relationship focusing on Energy Production.....	44
5.4.	Perception of Human- Nature Relationship focusing on the role of Science and Technology.....	47
5.5.	Perception of Human- Nature Relationship in relation to the concept of Sustainability.....	50
6.	APPROACHES OF NGOS ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF NGOS IN TURKEY.....	63
6.1.	Approaches of NGOs about Environmental Policies.....	63
6.2.	Approaches of NGOs about the Activities of Environmental NGOs in Turkey.....	69

7.	CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	76
7.1.	Conclusion.....	76
7.2.	Policy Recommendations.....	77
8.	REFERENCES.....	79
9.	APPENDICES.....	82
	Appendix A: Question Form.....	83
	Appendix B: Information about the NGOs.....	89

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Human beings shape the environment through their relationship with nature as they exist in the world. During the industrial production process, human beings need to use natural resources for their energy needs which leads into exploitation of nature. As the industrial production increases, the exploitation of nature also increases. Human beings use technology to change the natural circumstances to their benefit. However, gradually they have started to realize that the destruction on the nature they have caused. They have realized that resources are not plenty and hence they have also recognized the limitation of the resources and they will not be enough for the population. Such motivations created pollution which has caused illnesses. Destruction of the nature took a form which cannot be renewed by itself anymore. The limitations of the ecosystem have been acknowledged and reconsidered again by the significant points as ‘Limits to Growth’ (Frey, 2001,347).

Today, environmental issues are becoming more and more important. Environmental issues have become a crucial topic of discussion for the states' political agendas, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, etc. While the natural resources are becoming extinct, problems such as climate change, energy need are becoming evident, concerns about the effects of these changes on the human life are rising. However, it is not only the human beings to be protected since an extirpated nature would be a deprivation for the human life. This condition creates a dilemma between protecting the nature and human beings. The states try to cope with these problems taking decisions about economic, social and environmental policies. They endeavor policies of sustainable development in order to use the natural resources in the most efficient way, and to protect nature for the next generations. However, the whole issue focuses human rather than the nature.

In Turkey there are many debates about the destruction of the nature for the energy production like by the hydroelectric power plants, the upcoming plantation of the nuclear power plants and for the construction on the forestlands like the Law of 2B nowadays. We witness the protests of the local people and the non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Non-governmental organizations have an important role in raising awareness about environmental issues, promoting the politicians to protect the nature and to create solutions in policy making. In Turkey the so called activities of the non-governmental organizations were not much effective until 1970s and are newly being formed, however, they are noticeably manifesting themselves and their activities due to the encouragement of international developments and enforcements, media and also local experiences of the people.

Focusing on the environmental conditions is necessary since without a healthy and safe environment there would not be a healthy living for the humans. This thesis analyses the relationship of human and nature focusing on the human's effects on the nature rather than the effects of the disrupted nature on the human. Since the human is the source of the problem, it is necessary to analyze these effects in order to create solutions and proposals for environmental policies.

The aim of this thesis is to study the environmental non-governmental organizations' representatives' perceptions about the human and nature relationship in Turkey. The main research question of this study is 'How does the environmental non-governmental organizations in Turkey conceptualize the human-nature relationship?'. The relationship between human and nature is examined according to several dimensions formed by Pepper's comparison of the 'Conventional versus Green values' which is mentioned in the Chapter 4, Research Design and Methodology.

This study comprises the opinions of the representatives of the NGOs rather than the general opinion of the NGOs. The NGOs are chosen according to a classification of national, international, and professional NGOs. Referring to Pepper's classification, the differentiation between the national and international

NGOs' values about nature in Turkey is recognizable. Therefore, the national and international NGOs are compared according to Pepper's classification of 'Conventional' versus 'Green' values. Pepper defines the differences between 'Conventional values' and 'Green values' in five dimensions, about nature, humans, science and technology, production and economics, and finally politics (Pepper, 1996, 11-3).

General evaluation of relationship between human and nature and perception of human-nature relationship focusing on four dimensions: production and consumption processes, energy production, role of science and technology, and the concept of sustainability, moreover the approaches of NGOs about environmental policies and activities of NGOs in Turkey are studied.

The Chapter 2, Theoretical Framework starts with part, the history of nature in social theory, continuing with nature in environmental ethics part, the relationship of nature and human follows this part, mentioning the Pepper's comparison of 'Conventional versus Green Values'. In the third part of this chapter brief information about the environmental sustainability is given. Finally, in the last part global environmental principles referring to the Millennium Development Goals are mentioned. Chapter 3, Approaches to Environment in Turkey is composed of two parts, focusing on the environmental studies in Turkey and environmental NGOs in Turkey. Chapter 5 focuses on the NGOs' representatives' perceptions of the human-nature relationship, in four dimensions and also a general perception of the human-nature relationship. In the first part, general evaluation of the human-nature relationship, in the second part, the dimension of 'Production and Consumption processes', in the third part dimension of 'energy production' , in the fourth part dimension of 'the role of science and technology'and in the last part the concept of sustainability is studied. Chapter 6 focuses on the approaches of the representatives of the NGOs about environmental policies and activities of NGOs in Turkey. Finally, Chapter 7 is the conclusion and proposes policy recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. History of Nature in Social Theory

The Enlightenment has a key importance for understanding history of the relationship between environment and society, hence environment and human, since it offers the improvements through science, technology and industry affecting environment. Barry emphasizes that the environmental problems present today and also the critiques against industrialism by the ‘Green’ idea are results of the Enlightenment. Exploitation of the natural environment for the human to improve has its ground on the Enlightenment. Industrial revolution has also evoked crucial changes in economy and created a modern industrial society. The changes in economic life and social life affected the environment, since it treats the environment as a collection of raw materials for the factories and new technologies for the production as a ‘means for human ends’(Barry,1999, 43-4).The Democratic Revolution and the French Revolution has also buttressed the exploitation of the natural environment as the new government needed more ‘material wealth’; and emergence of ‘private property’, the environment being treated as a property being sold and bought (*ibid.*,47-8).

The ‘state of nature’ was defined as a ‘presocial’ state of human evolution, places humans to a prior position to society, the state, social institutions. Thomas Hobbes defines ‘state of nature’ as ‘solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short’, that is not harmony and cooperation within the ‘state of nature’. Whereas, according to Rousseau, it was contrary; his view was positive for the ‘state of nature’. He criticizes the Enlightenment being one of the initial ones also to criticize the modern worldview from a ‘green’ standpoint. However, as a heritage of the Democratic Revolution, John Locke asserted that the environment can be treated or claimed by the humans as a private property, which makes him one of the first of the theorists rationalizing the instrumental attitude towards the environment (*ibid.*,52-4).

Thomas Malthus's theory has a crucial importance, being critical of the Enlightenment thinkers sure of that the improvements in social, political and economic life would be guaranty of the humans. According to Malthus, the population increases geometrically, whereas the food supply increases arithmetically, therefore as Dickens (cited in Barry, 1999, 60) states, 'the prospects for progress were continually threatened by population growth and the fact that food production could in no way match such growth'.

Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by 'natural selection' is significant for the relation of the environment and human. His first theory, that 'humans are evolved from primates', weakens the separation between the humans and nonhuman world. Secondly, his theory of 'natural selection', that is the organisms are in a 'struggle for survival', and the best adapted organisms to the environment will survive and have the chance to produce. Spencer has improved Darwin's theory into 'Social Darwinism', adapting the struggle between the organisms into society, which Barry (1999, 62) states that it could be used to 'justify and legitimate a view of society in which there was little state interference in the 'natural struggle' for survival between human beings'. This little state interference leads Barry to claim that 'Social Darwinism' proposes 'libertarian social theory', that is 'individualistic view of human freedom based on economic competition and the free market'. Peter Kropotkin, contrary to Spencer, claimed that if the 'artificial' institutions of the state and the capitalist organization of the economy were eliminated, humans would live in a 'harmonious, cooperative and egalitarian social order' (Barry, 1999, 61-4).

In 1860, the negative impacts of the industrial revolution on the environment started to emerge. George Perkins Marsh has firstly mentioned the destructive effects of the human on the nature regarding the human-nature relationship in his book *Man and Nature or Physical Geography as Modified by Human Action* (Tekeli, 2000, 8).

According to Buttel (cited in Hannigan, 2006, 5) the classical social theory deemphasizes ecological questions and biophysical forces. Karl Marx and his theory has significance role in the relationship of society and the environment.

According to him, humans were unlike the nonhuman world, since they did not only take from nature, but they use their labor power, skills and creativity to change nonhuman world into things, goods to survive. These are the ‘material relations’ by which the society is organized. Marxist Social Theory asserts that the nonhuman world is ‘valueless’ if it is devoid of the human labor and creativity (Barry,1999, 67-8).

J. S. Mill is one of the greatest liberal political thinkers of 19th century, whose views could be termed as ‘green’. In his book ‘Of the Stationary State’, he criticizes the ‘view of ‘social progress’, that the domination of nature by acquiring more material goods or by science and technology is a limited view. Moreover, he claims for moral concern to animals within animal legislation (*ibid.*, 72-77).

Jean-Paul Sartre, Martin Heidegger, and Simone de Beauvoir are thinkers propounding Existentialism, claim that ‘humans are simply thrown into a meaningless world’. Human is separate from nature, isolated and alienated so there is an existential ‘homelessness’ for the human. Therefore, there is an instrumental relationship with nature (*ibid.*, 84).

The Frankfurt School, Max Horkheimer, Theodore Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Walter Benjamin, and Jürgen Habermas are thinkers from the Frankfurt School, depending their theory on neo-Marxist social theory are critical of the Enlightenment and the modern ‘social order’. Since the natural environment has only been used for the ‘human purpose and ends’, it only has an instrumental value (*ibid.*,85). This instrumental use of nature has diffused to institutions and also to the society, therefore Barry says ’the domination and exploitation of the natural environment leads to the domination and exploitation of the humans’. Horkheimer and Adorno summarize this as, ‘Men have become so utterly estranged from one another and from nature that all they know is what they need each other for and the harm they do to each other(*cited in Barry, 1999, 86*).

According to Marcuse the external environment is dominated by the human and it is exposed to human manipulation and control; this attitude towards the nature brings out ‘an aggressive, offensive modern social order (capitalism)’. His term

‘liberation of nature’ proposes use the improvements in technology for the freeing human and nature rather than to use it for the exploitation (cited in Barry, 1999, 86). Jürgen Habermas also sees the relationship between natural environment and human is instrumental, that is human manipulates the natural world by the use of technology. He claims that this treat to the natural environment could also shape human relations with each other, which he calls the ‘dangers of modernity’(ibid.,88).

Social theory as mentioned above generally highlights the priority of the human over the nature as well as some ‘green’ theorists. In order to understand the human-nature relationship, it is significant to refer to the Green Social Theory. The basics of the green theory depend on changing the idea of separation between human and nature, and that human is ‘superior’ to nature. Secondly, it is based on the view that humans are ‘species of natural being’, the ‘culture/nature’ separation is exceeded. Thirdly, the green theory emphasizes the significance of the natural dimensions not only for the social-environmental interaction but also for the society. Morality is another feature of green theory, that is to bring a moral concern to the nonhuman world (ibid., 201-2).

‘Limits to Growth’ that is there are ecological limits and plans of growth should have to be reconsidered again, was a significant point for the ‘permanent growth’ expectations of the Western Worldview had to be not that much optimistic(Frey, 2001,347).‘Ecological scarcity’ was also a crucial term for that time, ‘ensemble of separate but interacting limits and constraints on human action’ (Ophuls, 1977 cited in Frey, 2001, 348) through which the limitations of the ecosystem and that it is not infinite has been acknowledged. These all changes allowed a new perspective in environmental sociology.

Schnaiberg’s concept of ‘societal-environmental dialectic’ is important to explain the political-ecological dynamics of economic expansion. *It* has been separated into three synthesis, first one of which is the ‘economic synthesis’ common in industrial and industrializing countries. There is a contrary relationship between economic growth and ecological disruption which is ignored. Since the ecological problems grow, the ‘economic synthesis’ turns out to be ‘scarcity synthesis’,

American environmental policies in 1970s is an example of this, only the most critical ecological problems threatening production and public health took attention. Finally, according to the ‘ecological synthesis’, economic growth would be restrained due to the limitations of resources (Buttel and Humphrey, 2002, 52).

Social constructionism is also important regarding the relationship of nature and human. Social constructionism regards the environment as only constituted by the social, gaining its properties by the description of the social practices rather than its objective properties. Martell mentions Keith Tester’s “historical sociology of animal rights” as an explanation of social constructionism who denies that the “natural” has its objective properties or causal powers. He argues that natural environment is socially constructed and does not have an independent being without it (Martell, 1994,171-2).

Realist thinkers like Dickens and Benton, in contrast to social constructionism, regard the nature having its independent properties and effects. Dickens (1992, quoted in Martell) conceptualizes the relationship between society and nature as mutually constitutive but with independent objective potentialities. Society and nature are not completely independent from each other, and also their relationship is not one way like in social constructionists and environmentalists. According to the Realists, the social constructionists see the social processes as constitutive of the environment, they ignore the natural causality. On the other hand, the environmentalists pay too much attention on nature upon society relationship. Realism asserts that nature has its independent properties and it is not only constituted by society but how these manifest themselves is socially mediated (Martell, 1994,177-8). Benton argues that social scientific approaches should incorporate the “independent reality of nature and the environment” to their approaches. Through emphasizing the importance of the physical conditions Benton claims that, “..our social relationships to nature should be thought in terms of specific social practices along with environmental conditions (physical space, fresh air, raw material, etc.) and media (tools, machines, etc.) which are necessary for them to be carried out”(ibid.,18)

Social constructionists are often regarded as ignoring the environmental risks by the Realists. However, as Wyne (2002, quoted in Hannigan) claims, this is a “false reductionsim”. The constructionists defend the idea that the social, political and cultural processes need to be considered since they are contributing factors for the “environmental state of crisis”. Thompson (1991, quoted in Hannigan) calls these oppositions about environmental debates as “contradictory certainities” which are “several divergent and mutually irreconciable sets of convictions both the difficulties we face and the available solutions”. On the other hand, the ones critical of constructionism regard this idea of contradictory uncertaininities as a pretext for the ones who ignore the existence of environmental problems for their economic or political interests (Hannigan, 2006, 29).

The main point of the debate between constructionists and the realists is that how far the economic, social and political factors are effective for the evaluation of environmental issues. Social constructionism depends on the social, on who determines the environmental events as problematic and risky, which can be the politicians, cooperations, or the media. Besides realists ground their claims on the scientific researches-which is also not free form “authorities”. Castree in his coedited book “Social Nature”, states the reasons of the disadvantages of the “objective facts about nature”. He asserts that “facts of nature” cannot be isolated from the social biases and political interests of the analysts which depend on the interests of the individuals. Thus, these assertions if they are actualized can serve as “instruments of power and domination” (Castree, 2001,9).

Catton and Dunlap’s ‘New Ecological Paradigm’ (NEP) is a new prospect for the relationship of human and environment. It is more relevant to mention specific differences between Human Exemptionalism Paradigm (HEP) and NEP. The Human Exemptionalism Paradigm grounds on the idea that humans are ‘exceptional’ species because of their cultural characteristics like language, social organization, and technology. Therefore, Catton and Dunlap call this as “Human Exceptionalism Paradigm”. They deny that humans are ‘exceptional’ species, and contrary to the idea that humans are ‘exempt’ from environmental principles and limitations (Frey, 2001,346).

While both paradigms assert that ‘human are exceptional species’, NEP emphasizes that ‘humans are among many interdependent species’. In addition to the cultural and social effects, ‘biophysical environment’ also affects the humans, and those are often what the humans themselves have created like pollution and climate. The ‘biophysical environment’ constrains human life, however HEP does not acknowledge the biophysical impacts, rather emphasize the social and cultural effects. NEP and Dominant Western Worldview emphasize that the social and technological improvement would ensure ‘perpetual progress’. However, according to NEP, these cannot avoid the fact that there are ‘ecological principles’ which limit growth. To summarize, although humans have ‘exceptional characteristics’ and science and technology for the ‘perpetual progress’, these do not make them ‘exempt’ from ‘ecological constraints’ (Frey, 2001,350-1).

2.2. Nature in Environmental Ethics

Environmental ethics generally is discussed around two views, anthropocentrism and ecocentrism. Therefore, here these two views will be focused. Firstly, the features of the anthropocentrism will be mentioned. Secondly, ecocentrism with the two authors, Aldo Leopold known with “Land Ethic”, and Arne Naess and “Deep Ecology” will be mentioned.

According to the Anthropocentric view, human needs and interests have the primary value and necessity regarding ethical principles. Therefore, it is contrary for the nonhuman entities. Armstrong S. J. and Botzler R. G. mention the Bryan G. Norton’s classification of strong anthropocentrism and weak anthropocentrism. Strong anthropocentrism grounds on the idea that nonhuman species have value only if they fulfill a “felt experience”, which is “any fulfilable human desire-whether or not it is based on thought and reflection”. Regarding this classification, Rene Descartes and James Skidmore are illustrative (Armstrong and Botzler,2004, 271).Weak anthropocentrism depend on the “considered preferences”, which is “a human desire or need based on careful deliberation and is compatible with a

rationally adopted world view". Norton associates William H. Murdy, Stephen Jay Gould, and Frederick Turner with weak anthropocentrism (*ibid.*, 2004, 272).

Anthropocentrists limit the moral concerns to humans as superior creatures. Descartes's and Kant's ideas human capacity to reason is an instance for this. For Kant only humans have rationality and so intrinsic value, and humans do not have any responsibility to nonhuman world. According to Murdy, humans have an "observed power and biological superiority" in the nonhuman world. Murdy and Turner's position differ from Descartes and Kant in agreeing that the nature has intrinsic value, however, state confirm that humans have dominance over nature (*ibid.*, 2004, 272-3). The position of the anthropocentrists raises a critical question; "*Will anthropocentrism eventually lead the human species to self-destruction and perhaps to the destruction of many other species as well?*" The anthropocentrists reply to this question on the basis of "enlightened self-interest", that is they approve the destructive effects of the humans on the planet and since humans well-being requires an healthy and stable "ecological support system", it is necessary to take responsibility (*ibid.*, 2004, 273).

Ecocentrism grounds on the idea that "the natural world has inherent or intrinsic value (*ibid.*, 2004, 371). Dobson cites from O'Neill (1993) in order to explain what the "intrinsic value" is. Its definition is in three ways,

"First an object has intrinsic value if it is an end in itself (as opposed to) a means to some other end; second, Intrinsic value is used to refer to the value an object has solely in virtue of its 'intrinsic properties', and third, Intrinsic value is used as a synonym for 'objective value', i.e. the value that an object possesses independently of the valuation of valuers" (Dobson, 1995, 50).

Aldo Leopold propounds "Land Ethic" in the late 1940s. The ones who advocate the "Land Ethic" call for the human responsibility toward the natural World. Contrary to anthropocentrists who value the nature regarding its necessity for the well-being of the humans, they assert the "nature in and of itself". In "The Land Ethic", a chapter of his book "A Sand County Almanac", Aldo Leopold mentions this responsibility as, "a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends

otherwise.” (Armstrong and Botzler, 2004, 371) According to the “Land Ethic”, the concept of community comprises the land: soils, waters, plants, and animals. He emphasizes the destructive effects of the humans on the land and states that humans should perceive themselves as “plain members and citizens” of the biotic community, rather than the “conqueror” of it (Armstrong and Botzler, 2004, 374-5).

Arne Naess has propounded the term “deep ecology” in 1973, in ecocentric philosophy. He has made a distinction between “shallow ecology” and “deep ecology”. Naess has also articulated the term “ecosophy”, Devall (in Armstrong and Botzler, 2004,400) defines the term as “a philosophy of ecological harmony”. According to Naess, the term “ecosophy” is a reasoning process in which “ecophilosophy” searches for different paths to view the world in the platform of “deep ecology” of individuals (Naess, 1989,4).

Naess states 8 points which represent the “deep ecology movement”;

1. *The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent worth). These values are independent of the usefulness of the non-human World for human purposes.*
2. *Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves.*
3. *Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.*
4. *The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantially smaller human population. The flourishing of non-human life requires a smaller human population.*
5. *Present human interference with the non-human World is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.*
6. *Policies must there be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from present.*

7. *The ideological change will be mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between bigness and greatness.*
8. *Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to try to implement the necessary changes. (Naess in Sessions.,G.,1995, 68)*

Naess compares shallow and deep ecology: Shallow Ecology considers natural diversity as a resource, whereas Deep Ecology claims that it has intrinsic value. Likely, plant resources are to be saved for their use of humanity according to the Shallow Ecology. Thus, Shallow Ecology considers “resource” as for the humans, whereas Deep Ecology asserts that it is for the living beings. Another point is pollution: Shallow Ecology says that it should be decreased if it affects the economic growth negatively, for Deep Ecology eliminating pollution is much more necessity than the economic growth. Standard of living also deserves comparison: Shallow Ecology claims that “a broad decrease in the standard of living” would not be tolerable, Deep Ecology states that it should be in overdeveloped countries (cited in Pojman, 2000,177).

Ecofeminism has emerged in 1970s, claims for the relationship between the dominance of nature and the dominance of women (Armstrong and Botzler, 2004, 412). Warren cited in Pojman (2000, 183) states that patriarchy leads to racism, classism, sexism, and environmental degradation, and this domination is to be destroyed by the ecofeminism. Likely, in her book “Radical Ecology”, Carolyn Merchant, emphasizes the necessity of *“an alternative vision of the world in which race, class, sex and age barriers have been eliminated and basic human needs have been fulfilled”*. (cited in Pojman, 2000, 183) Pepper makes a critique of the shallow ecology by claiming that it is anthropocentric because it considers the nature as an “instrument to human ends” (Pepper, 1996,35).

O’Riordan makes a classification between ecocentrism and technocentrism. According to him, technocentrism is categorized by rationality, achieving the goals by the use of organizational and productive techniques by “a sense of

optimism and faith”, for the capacity to control physical, biological, and social development for the well-being of present and future generations (O’Riordan, 1976,11). Thus, technocentrism has basis on the idea that the environmental problems would be solved in order to achieve unlimited growth (Pepper, 1996, 38).

2.3. The Relationship of Nature and Human

As it has been mentioned in the Dominant Western Worldview, humans are separate from nature and have an instrumental view of the natural environment, changing the circumstances by science and technology. Greens state that this domination on nature and this exploitative position towards nature is the basic source of the environmental problems today. ‘Green values’ significantly differentiate from the ‘conventional values’ according to Pepper, in terms of nature and human relationship, the role of science and technology, production and economics, and also for the implementation of politics. Pepper summarizes these differences and makes a comparison of ‘green’ versus ‘conventional’ values as it has been displaced in the Table 1.1(Pepper, 1996, 11-3).

2.3.1. Human and Nature

There are significant contrasts between ‘conventional’ and ‘green’ thinking. First of all, the idea of nature is completely different, for Greens, humans are part of nature, and nature has a value in itself independent from its value for the human, therefore, human should respect and protect nature and live with it in harmony. However, for the ‘conventional’ view, humans are separate from nature, and human benefit is prior for domination or exploitation of the nature. The laws of nature are also important for the ‘conventional’ view for the exploitation of nature. Contrarily, Greens assert that humans should obey these rules such as ‘carrying capacity’. The main differences between these approaches are summarized in Table 1 (Pepper, 1996, 11-3).

Table 1.1 Green Values compared with conventional values

Pepper, 1996, Modern Environmentalism, Routledge, London, pp.11-3

Conventional values	Green values
<p>About nature</p> <p>1 Humans are separate from nature.</p> <p>2 Nature can and should be exploited and dominated for human benefit.</p> <p>3 We can and should use the laws of nature (scientific laws) to exploit and use it.</p>	<p>Humans are part of nature.</p> <p>We must respect and protect nature for itself, regardless of its value for us, and in harmony with it.</p> <p>We must obey the laws of nature (e.g. the law of carrying capacity, which means that there's a limit to the number of people that the earth can support).</p>
<p>About science and technology</p> <p>1 Science and technology can solve environmental problems, so we must go on perfecting them.</p> <p>2 It's progress in technology that largely determines social and economic changes, and there's not much we can do to control it.</p> <p>3 Large-scale 'high' technology (e.g. nuclear power) is a mark of progress.</p>	<p>Science and technology can't be relied on: we must find other ways to solve environmental problems.</p> <p>We can change society and economics as we like: technology should be servant not master. We don't have to have technology that harms us.</p> <p>Intermediate, appropriate and democratically-owned technology (e.g. renewables-solar, wind etc.) is a mark of progress.</p>

Table 1 (continue)

About production and economics	
1 The main object of producing goods and services is to make capital to invest more goods and services, benefitting everyone eventually.	We should produce goods and services that society needs, regardless of whether they are profitable or not.
2 Economic growth of any kind is good, and it can go on forever. It need not harm the environment.	Indiscriminate economic growth is bad. It can't continue because it uses up finite resources and creates pollution.
3 It's better and more efficient to make products on a large scale with central control and production-line techniques.	It's better and more efficient to make products on a small scale, with local control and in craft production.
About politics	
1 We can solve environmental problems without changing our social-economic-political system: though we'll have to regulate that system and intervene in the free market.	The only way to solve environmental problems is by wholesale social, economic and economic-political change – we must get rid of the industrial way of life.
2 The greens want to take us back to pre-industrial stone age, or a romantic rural vision.	To create a 'non-industrial' society, centered on small-scale production for local economies and social need, and in greater touch with nature, is going forwards.
3 In the end we must leave environmental decisions to experts best fitted to take them: politicians advised by scientists.	We must all take decisions, as much as we can – 'experts' should advise us, but should not command extra authority or power.

2.3.2. Science and Technology

Science and technology are the basic means for shaping and controlling the natural environment, and also for solving the environmental problems that have been caused by the former. They have always been the assurance of the humanity to cope with the nature, for the economic and social development of the society.

According to the ‘conventional values’, human can solve the environmental problems by science and technology, therefore they should be improved since they define the social and economic changes. Progress is signified by the large-scale ‘high’ technologies like nuclear power according to ‘conventional values’. On the other hand, science and technology cannot ensure the solution for the environmental problems, there should be alternatives to solve them according to ‘green values’. Technology should not dominate the social and economic life, rather it should help to change it. We should prefer ‘intermediate, appropriate and democratically-owned technology’ like renewables rather than large-scale technology which harm us (Table 1.1, Pepper, 1996, 11-3).

2.3.3. Production and Economics

‘Conventional values’ are founded on the objective that making capital to invest in more goods and services, and gaining more profit makes the economy more ‘efficient’. Whereas greens state that in producing goods and services, it is the society’s needs not the profit that should be fulfilled (*ibid.*).

Greens claim that industrial society is based on obtaining more and more profit and more consumption, while industries are releasing their wastes to the society rather than paying to recycle them. Thus, pollution increases since industries do not take precautions for the sake of competition (*ibid.*,14).

Pepper states that this progressiveness, maximization of profit, division of labor, mechanization produces ‘uncreative, unfulfilling and alienated work’. According to him, ‘the search to expand markets and command resources and cheap labor

has extended the industrial-consumer society across the globe, destroying rainforests and changing climate. The ‘overpopulated’ Third World is polluted and materially and culturally impoverished by this international trade system, which most people still see as essential to “development”” (*ibid.*,14).

2.3.4. Politics

Regarding politics, conventional thinking see the nation state as the most important political unit, whereas Greens think that it is the local community as a part of the international community, grounded on the idea of ‘think globally: act locally’. Environmental decisions should be taken by the politicians and guided by the scientist for the ‘conventional values’. However, Greens argue that people should all take decisions by the guide of ‘experts’ but not under the domination of an authority or power (Table 1.1,Pepper, 1996, 11-3).

According to Pepper (1996, 14), the economic system mentioned above, ‘produces a political system dominated by both narrow nationalism and uncontrollable multinational corporations. Each country needs a centralizing state to make its economic and political arrangements work. This state interferes with individual and community rights, inhibiting freedoms, self-determination and self-responsibility and producing undemocratic politics’.

2.4. Environmental Sustainability

The term of sustainable development was first revived in 1987 by the United Nations’ ‘Our Common Future’ Report. According to Brundtland Report, Our Common Future,

“Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It contains within it two key concepts:— the concept of ‘needs’, in particular the essential needs of the world’s poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and the

idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organisation in the environment's ability to meet present and future needs".(WCED, cited in Barry, 1999,205)

As it has been stated above, sustainability includes not only the peoples' necessary needs for living, but also the acknowledgement of the ecological limitations and the introducing a new agenda. In order to clear this aspect Barry (1999, 205) quotes from Jacobs:

"The concept of 'sustainability' is at root a simple one. It rests on the acknowledgement, long familiar in economic life, that maintaining income over time requires that the capital stock is not run down. The natural environment performs the function of capital stock for the human economy, providing essential resources and services. Economic activity is presently running down this stock. While in the short term this can generate economic wealth, in the longer term (like selling off the family silver) it reduces the capacity of the environment to provide these resources and services at all. Sustainability is thus the goal of 'living within our environmental means'. Put another way, it implies that we should not pass the costs of present activities on to future generations."

From a Green perspective Pepper (1999, 16) suggests that the social organization should be organized regarding the way nature is organized, there should be fewer demands for the resources, population control and low-impact technologies such as renewable should be considered, and economics should consider environmental aspects. Thus, development should be sustainable. Martell (1994, 47) emphasizes that it is also the technical decisions which sustainability necessitates like 'choice of technology, energy use and forms of production'. Moreover, it requires change in social life styles and values.

In order to expound the content of the sustainability more, it will be significative to refer to UNEP's statements. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP, 2011) states the key areas for the process in sustainable environment as follows;

- *implementation of the three UN Conventions on combating desertification, biological diversity and climate change, as well as the global objectives on forests and sustainable forest management;
- *new and renewable energy sources, low-emission technologies, more efficient energy use, greater reliance on advanced energy technologies, and sustainable use of traditional energy sources;
- *sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation;
- *integrated waste management systems;
- *sustainable management of marine biodiversity and ecosystems, and preservation of fragile mountain ecosystems;
- *sustainable consumption and production patterns.

2.5. Global Environmental Principles

This part the aim is to study the international environmental principles. The environment is generally related to the development, sustainable development since the issue of environment is started to take place in the agendas of the countries. There are different internationally recognized declarations. One of them is Rio Declaration on Environment and Development the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro on June 1992, is one of the most important declarations about the environment, which is a reaffirmation of the one in 1972, aims to protect ‘the integrity of the global environmental and developmental system’. World Summit on Sustainable Development was lastly held in South Africa Johannesburg in 2002. Another recent declaration about environmental sustainability is the Millennium Development Goals 2011 by United Nations. Since in the formation of the questionnaire’s sustainability part the questions are formed according to the Millennium Development Goals Report, it is also preferred to refer it in here too. Formation of the questions will be mentioned in the chapter 4, methodology section.

The declaration is composed of principles about both human development and environment, for the aim of this study the principles about the environment will be

focused primarily. There are 8 goals in the Millennium Development Goals 2011, the 7th goal is to “Ensure Environmental Sustainability”, and there are 4 targets defined;

1. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources

- *The rate of deforestation shows signs of decreasing, but is still alarmingly high*
- *A decisive response to climate change is urgently needed*
- *The unparalleled success of the Montreal Protocol shows that action on climate change is within our grasp*

2. Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss

- *The world has missed the 2010 target for biodiversity conservation, with potentially grave consequences*
- *Key habitats for threatened species are not being adequately protected*
- *The number of species facing extinction is growing by the day, especially in developing countries*
- *Overexploitation of global fisheries has stabilized, but steep challenges remain to ensure their sustainability*

3. Halve, by 2015, the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation

- *The world is on track to meet the drinking water target, though much remains to be done in some regions*
- *Accelerated and targeted efforts are needed to bring drinking water to all rural households*
- *Safe water supply remains a challenge in many parts of the world*
- *With half the population of developing regions without sanitation, the 2015 target appears to be out of reach*
- *Disparities in urban and rural sanitation coverage remain daunting*
- *Improvements in sanitation are bypassing the poor*

4. By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

- *Slum improvements, though considerable, are failing to keep pace with the growing ranks of the urban poor*
- *Slum prevalence remains high in sub-Saharan Africa and increases in countries affected by conflict (2011,48-57)*

CHAPTER 3

APPROACHES TO ENVIRONMENT IN TURKEY

This chapter aims to study the nature-human relationship in the environmental studies in Turkey and the development of Environmental NGOs in Turkey. In the first part, the environmental literature about the human and nature relationship is mentioned. However, there are not much studies about this issue, most of them follows the foreign literature and cites from these. In the second part, the information about the environmental NGOs in Turkey and their progress in time is mentioned.

3.1. Environmental Studies in Turkey

In the first part of the theoretical framework, ‘History of Nature in Social Theory’, it is stated in literature that human dominates the nature by technological developments and knowledge. Likely, Keleş, Hamamcı and Çoban (2009, 36-7) state that human transforms the nature both in positive and negative ways, therefore, it can be said that humans have destruction effect on nature in their book ‘Çevre Politikası’, ‘Environment Policy’. Human dominates and exploits the nature by the technological and scientific developments.

Tekeli (2000,3) states that the characteristic which differentiates humans from the nature is the culture that leads to humans control on the nature. Culture has two dimensions, first one is the technologies about production, transportation and communication, and the second is the moral factors. The humans shape their relationship by the use of technology like by production with less labor, adaptation to the nature, and by transportation. According to Tekeli, human develops the relationship with the nature by evaluating the consequences of her/his actions which is the second dimension of culture, the morality. This means that human has the potential to change

her/his relationship with nature in a way that eliminates her/his destruction on nature as well as destroying the nature. Therefore, human is able to use this control mechanism on the nature, on the one hand by destroying the nature by consuming the resources more, and on the other by eliminating this destruction by technological development and morality(Tekeli, 2000,3).Tekeli conceptualizes the effect of human on the nature as;

Environmental Impact= Population X Richness X Technology X Morality

He clarifies the technology's negative and positive effects on the nature as, “*Technology could increase production by the use of more and more resources and causing more population to stay alive, which causes richness and also consumption and as a result there are more negative effects on the nature. Whereas, the negative effects on the nature could be reduced by using appropriate technologies*”. As well as technology, the morality as a dimension of culture could change the negative effect into positive (ibid., 5).

Keleş, Hamamcı and Çoban define the environment and society relationship in six topics, population, human settlement (habitat), natural resources, nutrition, energy and environmental pollution. The population growth effects the ecological values as seas, forests, and cultivation areas to be misused and as a result, these values become polluted, and are destroyed(Keleş et al, 2009, 118). The writers state that urban settlements should be an important issue for the politics regarding the protection and enrichment of natural resources, biological diversity and efficient use of energy(Keleş et al, 2009, 132).

Natural resources are the third item in the environment and society relationship, the resources is composed of living resources as biological diversity and non-living resources. Biological diversity is called as ‘richness of natural resources’, and is stated by the writers that biological diversity is crucial for the economic development since the country’s economy depends on the natural resources. The non-living natural resources

such as water, air, soil, mines are also important for the economic benefits. However, the ambition of limitless economic growth creates problems (ibid.,2009,134-8). The issue of energy is another topic mentioned by the writer. Energy production pollutes the environment and if the current consumption maintains, the energy reserves would not require the future generations' needs (ibid.,2009, 149-50). According to the writers (ibid.,2009, 156),

“Scientific and technological development, industrialization, urbanization, economic growth pollutes the world as making it a place impossible to live for the humans and other creatures”.

In their book “Çevre ve Ekoloji” (Environment and Ecology), Kışlalioğlu and Berkes advocate the holistic view in ecology, which is considering the relations within nature as an entirety (Kışlalioğlu and Berkes ,2010,38). The writers mention the necessity of an holistic view to understand the ecological system, and refer to the examples of the environmental problems in Turkey(ibid.,43)They propose solutions for “Utilizing Nature Without Destruction”, mentioning agricultural production, waste recycling, biomass, renewable energy. The writers suggest practice of conventional tillage, organic agriculture, sustained yield, renewable energy sources for sustainable development (ibid.,,222-46).

Likely, Tamkoç in her article “Doğa ile Bütünleşme” (Integration with the Nature), from her edited book “Derin Ekoloji” (Deep Ecology), defends holistic view regarding human and nature relationship. She cites from deep ecology and states that human should acknowledge this holistic view, respect to all living beings, and become conscious(Tamkoç,1994,109).

Demirer, Torunoğlu, and Duran's article “Radikal Ekolojik Akımlar Üzerine Düşünceler” (Arguments about Radical Ecological Movements) in the book “Ve Kirlendi Dünya...” (And the Planet is Polluted) distinguish the ecological movements regarding the ecological crisis as “moderate” and “radical” movements. “The moderate movements” advocate maintaining the current system by reforming human activity, environmental legislation, and government politics.

Whereas, “the radical movements” assert that the ecological crisis can only be solved by changing the economic, social and political structures partially or completely (in Demirer et al, 1999,109). The authors support the “radical movements” as deep ecology, ecofeminism, social ecology, and bio-regionalism. Social ecology is developed by Murray Bookchin in 1960s, who criticises the current settled structure of the society by a radical perspective. According to him, the use of technology within the social, economic, and political structure is the reason of the ecological crisis(cited inDemirer et al,1999, 117-8). The supporters of the bio-regionalism search for the ecological problems in the bioregions of the planet (cited in Demirer et al, 1999, 119). Deep ecology and ecofeminism were explained in the environmental ethics section. As a result, the authors, make some critiques and propose several points,

- Ecological concerns are a part of political programs, therefore there should be a political, social and economic approach regarding to protect the planet and humanity.
- Ecologic problems cannot be considered without regarding the negative effects of the capitalist production.
- Ecological crisis is not a consequence of human beings rather the process of the capitalist system, since there is an inequality in terms of their effects on nature.
- All the species in the nature should have the right to live.
- An approach to the ecological crisis cannot be isolated from ideological standing.
- The radical ecology proposes to make changes in the life style and alternative energy resources, however there should be mechanisms to actualize these suggestions.
- The effect of capitalist production process should be considered internationally (in Demirer et al, 1999, 121-3).

There are also works about New Ecological Paradigm and Human Exemptionalism Paradigm.Özerkmen, in his article “İnsan Merkezli Çevre

Anlayışından Doğa Merkezli Çevre Anlayışına” (From Antropocentric Perspective to Eco-Centric Perspective), asserts that there is a need for a new paradigm for understanding the human and nature relationship, which is New Ecological Paradigm mentioned in first section of the second chapter. Moreover, he also points the necessity of an holistic view like the authors mentioned above (Özerkmen, 2000, 183). The New Ecological Paradigm Scale is also used by Tuna in his research, “Public Environmental Attitudes in Turkey”, inwhich he has found that the people having high education and better occupations tend to have more environmental commitment (Tuna, 2004,14). Tuna also mentions the necessity of the global organization to create solutions for the global environmental problems in his article, “Çevresel Sorunların Küreselleşmesi” (Globalization of the Environmental Problems) (Tuna, 2000,13).

3.2. Environmental Non-governmental Organizations in Turkey

In Turkey the ratio of the environmental NGOs to the whole NGOs is 0.7%. The main topics the environmentalist NGOs are active are nature conservation, forestry, erosion, bio-diversity, sea and sea-sides. Using media, awareness raising and education and campaigns are the primary methods for the activities of the NGOs. It is also crucial that the 76% of the environmentalist NGOs which are active today have been established in last 12 years. Despite the increased number of the environmental NGOs in last years, the number is still low. Approximately the 1/3 of the environmental NGOs are active in the most populated 3 cities of Turkey: Ankara, İstanbul and İzmir. In terms of geographical distribution, Central Anatolia and Marmara Region are the first, and Eastern and South Eastern Anatolia Regions are last ones (Baykan, Paker, 2008, 1-2).

According to the “Guide book of Non-Governmental Organizations” 1996, the aims of the NGOs have been also specified: “protection” and “awareness rising” are the mostly used words. Moreover, %53,6 of the organizations have the attempt to mold public opinion. Forestration and protest are the two other specified

actions. Between 1980 and 1990 environmental organization has taken a big step. The number of the organizations have increased rather in small cities, prioritising to mold public opinion and protesting

The negative developments about the environment (Atauz, 2000, 202-3). According to Adem this change depends on the return of democratic governance after 1983. The activity spheres of the NGOs also have transformed from forestry and beautification into conservation and professional organizations (Adem, ed. in Adaman et al, 2005, 83).

Environmental problems emerged with industrialization. At the beginning of the 20th century, organizations which we may call as environmentalist became apparent due to certain deficiencies in infrastructure, cleanliness, epidemics and for the protection of forestry and historical environment. Since the state has gained power in the republic period, the civil organizations started to be inspected and these organizations became to be composed of selected people basically depending on voluntariness. In 1946, the pressure on the civil organizations has been alleviated a little, and the number of the organizations active in environment protection, urban beautification and reconstruction issues has risen. In 1970s, the environmental problems have become apparent with air pollution in the big cities like Ankara. The international organizations and the signed agreements also have effects on the improvement of the environmental organizations in Turkey. In 1980s the environmental problems has gained currency as a new discussion platform. Moreover, new articles took place in the new Constitutional Law and in 1983 the environmental law has enured. In this period, the environmental organizations started to pay attention to public interest and the environmental benefit of the whole public rather than just the selected people(Atauz, 2000, 199-201).

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1. Methodology

This study intends to explore the non-governmental organizations' representatives' perceptions about human-nature relationship. The main research question of this study is 'How does the environmental non-governmental organizations in Turkey conceptualize the human-nature relationship?'. The relationship between human and nature is examined according to several dimensions formed by Pepper's comparison of the 'Conventional versus Green values'. The NGOs are chosen according to a classification of national, international, and professional NGOs. Referring to Pepper's classification, the differentiation between the national and international NGOs' values about nature in Turkey is recognizable. Therefore, the national and international NGOs are compared according to Pepper's classification of 'Conventional' versus 'Green' values. Pepper defines the differences between 'Conventional values' and 'Green values' in five dimensions, about nature, humans, science and technology, production and economics, and finally politics. (Pepper, 1996,11-3)

In this study, this comparison is taken as a typology in order to clarify the different perceptions of the NGOs'. The NGOs' representatives' perceptions about environmental sustainability takes place in the questionnaire, the questions are formed according to the primary topics are mentioned in the Millennium Development Goals Report 2011.

The approaches of the NGOs' about activities of environmental NGOs in Turkey are also taken place in the last part of the questionnaire. The information about the respondents such as name, title, level of education, information about the NGO as its level of activity, its foundation, objectives, information about the socio-

demographic status of its members, NGO's latests activities and activity spheres take place in the first section of the questionnaire.

The main questions in the questionnaire are specified as bold, there are also sub questions to be asked to clarify the answers of the respondents. (Please see Appendix A) The following parts of the questionnaire are formed as,

- I. General perception of human-nature relationship
 - I.a. Definition of nature
 - I.b. Human's place in the nature
- II. Perceptions about the natural resources
 - II.a. Definition of the natural resources
 - II.b. Environmental problems about the natural resources
- III. Perceptions about science, technology and energy
 - III.a. The Relationship between natural resources and energy
 - III.b. The effects of technological developments on nature
 - III.c. The effects of scientific thought on the nature
- IV. Perceptions about economy, production and consumption
 - IV.a. The Relationship of economic growth and nature
- V. Perceptions about Environmental Sustainability
 - V.a. Definition of environmental sustainability
 - V.b. Evaluation of Turkey in terms of natural resources (water, soil, forests, biological diversity)
 - V.c. Evaluation of Turkey in terms of climate change
 - V.d. Evaluation of Turkey in terms of energy
- VI. Approaches about the policies
 - VI.a. Decision makers
 - VI.b. Environmental legislation in Turkey

VI.c. Social policies' effects on the nature

VI.d. Economy policies' effects on the nature

VII. Approaches about the NGOs and nature

VII.a. Connections with local governments

VII.b. Connections with national and international NGOs

VII.c. Evaluations about the environmental NGOs in Turkey

VII.d. Recommendations for the environmental awareness

General evaluation of relationship between human and nature and perception of human-nature relationship focusing on four dimensions: production and consumption processes, energy production, role of science and technology, and the concept of sustainability, moreover the approaches of NGOs about environmental policies and activities of NGOs in Turkey are studied. The NGOs' are compared as national, international and professional NGOs about environment, and their perceptions are evaluated and compared according to these dimensions searching these questions,

- Which NGOs' perceptions are close to the Pepper's 'Conventional' or 'Green' values?
- Are NGOs' perceptions close to the 'Green values' as they are environmental NGOs? or
- Do they have 'conventional values' regarding the relationship of human and nature like other institutions?
- How do they conceptionalize the nature regarding the dimension of production and economics?
- How do they conceptionalize the nature regarding the dimension of science and technology?
- How do they conceptionalize the nature regarding the dimension of politics?
- How do they conceptionalize the nature regarding environmental sustainability?

What are their recommendations about the environmental policies in Turkey?

4.2. Sampling

In order to choose the non-governmental organizations for the sample the database of Sivil Toplum Geliştirme Merkezi (STGM), Civil Society Development Center is searched. There are 650 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) related to environmental issues in Turkey. Some of these NGOs are active in Turkey and their activities are specific on environment, on the other hand, some of them are related to different issues like agriculture, animal rights, protection of historical heritage, forestry, professional associations and are local institutions. In order to focus mainly on the environment and for their representativeness of Turkey, the NGOs that have the former characteristics are chosen. Today, the local NGOs are also actively working especially specific about campaigns against hidroelectirc power plants. However, to include these NGOs would not fit to the criterias such as working on environment generally, to be known by the public, and convenient for the topic I am studying.

As it is mentioned in the methodology, the NGOs have been chosen according to a classification of national, international, and professional NGOs. Regarding Pepper's classification of 'Conventional' versus 'Green' values, the differentiation between the national and international NGOs' values about nature in Turkey is recognizable. Therefore, the national and international NGOs are compared according to Pepper's classification of 'Conventional' versus 'Green' values.

Regarding the NGOs that are nationally active in Turkey, Doğa Derneği, Association of Nature, Türkiye Erozyonla Mücadele, Ağaçlandırma ve Doğal Varlıklar Koruma Vakfı (TEMA), The Turkish Foundation for Combating for Soil Erosion, Türkiye Çevre Vakfı (TÇV), Environment Foundation of Turkey are in-dept interviewed. As an international NGO, Greenpeace which is an active NGO internationaly and in Turkey is in-dept interviewed. As a third group

representing the professional NGOs of environmental engineers, Çevre Mühendisleri Odası (CMO), Chamber of Environmental Engineers is also in-dept interviewed.

Each NGO has been chosen for a reason: Doğa Derneği is a new association and has a different stand point than the NGOs, whereas TEMA is an old and known NGO for its campaigns in Turkey especially via media, TÇV is also an old NGO, being founded in 1970s, is one of the first NGOs in Turkey in those years. Regarding the international characteristics, Greenpeace has been chosen as it is a well known NGO in Turkey and in the world. Çevre Mühendisleri Odası (CMO), Chamber of Environmental Engineers, has been also chosen as a representative of professional NGOs of environmental engineers.

The respondents are conducted by getting an appointment in advance. The interviews took place in Ankara and İstanbul, since some NGOs like Greenpeace and TEMA have their main office in İstanbul. The in-depth interviews took between 1,5 and 2 hours. The interviews are recorded and the records are deciphered.

From each of the NGOs, the most authorized persons are in-depth interviewed, moreover from some NGOs two persons are chosen as respondents, like TEMA and Greenpeace as large and well known NGOs. In these two NGOs, a person at the top position and a person who is a volunteer activist has been interviewed. Interviewing one or two respondents from the NGOs might not be adequate, but since the respondents are chosen as the most informed and authorized people from the NGOs, this could be the representative of the major tendencies of those NGOs. In-depth interview is chosen as a qualitative research method. The respondents are in-depth interviewed since this study aims to search NGOs' perceptions. In the table below, information about the respondents is indicated.

Table 2: Information about the respondents of the NGOs

Level of activity of the NGO	Name of the NGO	Title and Status of the Respondent	Gender	Name
National	TEMA	Representative (provisional), Volunteer	Female	1 st Representative of TEMA
National	TEMA	Department Director	Female	2 nd Representative of TEMA
National	TÇV	General Secretariat	Male	Representative of TÇV
National	Doğa Derneği	Director	Male	Representative of Doğa Derneği
Public	ÇMO	General Secretariat (provisional)	Female	Representative of ÇMO
International	Greenpeace	General Director	Male	Representative of Greenpeace
International	Greenpeace	Volunteer	Male	Volunteer of Greenpeace

A summary of the information about each NGO is given below, including their foundation, aims, socio-demographic information, and their activities. (For further information about the NGOs please see Appendix B.)

Doğa Derneği (Association of Nature) was founded by bird watchers in 2002. Their study starts with important bird habitats, later natural areas are the most important sphere of their study. Their aim is to protect crucial natural areas regarding nature and human as a whole. The members of the NGO are young, between 18-30 years of age, the population of males and females are approximately the same, and are university graduates. Protection of the species and areas like Delta of Gediz and Kızılırmak, Burdur Lake and Campaign of Hasankeyf are the activities of DoğaDerneği in the last year.

Türkiye Erozyonla Mücadele, Ağaçlandırma ve Doğal Varlıklar Koruma Vakfı (TEMA), The Turkish Foundation for Combating for Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats was founded in 1992 by Hayrettin Karaca and Nihat Gökyigit. The aims of TEMA, in summary are to promote protection the soil, combat soil erosion, biodiversity, water resources. The members of TEMA are between 31-50 years of age, female members are more than male members, and the members are generally high school graduates. In last year TEMA had activities about 2B Law, ‘Minik TEMA’, ‘Little TEMA’ about soil, and awareness raising.

Türkiye Çevre Vakfı (TÇV), Environment Foundation of Turkey was founded in 1978. In 33 years they have published publications, done researches, training programmes, comparative legislation studies, public training studies. The objectives of TÇV is to make researches about environment, to inform public, focused on the topics: environmental management, environmental impact assessment, biological diversity, renewable energy, and energy-environment relationships. The members of TÇV are generally up to 50 years of age and are generally males, and university graduates. Activities about environmental

legislation, contact meetings about wind energy, studies about renewable energy and about smes' expectations about environment are the last year activities of TÇV.

Chamber of Environmental Engineers has been founded in 1992. The aims of Chamber of Civil Engineers is to defend colleagues' rights, benefit of society and environment. Their members are between 31-50 years of age, the number of females and males are approximately the same, and are university graduates since it is a professional chamber. Symposium of Environmental Resistances, panels and workshop about environment are the activities of CMO in the last year.

Greenpeace Mediterranean was founded in 1995 being composed of Israel, Lebanon, Malta, and Turkey. The objectives of Greenpeace are to avoid crimes against the environment by struggling against climate change via proposing renewable energy sources, protecting seas. Greenpeace does not have certain information about the socio-demographic characteristics of its members. Campaigns about climate change and protection of the seas are the activities of Greenpeace in last year.

4.3. Limitations of the Research

There are also limitations in terms of respondents. I could not access to the top executives in certain NGOs which is a limitation. Also there are few cases as 7 respondents from 5 NGOs is a limitation. Since I have chosen the known NGOs and experienced executives which are experienced in the mentioned NGOs for a long time, to access to them was a problem. Therefore, the interviews took place in Ankara and İstanbul.

Moreover, there were difficulties in terms of reaching the respondents since it was not easy to reach the top executives and the other members in the offices of the NGOs. Therefore, the study comprises the opinions of the representatives of the NGOs rather than the general opinion of the NGOs.

It was another difficulty that some national and international NGOs did not reply to the request for an appointment. Therefore, the NGOs that are more accessible are chosen.

CHAPTER 5

DIMENSIONS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN AND NATURE

This study intends to explore the perception differences between the national, international and public NGOs' representatives. The perceptions of the representatives of the NGOs have been evaluated according to the Pepper's comparison of 'conventional' versus 'green' values as it is designed in the interview and mentioned in the methodology section. Regarding the human-nature relationship, in this study there are 4 dimensions within this relationship has been chosen and also a general perception of the human-nature relationship. The 'general evaluation of the human-nature relationship', trying to clarify how do the NGOs perceive nature and human-nature relationship. The first dimension is the 'Production and Consumption processes' focusing on the relationship of human and nature, that is how this processes affect the nature according to this relationship. The second dimension is the 'energy production' focusing on the human-nature relationship, how does energy production affect the nature, do the respondents perceive that energy production is a must for human living whatever happens to the nature or they only prefer the environment friendly energy production like renewable energy forms? The third dimension is 'the role of science and technology' focusing on the relationship of human and nature; how does science and technology affects nature regarding this relationship, is science and technology for the sake of human development, but is it to the bitter end? Does technological developments protect the nature or vice versa? How does scientific thought affect the relationship of human and nature? The final dimension is the perception of the sustainability and how it is conceptualized regarding human-nature relationship. How do the respondents conceptualize sustainable environment? What are their views about depleted natural resources, climate change and energy problem which are the crucial focus points of the sustainable environment according to the Millennium Development Goals Report

2011. This chapter first of all starts with the general perceptions about the human-nature relationship of the NGOs, in order to introduce their views about nature.

5.1. General Evaluation of Relationship between Human and Nature

This section intends to clarify NGOs' perceptions of nature and human-nature relationship, that is how do they define nature, is human a part of the nature, is human dominating nature, does nature need to be protected? According to Pepper's classification, all the respondents are like minded about the idea that 'humans are part of nature'. However, they have also the same opinion that human's control on the nature and that human destroys the nature.

It's the dominant power who defines what is the nature and the human. The human is only a component of the nature, does not have any priority in terms of intelligence or law. As a result of human's existence, the impact of human being on nature is dominance and destruction.
(Doğa Derneği, Association of Nature, Director)

The respondent from Türkiye Erozyonla Mücadele, Ağaçlandırma ve Doğal Varlıklar KorumaVakfı (TEMA), The Turkish Foundation for Combating for Soil Erosion, also agree that humans dominate nature.

Nature-human relationship is inseparable. Nature was there before human was created. Before creation there were many living beings as plants and animals, however as the human population increased human have started to consume and give damage to the nature. Human-nature relationship should be a sharing and understanding relationship but it is an inverse relationship. We forget that we are a part of

*the nature and we behave dominating the nature,
this is where we are mistaken. (TEMA, volunteer,
representative)*

There is also a different definition of nature by the representative of Türkiye Çevre Vakfı (TÇV), Environment Foundation of Turkey and the representative of Çevre Mühendisleri Odası (CMO), Chamber of Environmental Engineers perceiving nature as a sphere of natural resources, is quite anthropocentric view.

*It is the sphere the human lives, so it is the land
human live on, the water human drink, swim, it is
the air human breath, in brief it is air, water,
soil. Human is a part of nature for sure but
human destroys the natures benefactions in order
to maintain his/her life. (TÇV, secretary)*

According to the representative of Greenpeace, nature is an ‘entirety ecological relationships’, which is a holistic view.

*Nature is an entirety of ecological relationships
composed of ecological principles, biological
diversity living and non-living and also human
being. Human is a part of the nature but shatters
the nature. (Greenpeace, director)*

Here we see specifically different perceptions about nature’s definition. Some see the nature as an ‘entirety of ecological relationships’, some have the perception of nature as a ‘resource’ for the human beings to live, like the representatives of TÇV and CMO. Nature needs to be protected according to the respondents’ views, but is it protecting nature as it is a resource or is it ‘protecting nature for itself, regardless of its value to us’ as the Green values state?

The representative of Doğa Derneği has the perception much more close to the ‘Green values’. Moreover, it is much more close to the Ecocentric view that “the natural world has inherent or intrinsic value”(Armstrong and Botzler, 2004, 371).

The nature cannot renew itself so the nature has to be protected since there is a threat to it. The human beings should tell the others that the nature has its own rights of itself. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

The representative of TÇV has a different perspective focusing on the resource depletion caused by human population.

Nature, in other words soil, water and air, needs to be protected since urban life, transportation, industry, operations for energy obtaining, dams destroys it. Rapid population growth on earth and the environment has an important relationship since the resources won't be sufficient for the population. (TÇV, secretary)

There is also a different point of view by the 2nd representative of TEMA, focusing on the human, has an anthropocentric view.

As TEMA we do not agree with the idea that "protect the nature whatever happens to human". Primarily we have to provide basic needs of the people, like sheltering, accessing water, otherwise it is not surprising that hungry people chopping the woods or are engaged in farming without right methods. (TEMA, head of department)

The representative of Greenpeace on the other hand, does not mention the concept of 'protection' but rather 'harmony' like the 'Green values'.

The nature could renew itself if the human could live in harmony with the nature. (Greenpeace, director)

There is a tendency for the nationally active and public NGOs perceiving nature as a sphere where there are natural resources that are crucial for the living of the humans, however humans damage, pollute the nature as their population increases, therefore the nature has to be protected. On the other hand, as an international NGO, the representative of Greenpeace and an exceptional national NGO, the representative of Doğa Derneği have the view that nature has its own rights and humans should live in harmony with nature which is close to the ‘Green values’ of Peppers typology.

5.2. Perception of Human Nature Relationship focusing on Production and Consumption processes

In this section the focus will be how production and consumption processes affect the nature according to human-nature relationship. Pepper mentions the differences between ‘conventional’ and ‘green’ values in terms of production and economics. (see Table 1.1.) Are production and consumption processes for only the societies’ needs or these processes are for the more efficient economy? Is economic growth of any kind is good, and would not harm the nature? or this kind of an economy is bad, and it can not continue because it uses up finite resources and creates pollution as Pepper mentions(Pepper,1996, 12).

The respondents both agree that economic growth is necessary for a country’s development and also this growth should be in consideration of the environmental protection. However, they mention this in different ways. While the representative of TÇV claims that economic growth is necessary, other representatives of NGOs are critical of economic growth since it damages environment. Some of them propose a midway between economic growth and protecting nature, some of them are critical of the economic system since it damages the nature.

Logically economic growth should bring the facilities for environmental protection to the country. Therefore, the idea of economic growth is to the detriment of the environment is wrong. Industry is going to be for sure like economic growth. However, the policies which maintain ignoring the environment should not be adopted.
(TÇV, secretary)

The 2nd representative of TEMA's perception is kind of a midway between economic growth, consumption and production processes and nature protection. Likely, the representative of ÇMO proposes an economic growth with a sustainable environment.

Do not say no to development, but economic development should be protecting ecology. Industry has negative impacts on environment. We have to consume and produce in a right way. We lose our culture and adopt consumption culture.
(TEMA, head of department)

The representative of Greenpeace is critical about the current socio-economic system.

There is direct relationship between economic growth and environment. Depredation of the nature and socio-economic system cannot be separated, it is the effect of the system...like harming the oceans, changing the chemistry of the atmosphere by using fossil fuels, transforming ecosystems into agricultural lands, usage of the water and the other creatures in the ecosystems only for the humans as a resource.
(Greenpeace, director)

Respondents share the view that economic growth brings out more production and consumption.

Since we consume more, commodities that we create value from are consumed and we need more commodities and there is more expansionism. The state is regarded as a finance agent for consumption and entertainment, not for the projects for the welfare of the public. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

However, the representative of TÇV's views are different from the other NGOs', claiming that it is up to the consumer to consume less since the economic growth is needed.

Industry is going to be for sure like economic growth. However, it should be without ignoring its impacts to the environment in every investment. It is for sure that economy would want to sell what it has produced, I cannot blame them. It is all about the consumer who will be informed and conscious. (TÇV, secretary)

The representative of Doğa Derneği mentions the negative effects of the industry especially by the industrial wastes.

First of all, industry as a technology is affecting environment. Moreover, wastes it has. It produces goods for consumption, which are for individuals, like cars. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

All the representative of NGOs share the view that economic growth and so the production and consumption processes have negative effects on the nature. However, there are significant differences, between national and international NGOs and even between the representatives of national NGOs. The representative of Doğa Derneği has different perception than the representative of other national

NGOs, critical of above. Whereas, according to the representative of TÇV, economic growth, production and consumption as a need. It is also notable for the representatives of TEMA, but the difference is they try to find a midway like the representative of CMO emphasizes sustainable development, is like ‘having one’s cake and eating it too’. The representative of Greenpeace’s perception is critical of the current system damaging the nature like the representative of Doğa Derneği which is much more close to the Pepper’s ‘Green values’.

5.3. Perception of Human - Nature Relationship focusing on Energy Production

This section tends to clarify ‘energy production’ focusing on the human-nature relationship, how does energy production affect the nature, do the respondents perceive that energy production is a must for human living whatever happens to the nature or they only prefer the environment friendly energy production like renewable energy forms?

The respondents agree with the idea that the current energy production ways damage the nature and renewable energy forms are considered as a solution for the energy need. Some representatives of the NGOs especially focus on the effects of hydroelectric power plants and are critical of this type of energy production.

The millions’ lives are being separated from their origins and are send to somewhere else, and it is seems as something reasonable. The people and the animal species are both being destroyed, the species are being taken form their nests while people lose their culture, language and family like dying slowly. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

While the representative of Doğa Derneği focuses on the effects of the energy production on the animal species, the 2nd representative of TEMA focuses on the economic concerns of the energy production. The representative of TEMA mentions the priority of the economic purposes as a reason of more than needed power plants being planted.

In TEMA our studies are not much related to energy, but we prefer renewable energy. Hydroelectric power plants are called to be renewable energy production forms, they are if they are planned and established in an accurate way, and if they do not exterminate natural resources. We go wrong by the idea of planting more and more, gaining more money, and we will regret at last. (TEMA , head of department)

The representative of ÇMO also emphasizes the negative effects of thermal power plants and nuclear power plants since they cause resource depletion.

Energy is one of the biggest enemies of the environment. The countries try to develop technology and industry more and more, however the need for energy is not fulfilled. In our country and also in the World wrong energy policies cause our environment and natural resources to be consumed, however there could be environment friendly solutions. We establish hydroelectric power plants, dams and dry out our water resources; by nuclear power plants we cause radioactive accidents, by thermal power plants we use fossil fuel which pollutes our air. Moreover, we have wrong transportation policies like using individual automobiles rather than public transportation. (ÇMO, secretary)

The representative of Greenpeace relates energy and economy and recommends transforming current energy systems as a solution;

Currently, almost all of our energy systems depends on fossil fuels and controlling of “being of water” as a resource and producing energy from it. Nuclear energy also negatively affects

the World as fossil fuels. Moreover, it hinders renewable energy investments. It is the used energy amount which ensures the present economic system to work. There is a strong relationship between energy and economy. What we are trying to do is to transform energy systems, to avoid fossil fuels and nuclear energy, to improve energy efficiency by renewable energy in the long run. (Greenpeace, director)

Like the representative of Greenpeace, the representatives of NGOs support the renewable energy, as a solution for the energy need. However, there are also critical views about renewable energy like the representative of TÇV.

Renewable energy resources like solar, wind, and geothermal should be used more, but if we look from a realistic perspective, there is not any trustable statistical data about how much energy we can supply from these resources. Therefore, relying only on these resources is not realistic.

(TÇV, secretary)

The representatives of the NGOs share the view that energy production ways like thermal power plants and nuclear power plants affect the nature negatively. However, the representative of TÇV emphasizes the need for energy.

When we talk about efforts of energy production, large dams exterminating the environment comes to mind. Therefore, in Turkey like in the World, large environmentalist groups are against these dams, they are right, however the country, all the people need energy. The environment should not be destroyed, on the other hand, the need for energy should not be ignored. (TÇV, secretary)

The respondents agree with the idea that the current energy production ways damage the nature like hydroelectric power plants, large dams, thermal power plants, nuclear power plants. Renewable energy forms are considered as a solution for the energy need. Some of the representatives of NGOs especially focus on the effects of hydroelectric power plants and are critical of this type of energy production like TEMA, CMO, Doğa Derneği and Greenpeace. However, their focus changes, for instance the representative of TEMA emphasizes the natural resources being depleted, the representative of Doğa Derneği emphasizes the animal species to be destroyed and also the people have to leave their land because of hydroelectric power plants. Whereas, the representative of TÇV agrees energy production damages the nature, however emphasizes the energy need cannot be ignored. The representative of Greenpeace proposes to leave these energy forms and to transform energy production to renewable energy. In terms of energy production, there is not a big difference between the views of the representative of the NGOs as international or national, however the representative of TÇV's views are discrete.

5.4.Perception of Human-Nature Relationship focusing on the role of Science and Technology

The third dimension is ‘the role of science and technology’ focusing on the relationship of human and nature. Pepper mentions the differences between ‘conventional’ and ‘Green’ values regarding the role of science and technology. According to the ‘conventional values’, science and technology can solve environmental problems, therefore human should improve them. However, in order to solve environmental problems, humans should find other ways rather than relying on science and technology stated by the ‘Green values’. Second important differentiation is about technologies affect on social and economic change. For the ‘conventional values’, social and economic change is defined by the technology and humans cannot control it, whereas according to the ‘Green values’, ‘technology should be a servant not a master’. (Pepper, 1996, 11)

This section focuses on these questions: How does science and technology affect nature regarding this relationship? Is science and technology for the sake of human development, but is it to the bitter end? Does technological developments protect the nature or vice versa? How does scientific thought affect the relationship of human and nature?

The representatives of the national NGOs agree that technological developments have both positive and negative effects on the environment.

Technological developments have both positive and negative effect to the environment. On the one hand, environment is polluted due to the technological developments. On the other hand you can take precautions for pollution by developing methods. (ÇMO, secretary)

The representative of Doğa Derneği emphasizes the impact of economic concerns in using technology. The use of technology is closely related to the profit maximization of the current economic system.

All of the forms of energy production, communication, transportation, and building are negative developments due to use of technology. To minimize this by using technology is possible but it is not for more profit, since it has minimum profit minimizing is not a choice for the big corporations. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

The representative of Greenpeace points to the misuse of technology and recommends the use of environmental-friendly technologies rather than for modifying the genes of the organisms.

Scientific research and development should be for the good of citizen and nature. If we exterminate nature by genetically modified organisms within agricultural systems for more productivity or use toxic material, then it is misuse of technology. Technological developments should incline to how to avoid toxic materials, use natural materials, improve renewable systems which do not produce wastes.

(Greenpeace, director)

The representatives of the NGOs have different perceptions about the use of technology, but they all agree that current technologies harm the nature. There are dissimilarities between national NGOs, the representative of Doğa Derneği criticizes the economic concerns in role of technology as also mentioned by Pepper, which is the relationship between technology and the social and economic forces(1996, 11). The representative of Greenpeace's views are close to the 'Green values', emphasizing the misuse of technology, which refers to the Pepper's statement of 'we do not have to have technology that harms us' (1996,11).

The respondents have different views about the scientific thought, some think that science has the ultimate status regarding its decision making about nature, however some views question the legitimacy of scientific thought.

The representatives of TÇV, TEMA, and ÇMO, the national NGOs, perceive science and reason as leading to environmental protection.

Science and reason leads in environmental protection like in other issues. However, it is the people, management group, governments, local authorities, research and development managers who would follow science and reason. (TÇV, secretary)

The representative of Greenpeace also questions the legitimacy of science like the representative of Doğa Derneği.

Science should be constitutional. It is sure that the people who want to create an environment friendly world do not deny science and scientific method, but they think that these are seized by current socio-economic system and by specific power groups. Therefore, there should be freedom movement in science and scientists should put constitutional and ethical principles in order, otherwise science has no legitimacy today.

(Greenpeace, director)

While national the representatives of NGOs, and CMO, except Doğa Derneği perceive that science has a leading role and status in protecting nature, as an international NGO, Greenpeace questions the trustfulness of science since it is dominated by the current socio-economic system and power groups as also mentioned by the representative of Doğa Derneği. According to Pepper, the conventional values claim that science and technology can solve environmental problems. Whereas, Green values support the idea that science and technology cannot be relied on (Pepper, 1996, 11). Regarding Pepper's comparison, the representatives of the national NGOs are close to the conventional values, however, as a national NGO, the representative of Doğa Derneği and as an international NGO, the representative of Greenpeace have their views close to the Green values.

5.5. Perception of Human-Nature Relationship in relation to the concept of Sustainability

In this section, the representatives of the NGOs' perceptions of the sustainability regarding the relationship of human and nature is tried to be clarified. First of all, respondents conceptualization of environmental sustainability is explained.

Secondly the respondents' perceptions about primary topics which have been mentioned in the Millennium Development Goals Report 2011, as natural resources, water, soil, deforestation, biological diversity, climate change and energy problem is mentioned. The respondents' views and their recommendations about these topics have been asked.

The answers of the respondents' to the question of 'what is environmental sustainability?' were surprising since half of them did not want to use the term 'sustainability' or find the term 'environmental sustainability' unnecessary. The others defined it as it has been referred in the sustainability chapter as 'legating the natural resources to the next generations'.

The representative of Doğa Derneği claims that the term of 'sustainability' is a way of legitimization. Likely, the representative of Greenpeace states that the concept of sustainability does not have a ground. In addition, the representative of TÇV agrees that environmental sustainability is an unnecessary ascription.

I do not think that the concept of sustainability has a ground, and also the concept of environment. Even the idea of environmentalism externalizes what has to be internalized. Environment is not a sector, it should not have been a sector, since it has been a sector it has been included to the system. I prefer harmony with the nature, nature-friendly rather than the idea of environment, because you do not betray, harm your friend, you share with, protect your friend. There is sharing in nature, there is no competition in nature. However, the current socio-economic system prefers competition, defeating the enemy to the adaptation, acting in concert, protecting. (Greenpeace, 1, director)

The 2nd representative of TEMA mentions sustainable development already covers environment. The representative of CMO's view is similar to the TEMA's.

The concept of sustainable environment does not sound reasonable to me. Sustainable development is reasonable and it covers environment already. (TEMA, head of department)

According to the answers of the respondents, the representatives of CMO and TEMA perceive 'environmental sustainability' as 'legating the natural resources to the next generations', which has a human focus. That is environmental sustainability is necessary for the human generations to benefit from natural resources, is a way of maintaining these resources. Whereas the representative of Greenpeace states the term does not have a ground and rather prefer 'living in harmony with the nature'. The representative of Doğa Derneği also perceives sustainability as a tool for legitimization of the projects about the environment.

In terms of environmental sustainability there are primary topics which have been mentioned in the Millennium Development Goals Report 2011, as natural resources, water, soil, deforestation, biological diversity, climate change and energy problem. The respondents' views have been asked about these topics and also their recommendations. First of all, their views about natural resources have been asked in order to understand their general perception about the topic and since it is important to understand their perceptions about how they perceive nature, is it only sphere offering these resources? Moreover, the reason why these natural resources should be protected asked.

The respondents' views can be separated into two groups, that is the one's perceiving the natural resources as water, soil and air for the living of the humans, and the other one perceives these as living beings rather than resources, and crucially deny the conceptualization of 'natural resources'.

The representatives of TÇV, TEMA, ÇMO, national NGOs, define natural resources as water, air and soil. The representative of ÇMO focuses on the pollution of the natural resources.

The pollution and shortage of water, pollution of the air we inhale, giving damage the soil are most important problems about the natural resources. Giving damage to the soil means hardly growing some crops, this affects the human beings' nutrition for their living. Global warming and climate change are the crucial reasons of the pollution of air and water. (TÇV, secretary)

The representatives of Doğa Derneği and Greenpeace are critical of the term ‘natural resources’, the respondent states that we should rather call them as ‘living beings’, if we call them as ‘resources’ it becomes something ‘anthropocentric’, and it is regarding ‘living beings’ as a benefit for human and calling them ‘resource’. He expounds,

I think that using the concept of natural resources is the basic problem. We can call them as living beings but if we call them as resources it becomes something “anthropocentric”. Regarding living beings as a benefit for human and calling it resource. However, water is not a resource, it is the basic thing that we are made up of. Since we make our creation elements to resources, we also extort other living beings' rights to use it. (Greenpeace, director)

There is a certain difference between the views of the NGOs, the representatives of the national NGOs perceive the natural resources as means to human needs, whereas, as an exception the representative of Doğa Derneği, and as an international NGO, the representative of Greenpeace perceive natural resources as living beings.

Above the NGOs' perceptions about natural resources has been explained. The NGOs' perceptions about these resources and their views about the situation of these in Turkey regarding primary topics which have been mentioned in the Millennium Development Goals Report 2011, as water, soil, deforestation, biological diversity, climate change and also energy problem is expounded in here. The respondents are asked if there is a water shortage in Turkey, or a problem about accessing water and also their recommendations. Some of them replied that Turkey does not have a problem in short term but will have problems in the future and some respondents mentioned that there is a problem of water in some regions of Turkey.

Some argue that Turkey is rich water resources, some say it is not, I do know since there is not much research about it. We have rivers and lakes right, but also water is not enough for a population over 70 million. This year it has been rained much but when the rainfall decreases there is drought especially in Southeastern region. Climate change is another factor. We have water for today, but climate changes in the world, population grows so that we have to use the water wisely. (TÇV, secretary)

The 1st representative of TEMA mentions the next generations' accessing water like has mentioned for the sustainability.

There should be a regulation about water. People should be informed, the rules should start from

the individuals. People should behave as the next generations have the chance to access water.
(TEMA, volunteer, representative)

According to the representative of CMO, there is a problem of accessing water in Turkey. The representative of Doğa Derneği mentions the problems of accessing clean water.

There is a problem of accessing clean water. Accessing water also can be considered as irrigation, there is no right like this in Turkey. People in Halfeti are living near the dam but they do not have water. They have to leave their lands. This is a separation of human and nature, peoples social lives will be ended. They will immigrate, their cultural and social structure will be vanished. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

The volunteer from Greenpeace recommends a committee about water management.

We do not have awareness about water resources. We have drink water in Turkey, so we do not have any concern for short time. There should be a committee about water management or the existing management should be more active. There should be regulations about water usage. (Greenpeace, volunteer)

Soil is also an important natural resource for the human living. There are discussion in Turkey about agriculture and organic agriculture. Therefore, the respondents are asked about these topics.

We should be careful about the pesticides and fertilizers, these two are risky. If we behave carefully, agriculture is the most compatible activity with the environment and does not harm. Since 1980s, we despise agriculture in Turkey, industry has developed, we import foodstuff now. Agriculture is not the priority of the politicians.

(TÇV, secretary)

The 2nd representative of TEMA emphasizes the land use in Turkey, focusing on the farm lands and agriculture in Turkey.

The issue of agriculture is being discussed in the world and is problematic since there are indicators that there is food shortage in the world. In Turkey the farm lands are used for other purposes. There should be regulations about land use. (TEMA, head of department)

The representative of CMO refers to the agricultural policies.

We are known as a country of agriculture in the world but our agricultural policies are not right. The pesticides and chemicals affect our soil, air, products and also are a threat to us. Organic agriculture makes sense since the harmful pesticides are not used, therefore people prefer organic products. (CMO, secretary)

Respondents agree that Turkey was known as a country of agriculture but it is critical now. The representative of TEMA emphasizes the farm lands being used for other purposes, and pesticides are harmful for the environment. The NGOs lean to organic agriculture but some of them emphasize that organic products are

expensive for everyone to buy. The respondents also state that Turkey needs appropriate agricultural policies.

Deforestation is another important topic for the environmental sustainability and is discussed in Turkey currently since forest lands are being used for other purposes. The respondents are asked the current condition of the forests in Turkey and the importance of the forests.

The representatives of ÇMO, TEMA and TÇV focus on the legislations about the forests like 2B.

Forest is one of the primary issues about natural assets and biological diversity. I do not know if the people are aware of what we are losing by the forest fires, or what is our forestry legislation and policy, or the legislation of 2B. These are all cause forest destruction increasingly. We love the ‘green’ just in daily talks, in the poetries, songs. The villagers living in forests have needs, problems, and it is the resources in the forest that fulfill their economic necessities; they still use wood for heating, in Turkey this cannot be avoided.. I do not think that management groups in Turkey really pay attention to the forests.
(TÇV, secretary)

The representative of Doğa Derneği focuses on the deforestation's effects on the living creatures, referring to the energy production ways.

There thousands year old trees being chopped, and new plants which do not adapt to the soil in that region, the nature is destroyed. Hydroelectric power plants and dams also affect the soil and trees; to cease the circle affects all the creatures. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

Since nature is being destructed the biological diversity also becomes an important issue, the species are being extinct. The respondents asked the condition of Turkey in terms of biological diversity and if there are any problems about biological diversity. The respondents agree that Turkey is a rich country in terms of biological diversity, however there is not enough legislation to protect those and no research about the species.

We are a very rich country in terms of biological diversity. There is almost a continent's diversity in Turkey, in terms of flora and fauna. Biological diversity is the richness of our country for its development. People should be informed. (TEMA 1, volunteer, representative)

Having a different view, the representative of Doğa Derneği mentions the threats to the biological diversity.

Turkey has a special geographical structure, it has 3 different continental climate, it is a 'hot spot' in terms of biological diversity. Most of the species are not known. Ministry of Environment and Forestry has to do research about those. Hydroelectric plants, mines, nuclear are threats to biological diversity. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

Climate change is a crucial issue which is on the agendas of all countries in the world. It is seen as a threat for the whole world since is going to affect all living of humans by changing the physical conditions of nature. There are many discussions about the effects of climate change and efforts to eliminate the factors causing climate change in the world like Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement to struggle against climate change, which is also signed by Turkey in 2009. The respondents are asked to evaluate Turkey's condition regarding climate change and also their recommendations. The representative of TÇV mentions the different implementations between developing and developed countries.

There are some efforts about climate change in Turkey since the global efforts urge Turkey. There is a Kyoto Protocol, international treaties about depletion of the ozone layer, like reducing the emissions caused from industry and transportation. However, Turkey wants to be exceptional in this regard, stating that it is not a developed country yet and does not want to undermine its developing industry; there is a contradiction in here. However, there are some efforts. Regarding global warming, it is not something to avoid with only a country's effort, it is only contributing the global efforts. (TCV, secretary)

The 1st representative of TEMA states that afforestation and changing of consumption habits would be useful in struggling with climate change.

Turkey is one of the places that will be affected by climate change according to the experts. We cannot avoid it but we can soothe it, by afforestation, by changing our consumption habits like using less water. We have to use our natural resources efficiently. Hence, we have to be informed. (TEMA , volunteer, representative)

The representative of CMO emphasizes the effects of the climate change on the resources.

Climate change threatens the whole world and us. Turkey is one of the countries which is going to face desertification, even some areas have become desert. Global warming is big effect in depletion of resources; we have water shortage problem, our soil will go desertification, we will

not produce enough products. Climate change is a danger which is going to affect water, soil and air. Decisions that we only take as a country are not enough; it is not effectual if we as a country do not use fossil fuels. All of the countries should take measures. You produce less greenhouse gas but USA emits 10 times of yours, but the result affects not only that region, but the whole world.
(ÇMO, secretary)

The representative of Doğa Derneği points to the relationship of energy production and climate change.

They plant hydroelectric plants for not emitting carbon. The projects are not efficient. The measures taken by the public are not effective. Climate change is also a means for the legitimization of the renewable energy, like planting hydroelectric plants. There is a carbon emission trade, when you plant you win a quota, the state incentives you and sells this quota, there is a great economy. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

The NGO's have different focus points regarding climate change. While the representatives of TEMA and ÇMO focus on the depletion of natural resources due to climate change, Doğa Derneği emphasizes the choice energy production like plantation of hydroelectric power plants as renewable energy and calls it as a legitimization for the energy sector. The representatives of Doğa Derneği and TÇV are critical of the inequalities in terms of carbon emission. The representative of Greenpeace emphasizes the lack of policies in Turkey in terms of climate change.

Climate change is a very necessary issue but we forget things as a society. It is being affected by so many factors and also it affects many things. The effects of it approves that there is a problem; maybe this is good to show people that there is a treat. Climate change is not on government's agenda. There are ministries in charge of climate change abroad but we do not have in Turkey. There are not any researches about its effects in Turkey. These should be searched, people should be informed.

(Greenpeace, 2, volunteer)

Use of energy is a crucial issue in the world, the countries are looking for new resources of energy, some countries quit the energy sources like fossil fuels and prefer renewable energy. Turkey is also experiencing difficulties for its energy need and there are many debates about effects of the energy production on nature and local people and also about renewable energy. Regarding these, the respondents are asked if there is an energy problem in Turkey, what are their recommendations for solution, and how do they evaluate the developments about renewable energy in Turkey? The representative of ÇMO emphasizes Turkey's being dependent on foreign sources in energy production.

There is a significant need of energy in Turkey. Energy policies are not right. There is severe energy loss in Turkey, in a significant rate. Turkey should lessen this energy loss first of all, rather than planting many hydroelectric power plants. We are dependent on foreign sources. In terms of nuclear energy, for the inputs we will be more dependent like natural gas. (ÇMO, secretary)

The representative of Doğa Derneği is against to the energy production which is central.

As Doğa Derneği , we are against the energy production type which is central. In terms of electricity Turkey has many losses in the electricity production lines. We do not need so much energy for the industrial production since the production has decreased. Renewable energy means the nature is renewing itself. First of all, hydroelectric plants are not renewable since they affect the water, biological diversity.. Secondly, wind power when planted so much, also affects the humidity and heat rate in the air, hence affecting many species. Thirdly, is the solar, can used on top of the apartments. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

Like mentioned in the 3rd section ‘Perception of Human- Nature Relationship focusing on Energy Production’, the NGOs are against energy production like hydroelectric power plants or nuclear power plants. The representatives of CMO and Doğa Derneği emphasize that Turkey has many energy loss. Being different from the other NGOs, the representative of Doğa Derneği is against to energy which is central and also criticizes some types of renewable energy.

CHAPTER 6

APPROACHES OF NGOS ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF NGOS IN TURKEY

This chapter intends to clarify the approaches of the NGOs environmental policies and the effects of social and economic policies on nature in Turkey. Moreover, the approaches of the NGOs' about the environmental activities in Turkey and their connections with other environmental NGOs and local authorities is mentioned. The chapter is composed of two sections, in the first, NGOs' approaches about the policies will be clarified, and in the second section their approaches of the NGOs' about the environmental activities in Turkey and their connections is expounded.

6.1. Approaches of NGOs about Environmental Policies

In this part respondents' ideas about environmental policies and the effects of social and economic policies on nature in Turkey have been examined. Therefore, their ideas about decision makers about the environment, environmental legislation, the effects social and economic policies on the nature and their recommendations have been asked.

The NGOs are first of all asked their ideas about who were the decision makers about environmental issues? Is it science, politicians, industrialists or the environmentalists according to their opinions. According to the representatives of ÇMO and TEMA it is the politicians who take decision, but also NGOs should involve this.

First of all the related ministries take decisions; general directorate of state hydraulic works, ministry of environment and forestry, ministry of agriculture. NGOs should step in here, however the works of NGOs are not sufficient. There should be a civic involvement and knowledge about these works. (TEMA 1, volunteer, representative)

The representatives of TÇV and Doğa Derneği add big corporations to take the decisions.

Not only the politicians take the decisions, there are also big corporations, and international agencies like IMF, World Bank. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

The representative of Greenpeace emphasizes the responsibility of the NGOs in decision making. But also, claims that it is the duty of the state to protect the environment.

Protecting nature is a duty of the government agencies depending on constitutional security, current laws and regulations together with the NGOs. Moreover, individuals (individuals in an NGO or supporting an NGO) have responsibilities, to witness the destruction of the nature and to struggle legally to these destructions, joining in democratic and social processes. When we say democracy it is to be responsible citizenship to one's country, responsible of protecting nature; here freedom of organization is very important, we cannot talk

about democracy without freedom of organization. In terms of freedom of organization, the laws and the regulations are poor in Turkey. (Greenpeace, director)

The representatives of national NGOs think that the related ministries and administrative managements who take decisions. However, as an exception the representatives of TÇV, Doğa Derneği and Greenpeace think that economic forces also have effects on decision making. The representative of Greenpeace emphasizes the responsibility of the NGOs and individuals in decision making. Pepper mentions the different views of ‘Conventional’ and ‘Green’ values in terms of decision taking in the political dimension. The ‘Conventional values’, ‘politicians advised by scientists’ should take decisions, whereas ‘Greens’ think that people should take decisions by the advice of the experts but there should not be a ‘command of an authority of power’. (1996, 13) According to this comparison, Greenpeace’s view is likely to the ‘Green values’, whereas TÇV’s and ÇMO’s views are close to the ‘Conventional values’.

The NGOs’ ideas about the environmental legislation in Turkey is asked. The respondents agree that the current environmental legislation in Turkey is not sufficient or there are problems about the implementation of the legislation.

The representatives of ÇMO and TÇV claims that the environmental legislation in Turkey is sufficient if it is implemented.

The environmental legislation in Turkey is sufficient if it is implemented. There is a legal basis for environmental protection in the legislation. To enforce this legislation sometimes disadvantages private persons. (TÇV, secretary)

The 2nd representative of TEMA states that they confirm Turkey's adopting the European Union's Environmental legislation.

We support Turkey's adopting the European Union's Environmental legislation. Some adjustments might be necessary. We think that it is important to practice the decisions and to create a platform to question some decisions taken about environment if it is possible. (TEMA , head of department)

The representative of Greenpeace criticizes the environmental legislation in Turkey.

There was an environmental legislation in Turkey for the protection of nature but it has been undermined in last 10 years, like the new regulations that open nature protection zones to the energy plants. Moreover, current laws are not being enforced effectively. (Greenpeace, 1, director)

The NGOs are asked the effects of social policy implementations on the environmental problems and the economy policies' effects on the environmental policies. The respondents' perceptions about the effects of social policy implementations on the environmental problems are generally focused on the idea that if people do not have decent living then they would not care about the environment, and would harm the environment more. The representative of TÇV shares this view,

It is the role of the politics to arrange the balance between environment and social policies. If a person cannot make a living by a retirement pension, it is meaningless to mention environment, because that person would not even

think about it. It is the art of politics to provide a good life for the society, to carry out the economy, to budget for protecting environmental values. (TÇV, secretary)

The representatives of TEMA and TÇV mention the effects of economy policies on the environment.

Economic incentives, investments, new circles of trade, dams, fabrics all of these are sure going to be, however, if these have negative activities for the environment, the management groups should have to take preventive measures. (TÇV, secretary)

The representative of Greenpeace focuses on the justice for the people and the nature which CMO's representative shares.

Protecting nature is a patriarch structure, you separate human from the nature, and you protect it. It is like the protectionist approach like in the women's rights. In order to create a nature friendly society patriarch social system should be overcome. ..In last three years with the struggle for nature's rights, a social perception has been grown about the crimes against nature. The nature has to be set free from the slavery, people should achieve this, complete this phase. If we cannot complete this transformation, we will not be able to live in this world. In this regard, all of the struggles for justice should create synergy with the struggle for the nature. (Greenpeace, 1, director)

The representative of Greenpeace mentions the economic policies' effects on the nature.

There is 9% economic growth in Turkey. An economic growth like this would end in destruction of nature. Turkey has a special place and diversity in terms of its geography. Therefore, every economic activity we do in here, the economy based on growth and consumption would shatter nature. Turkey will not prevent this annihilation, if it does not quit this economy based on growth and consumption. It has to create quality economy. Forms of energy production should be transformed, wind and solar energy should be preferred, more investments should be made for energy efficiency to enliven economy. (Greenpeace, 1, director)

The representative of Greenpeace proposes the policies that struggle for the nature's rights rather than protecting nature and to transform the current economic policies to avoid the destruction of the nature. The representative of Doğa Derneği recommends taking decisions together with the people and also shares the opinion of the representatives of TEMA, TÇV and ÇMO that if the people do not have decent living then they would not care about the environment, and would harm the environment more. Pepper mentions the comparison of 'Conventional' and 'Green' values regarding the social, political and economic system, the 'Conventional values' state that the environmental problems can be solved without changing the social, political and economic system, however, 'Green values' claim that these systems should be changed in order to solve the environmental problems (1996, 13). In these terms, Greenpeace's ideas about the economic policies mentioned above are close to the 'Green values'.

6.2. Approaches of NGOs about the Activities of Environmental NGOs in Turkey

This section intends to clarify the approaches of the NGOs' about the environmental activities in Turkey and their connections with environmental NGOs and local authorities. First of all, respondents are asked if they cooperate with local governments, since the local environmental problems are often announced by the environmental NGOs struggles in cooperation with local governments. Secondly, the NGOs' connections with the national and international environmental NGOs is asked. Thirdly, their opinions about the activities of the environmental NGOs about the environment in Turkey and how do they evaluate these activities are asked. Finally, their recommendations for the environmental awareness in Turkey is mentioned.

Most of the NGOs cooperate with the local governments, but it depends on the content of their activity. For instance, the representative of ÇMO susally cooperates about the problems in the city.

Of course local governments, municipalities apply us when they recall for some sort of contribution. When there is a study about Atatürk Orman Çiftliği, for example, we would like to participate into it, or into another work of Çankaya municipality about the problem of water or recycling. Public institutions, provincial department of environment... even primary and high schools. They just call us when they work on the recycling issue. We cooparate with both local governments and institutions. (CMO, secretary)

The representative of TÇV states that they do not cooperate if their activity is an academic work.

It depends on the work itself. In some works, we of course cooperate with local governments as the work needed it. While conducting an academic work about biological diversity, it is meaningless to cooperate with them, though.
(TÇV, secretary)

Greenpeace cooperates with the local governments about the nuclear issue.

Although very little, we cooperate with local governments in accordance with existing possibilities. One of these is building Solar Energy in Akkoyun with local government, municipality and even the imam of the mosque before Nuclear Energy. (Greenpeace, 1, director)

The NGOs cooperate with other NGOs but it their company differs regarding they are a national, international or public NGO. For instance ÇMO cooperates more with the professional chambers, Greenpeace has more company with the international NGOs compared to nationals. TEMA is the only national NGO which has connections with international NGOs.

We come together with related professional chambers about engineering or architecture; with associations of civil engineers, landscape architects, city planners about environment; with association of meteorology engineers about air pollution. In addition, other charities, foundations and institutions about environment apply us when they request to make a work together. If their request is appropriate for us, we cooperate with them. We gave instructions about

environment with Yerel Yönetim Derneği and YAYEK 3 years ago, for example. In addition, we organize cooperative seminars with Kırsal Çevre and Ekoloji Kolektifi. (ÇMO, secretary)

Doğa Derneği cooperates with the local movements especially about the energy issues.

We cooperate with all the foundations that work on the issue of water like and participate in the campaigns like 'Anadolu'yu Vermeyeceğiz' or Dam of Munzur. In fact, we are a member of Türkiye Su Meclisi (Turkish Water Parliment). We work on nuclear and on hydroelectric power plants with Greenpeace. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

The representative of TEMA claims that works with other organizations within the projects.

There has been a constitution including TEMA, Buğday, Çekül that has lasted about one and a half year. We worked with Doğa Koruma Merkezi in Kaçkar Project. We are also member of many international umbrella organizations. We are included to some of the institutions and agreements of United Nations like the ones about climate change and desertification. In addition to these, we try to follow the developments and projects. (TEMA, head of department)

Greenpeace has active cooperation with international and national organizations and platforms.

We have signed the manistation of International NGOs, INGO Charter so we perform international standarts. We are also a member of CIVICUS. In national level, we are member of GDO'ya Hayır Platformu, Nükleer Karşımı Platform. We also cooperate with some civil movements like KEG. In addition to this, colloborate with about our fish campaign. We are trying to cooperate as it raises the power.
(Greenpeace, 1, director)

The respondents' opinions about the activities of the environmental NGOs in Turkey are asked. The evaluation of the respondent were different, while national NGOs except Doğa Derneği are hopeful about the efforts of the NGOs in Turkey, Greenpeace and Doğa Derneği and Greenpeace complain about the problems about financial issues and reaching people.

In Turkey, none of them are effective and sufficient including us. We have a difficulty with reaching people because of economic problems.
(Doğa Derneği, Director)

However national NGOs think differently. The representative of TEMA thinks that the efforts and the effectiveness of the NGOs will grow in time.

As these are new ideas for our country, I am hopeful about the future. There is not enough work yet, however. The environmental organizations should be more related to each other and move together. Of course the attitude of each organization is different. They may be activist, reactive or radical. TEMA is rather more lenient and follow the way of science and law. The first aim of us is to add combating with soil erosion to the political schedule and a lobby work is needed in here. We have a tolerant

attitude towards this issue. Turkey is at the bottom of the ladder now and a slow movement has begun. The ideas of NGOs are becoming more important now. (TEMA 1, volunteer, representative)

The respondents are asked if they think the NGOs are effective in solving the environmental problems in Turkey. Respondents intend to have the opinion that the NGOs are not effective in solving problems.

The representative of ÇMO emphasizes the local protests' efforts that are effective.

In the local level, there are of course many effective and challenging unions some of which had serious rights. Wide range of protests about rivers and hydroelectric power plants, for example. There are also ineffective foundations, though. (ÇMO, secretary)

The representative of TÇV states that NGOs are not authorised in solving problems, which is caused by managing dilemma.

As there is no power in these NGOs, they are not 100 % authorised. In fact, they direct public opinion and evoke reactions. As they are not commercial associations, they have economic difficulties. And each organization desire to settle up the problem alone which is an inevitable psychology, so cooperation is something depends on choice. (TÇV, secretary)

Lastly, the respondents' recommendations about to raise awareness about environment in Turkey is asked. Respondents have different ideas, ÇMO proposes political improvements about environment, Doğa Derneği emphasizes the importance of unionization of the local people to form an environment movement rather than the NGOs. Likely, Greenpeace 1 mentions the political formation of the NGOs in Turkey. Whereas, TCV proposes the other means for raising awareness such as publications, conferences. The representative of ÇMO recommends the application of the environmental policies in an accurate way.

As a professional chamber, our primary goal is to protect and develop our profession and then to protect our environment and natural resources. We suggest to perform correct environmental policies, to strengthen control mechanisms, and by this to hand down a healthy environment and nature to the next generations. The awareness about the environment is very low in Turkey. Thus, in accordance with the demand of primary schools, we organize trainings about recycling and pollution to little students. It is important to gain consciousness protecting nature and the situation of our world in an early age. Economic development should be regarding the examination of energy and environmental policies. For the safety of the future generations, and cost benefit analysis should be considered for the environment. Politics should be organized in accordance with the idea of sustainability. Our people should be educated when they are younger. Without environment, we can not survive. This consciousness should be thought to everyone including even a 50-year-old person.
(ÇMO, secretary)

The representative of Doğa Derneği focuses of the unionization of the local people for the movement of nature.

What is going on about environment in Turkey is not because of the success of NGOs, but the effort of local people. Something becomes important when people pay the price for it. Now, the movement has started because of this situation, as the local people unionized instead of NGOs. Thus, now there is the movement of nature which does not take a political side. (Doğa Derneği, Director)

The representative of TÇV's recommendations for raising awareness are totally different from other NGOs.

It is possible by publishing books, organizing conferences, public statement. There are a lot of means to enlighten and direct public opinion like the trendy web pages. (TÇV, secretary)

The representative of Greenpeace emphasizes the need for a political formation in order to enlarge the efficiency of the NGOs.

There is a need for a political formation that has not been marginalized in Turkey. The NGOs fulfill their duties to some extent, however without this political formation, the political structure empower which perpetuate the socio-economic structures our sphere of influence becomes smaller. So does social transition. Therefore, this political organization in Turkey should be improved. (Greenpeace, director)

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. Conclusion

In this thesis, the representatives of the environmental non-governmental organizations' perceptions about the human and nature relationship in Turkey is tried to be studied. The representatives of the NGOs perceptions were different depending on the different dimensions and their being a national, internationl and professional NGOs.

The representatives of the national NGOs tend to perceive the nature for the human benefit, whereas for the representative of the international NGO it is protecting nature for its own right. As a general perception of the human-nature relationship, according to Pepper's classification, all the respondents are like minded about the idea that 'humans are part of nature'. However, they have also the same opinion that human's control on the nature and that human destroys the nature. There is a tendency for the representatives of nationally active and public NGOs perceiving nature as a sphere where there are natural resources that are crucial for the living of the humans, however humans damage, pollute the nature as their population increases, therefore the nature has to be protected. On the other hand, as an international NGO, the representative of Greenpeace and an exceptional national NGO, the representative of Doğa Derneği share the view that nature has its own rights and humans should live in harmony with nature which is close to the 'Green values' of Peppers' typology.

The national NGOs tend to be affected from the national dynamics about nature, like the use of the natural resources for the development. For the international NGOs the global dynamics are more important. According to the human- nature relationship in terms of production and consumption, all NGOs share the view

that economic growth and so the production and consumption processes have negative effects on the nature. However, there are significant differences, between the ideas of the representatives of national and international NGOs and even between national NGOs.

To sum up, regarding the perceptions of the representatives of the national NGOs, their main focus is the human, they perceive the human-nature relationship referring to the nature's supplies to the human beings, rather than perceiving nature from the green perspective as mentioned by Pepper. The participants' perceptions change regarding the different approaches like economy, energy production, etc. Every NGO has a different focus point regarding the approaches. On the other hand, the views of the representative of Doğa Derneği are close to the Green values like the representative of Greenpeace, an international NGO.

There are also significant points that are mentioned or not mentioned by the representatives. The gender issue is not mentioned in the in-depth interviews. The labor issue is also one the points that not acknowledged by the participants. There is a common view that it is the government who is responsible from the protection of the environment. Regarding the role of the NGOs in protecting nature and creating solutions for the protection of the nature, is it questionable why they see the state as the responsible body to protect the nature. The participants mention the need for research for the biodiversity loss, they claim that the state is the responsible body.

7.2. Policy Recommendations

Regarding the Millennium Development Goals 2011, for Environmental Sustainability, and there are targets defined, regarding these targets some policy recommendations have been mentioned. First of all, regarding these targets the environmental policies should be developed. Environmental policies should consider nature more regarding the human-nature relationship since the protection

of nature will result in the protection of the human life. Environmental policies should be regarding to the international criterias.

Moreover, the people should be informed to be aware of the severeness of the environmental problems. For instance, this can start from the primary school for the children.

This research's aim was to search for the perceptions of the environmental NGOs through the perceptions of the representatives of the NGOs. However, it has been acknowledged in the recommendation of the policies part that the representatives of the NGOs regard the state as the responsible body from the protection of the environment. Therefore, for the further researches I recommend to study the perceptions of the governmental bodies regarding the human-nature relationship and policies.

REFERENCES

- Adem, Ç., 2005, Non-state Actors and Environmentalization, (ed.) Adaman, F.,
- Arsel, M., Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development?, Ashgate Publishing Limited, England.
- Armstrong, S. J., Botzler, R.G., 2004, Environmental Ethics, McGraw-Hill, New York
- Ataüz, A., 2000, Çevreci Sivil Toplum Hareketinin Yakın Tarihi, in: Türkiye'de Çevrenin ve Çevre Korumanın Tarihi Sempozyumu, Tarih Vakfı.
- Barry, J., 1999, Environment and Social Theory, Routledge, London
- Baykan, B.,G., Paker, H., May 2008, Türkiye'de Çevre ve Sivil Toplum: Örgütlenme ve Son Eğilimler, Betam Araştırma Notu, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, 18/8
- Buttel, F.H., Humphrey, C.R., 2002, Sociological Theory and the Natural Environment, (ed.) Dunlap, R.E., Michelson, W., Hnadbook of Environmental Sociology, Greenwood Press, London
- Castree, N., Braun, B. (ed.), 2001, Social Nature, Blackwell Publishers, USA
- Demirer, G. N. et al.,1999, Radikal Ekolojik Akımlar Üzerine Düşünceler, (ed.) Demirer G. N. et al., Ve Kirlendi Dünya, Öteki Yayınevi, Ankara
- Devall, B., 2004, The Deep , Long-Range Ecology Movement: 1960-2000-A Review, (ed.) in Armstrong, S. J., Botzler, R.G., Environmental Ethics, McGraw-Hill, New York
- Dobson, A., 1995, Green Political Thought, Routledge, London and New York
- Frey, S.R., 2001, Environment and Society, A Pearson Education Company, USA
- Hannigan, J., 2006, Environmental Sociology, Routledge, London and New York
- Keleş, R., Hamamcı, C., Çoban, A., 2009, Çevre Politikası, İmge Kitapevi Yayıncıları, Ankara
- Kışlalioğlu, M., Berkes, F., 2010, Çevre ve Ekoloji, Remzi Kitapevi, İstanbul

Martell, L., 1994, Ecology and Society: An Introduction, Rethinking Relationship between Society and Nature, Polity Press.

Naess., A., 1995, The Deep Ecological Movement, (ed.) in Sessions.,G.,Deep Ecology for the 21st Century, Shambhala Publications, Boston

Naess, A., 1989, Ecology, Community and Lifestyle, Cambridge University Press, UK

O'Riordan, T.,1976, Environmentalism, Pion Limited, London

Özerkmen, N., 2002, From Antropocentric Perspective to Eco- Centric Perspective, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi, 42,1-2, pp. 167-185

Pepper,D., 1996, Modern Environmentalism, Routledge, London

Pojman, L. P., 2000, Global Environmental Ethics, Mayfield Publishing Company, California

Redclift., M., Benton, T.,1994, Social Theory and the Global Environment, Routledge, London and New York

Tamkoç, G., 1994, (ed.) Doğa ile Bütünleşme, Derin Ekoloji, Ege Yayıncılık, İzmir

Tekeli, İ., 2000, Türkiye Çevre Tarihçiliğine Açılrken, Türkiye'de Çevrenin ve Çevre Korumanın Tarihi Sempozyumu, Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 1-14

Tuna, M., 2000 Güz, Çevresel Sorunların Küreselleşmesi, SBE Dergisi, Cilt:1 Sayı:2, 1-16

Tuna, M., 2004, Public Environmental Attitudes in Turkey, Mugla University Department of Sociology, Mugla, Turkey, 1-16

UNEP, 2011, Millennium Development Goals Report. Retrieved from, <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/reports.shtml>

Websites of the NGOs

<http://www.cevre.org.tr/>

<http://www.greenpeace.org/turkey/tr/about/history/greenpeace-akdeniz-in-tarih-es/>

<http://www.cmo.org.tr/index.php/odamz/kurulus>

<http://english.tema.org.tr/Sayfalar/Hakkimizda/AmacVeHedefler.html>

<http://english.tema.org.tr/Sayfalar/Hakkimizda/Tarihce.html>

<http://www.dogadernegi.org/hakkimizda.aspx>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Question Form

This research is done for the masters' thesis of Middle East Technical University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Program of Social Policy. The aim of this study is to search for the conceptualizations of human-nature relationship of the representatives of the environmental Non-governmental Organizations' (NGO) in Turkey.

NGOs,

Name:

Address:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Web site:

Respondent's,

1. Name:

2. Title and Status:

3. Educational Status:

4. Activity scale of the NGO:

- [1] In one city
- [2] More than one city
- [3] International

5. Who are the founders of your NGO? How it was founded?

6. What are the aims of your NGO?

Information about the members of the NGO

7. Number of the members in the NGO

8. Which one of the below is the predominant age group of the members in your NGO?

- [1] Between 18-30
- [2] Between 31-50 ages
- [3] More than 50

9. Which one of the below is the predominant sex?

- [1] Female
- [2] Male
- [3] Approximately the same

10. Which one of the below is the predominant education level of the members in your NGO?

- [1] Primary school graduate
- [2] High school graduate
- [3] University graduate

The activities/projects of the NGO

11. What are the activities of your NGO in the year 2011? Could you say the 5 most important activities? What are their aims?

Activity	Aim

12. Which of the areas below are the activity areas of your NGO? Could you rank the activities in terms of their importance for your NGO?

Area	Yes	No	Ranking
Natural resources	[1]	[2]	
Forest	[1]	[2]	
Erosion	[1]	[2]	
Soil/ Agriculture/Organic agriculture	[1]	[2]	
Food/Seed/Gnetically modified organisms	[1]	[2]	
Sea/Coasts/Fisheries	[1]	[2]	
Water/ Dams	[1]	[2]	
Climate change	[1]	[2]	
Energy	[1]	[2]	
Nuclear	[1]	[2]	
Wastes/ Recycling	[1]	[2]	
Biological diversity	[1]	[2]	
Animal rights	[1]	[2]	
Eco tourism	[1]	[2]	
Others (Please explain)	[1]	[2]	

I. General view of human and nature relationship

13. How do you define nature?

14. What is the position of the human beings in their relationship with nature?

15. Human beings are social and cultural beings. What do you think about the effect of the bio-physical environment on the human beings?

16. Do you think that the nature needs to be protected? Why?

Is nature capable of renewing itself against the effects?

II. Views about the natural resources

17. What are the natural resources? Why do you think the resources should be protected?

18. What are the main environmental problems about the natural resources?

19. What are the problems about the water resources? What do you think about accessing clean water?

20. What are the factors that affect the soil fertility?

21. What is the main reason of the deforestation?

22. What is biological diversity?

23. What are the factors leading to climate change?

III. Views about science, technology and energy

24. How do you evaluate the relationship between the natural resources and the energy?

25. How do you evaluate the effect of the technological developments on the nature?

26. How do you evaluate the effect of the scientific thought on the nature?

27. Do you think that the renewable energy forms can be a solution for a sustainable environment?

IV. Views about economy and production/consumption

28. How do you evaluate the relationship between economic development and nature?

29. How do you evaluate the relationship between industry and nature?

30. How do you evaluate the effect of the agricultural sector on the nature?

31. What do you think about the effects of the consumption habits on the nature?

V. Views and recommendations about the sustainable environment

32. What is the sustainable development?

33. Is it important to protect the natural resources for the sustainable development? Why?

34. What do think about the arguments about Turkey's being a rich country of its water resources?

35. What are the problems of Turkey in terms of water resources?
What are your recommendations?

36. What is the importance of the forests in Turkey? Why?
Is there any risk of deforestation in Turkey? What are your recommendations?

37. What do you think about biological diversity in Turkey? What are the problems of Turkey in terms of biological diversity? What are your recommendations?

38. What do you think about the organic agriculture in Turkey? How does organic agriculture affect the nature?

39. What is your comment about the situation of Turkey in terms of climate change? What is your comment about the measures taken about climate change in Turkey? What are your recommendations?

40. What are the effects of the industrial production on the nature in Turkey? What are the measures can be taken?

41 Do you think that Turkey has a energy problem? If yes, could you explain?
What do you think about the existing solutions about energy production? What are your recommendations? What do you think about the renewable energy in Turkey?

VI. Views about Policies

42. Who do you think are the decision makers about the environmental issues?

43. What do you think about the current environmental legislation in Turkey?

45. How do the social policy implementations affect the environmental problems? What is your comment regarding Turkey?

46. How do the policies of economy affect the environmental policies? What is your comment regarding Turkey?

47. What are your recommendations in terms of social and economic policies in Turkey?

VII. Views about NGOs and environment

48. Do you cooperate with local authorities? Could you give example?

49. Do you cooperate with other nevironmental NGOs? Could you give example in terms of national and international NGOs?

50. What are your comments about the activities of the environmental NGOs in Turkey?

51. Do you think that environmental NGOs are effective for the solution of the environmental problems in Turkey?

52. What are your recommendations as an NGO for the raise awareness of environment in Turkey?

THANK YOU

APPENDIX B: Information about the NGOs

DOĞA DERNEĞİ

Foundation: DoğaDerneği (Association of Nature) was founded by bird watchers in 2002. Their study starts with important bird habitats, later natural areas are the most important sphere of their study. Their chief office is in Ankara, and they maintain their communication and campaign works from İstanbul. In Antalya, Burdur, Hasankeyf and Birecik there are representative offices.

Aim: Their aim is to protect crucial natural areas regarding nature and human as a whole. Their vision is to create a world that is human respects to all living creatures and ecological entirety, and adopts a life style which does not require protection of nature.

Retrieved from <http://www.dogadernegi.org/hakkimizda.aspx>

Socio-demographic characteristics: The members of the NGO are young, between 18-30 years of age, the population of males and females are approximately the same, and are university graduates. Protection of the species and areas like Delta of Gediz and Kızılırmak, Burdur Lake and Campaign of Hasankeyf are the activities of DoğaDerneği in the last year.

Sphere of activity: Biological diversity, water and dams and animal rights are the primary activity spheres of DoğaDerneği.

TEMA (THE TURKISH FOUNDATION FOR COMBATING FOR SOIL EROSION, FOR REFORESTATION AND THE PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS)

Foundation: Türkiye Erozyonla Mücadele, Ağaçlandırma ve Doğal Varlıklar Koruma Vakfı (TEMA), The Turkish Foundation for Combating for Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats was founded in 1992 by Hayrettin Karaca and Nihat Gökyiğit. Hayrettin Karaca founded the first private Arboretum of Turkey, searched for Turkish wild life species, and especially plants from all over the country. He decided to do something about erosion, extinction of plant varieties, forest fires, and impairment of croplands.

Retrieved form <http://english.tema.org.tr/Sayfalar/Hakkimizda/Tarihce.html>

Aim: Increase awareness of environmental problems, engage in capacity building for their solution. Promote protection of natural habitats and ecosystem conservation of water resources and vegetative cover of the soil, sustainable use of agricultural lands and rangelands. Support establishment of national policies friendly to the protection of biodiversity, sustainable use of lands and rational management of water resources. Develop models for action to combat soil erosion in impoverished rural areas of Turkey and inspire the implementation of similar models in other parts of the country. Establish the necessary organization and legislation with the support of volunteers in order to achieve the goal of stopping soil erosion. Retrieved from

<http://english.tema.org.tr/Sayfalar/Hakkimizda/AmacVeHedefler.html>

Socio-demographic characteristics: The members of TEMA are between 31-50 years of age, female members are more than male members, and the members are generally high school graduates. In last year TEMA had activities about 2B Law, 'Minik TEMA', 'Little TEMA' about soil, and awareness raising.

Sphere of activity: Soil erosion, soil, forests are most important activity spheres of TEMA.

ÇEVRE MÜHENDİSLERİ ODASI (CHAMBER OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERS)

Foundation: Environment Engineering has emerged as a professional discipline in 1980, has been leagued together in Chamber of Civil Engineers. The Association of Environmental Engineering was founded in 1986, and due to their efforts for strengthening their colleagues togetherness their solidarity and their organization, Chamber of Environmental Engineers has been founded in 1992.

Retrieved from <http://www.cmo.org.tr/index.php/odamz/kurulus>

Aim: The aims of Chamber of Civil Engineers is to defend colleagues' rights, benefit of society and environment. First of all, to think for the benefit of society, for the professional problems, and then to protect the environment for the benefit of the society, to maintain sustainable development.

Socio-demographic characteristics: Their members are between 31-50 years of age, the number of females and males are approximately the same, and are university graduates since it is a professional chamber. Symposium of Environmental Resistances, panels and workshop about environment are the activities of CMO in the last year.

Sphere of activity: Natural resources, soil, water and dams, climate change, energy, nuclear and biodiversity are most important activity spheres of CMO.

GREENPEACE

Foundation: Since 1986, the ships of Greenpeace were working in Mediterranean in order to search environmental problems, meet the public and the local authorities, rise awareness and to make direct actions. Regarding the importance of need of Greenpeace in this area Greenpeace Mediterranean was founded in 1995 being composed of Israel, Lebanon, Malta, and Turkey.

Aim:

To support clean energy by protesting against the use of fossil fuels and nuclear
To ensure the adoption of renewable energy sources in struggle of climate change
To protect thunnusorientalis in danger of extinction by a sea campaign

Retrieved from <http://www.greenpeace.org/turkey/tr/about/history/greenpeace-akdeniz-in-tarih-es/>

Socio-demographic characteristics: Greenpeace does not have a certain information about the socio-demographic characteristics of its members. Campaigns about climate change and protection of the seas are the activities of Greenpeace in last year.

Sphere of activity: Climate change, energy, nuclear, and biological diversity are the most important activity spheres of Greenpeace.

TÜRKİYE ÇEVRE VAKFI (ENVIRONMENTAL FOUNDATION OF TURKEY)

Foundation: Türkiye Çevre Vakfı (TÇV), Environment Foundation of Turkey was founded in 1978. In 33 years they have published publications, done researches, training programmes, comparative legislation studies, public training studies.

Retrieved from <http://www.cevre.org.tr/>

Aim: The aims of TÇV is to make researches about environment, to inform public, focused on the topics: environmental management, environmental impact assessment, biological diversity, renewable energy, and energy-environment relationships.

Socio-demographic characteristics: The members of TÇV are generally up to 50 years of age and are generally males, and university graduates. Activities about environmental legislation, contact meetings about wind energy, studies about renewable energy and about smes' expectations about environment are the last year activities of TÇV.

Sphere of activity: Indicated as the 'other' option, legislation, energy, and climate change are the most important activity spheres of TÇV.