

THE APPROACH OF THE UNDP TO POVERTY REDUCTION: THE CASE OF  
TURKEY

A Master's Thesis

by  
TUĞÇE ŞENOL

Department of  
International Relations  
Bilkent University  
Ankara  
July 2009

THE APPROACH OF THE UNDP TO POVERTY REDUCTION: THE CASE OF  
TURKEY

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences  
of  
Bilkent University

by

TUĞÇE ŞENOL

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

July 2009

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----  
Assistant Prof. Gülgün Tuna  
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----  
Assistant Prof. Pınar İpek  
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----  
Assistant Prof. Saime Özçürümez Bölükbaşı  
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

-----  
Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel  
Director

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE APPROACH OF THE UNDP TO POVERTY REDUCTION: THE CASE OF TURKEY**

Şenol, Tuğçe

M.A., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Gülgün Tuna

July 2009

This thesis analyzes the approach of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as a well-known international organization in the field of development regarding the issue of poverty reduction. Throughout this thesis, where the issues of development and poverty stand in the United Nations' agenda and the role of the UNDP as well as its contributions to the development field will be discussed. An outline of the theoretical framework and the rhetorical position of the UNDP concerning the issue of poverty reduction will be presented. Finally, how the UNDP approach works in practice with its projects for reducing poverty and whether its perspective concerning reducing poverty in a country is compatible with its rhetorical and theoretical position will be examined.

In this sense, UNDP Turkey's projects aiming at reducing poverty will be analyzed as an exemplary case. This thesis reveals that the UNDP is more aligned with the "Post-Washington Consensus" (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective and this feature of the UNDP places itself in an alternative position in a global economic order which is predominantly based on liberal economic perspectives. This thesis concludes that the framework of the UNDP Turkey's projects concerning reducing poverty mostly overlaps with the UNDP's overall approach to poverty reduction presented in Chapter 4 and its theoretical position discussed in Chapter 3; however, it should be noted that the rationale of some of these projects is not totally independent of the dominant liberal economic perspectives.

**Keywords:** Poverty Reduction, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

## ÖZET

### BİRLEŞMİŞ MİLLETLER KALKINMA PROGRAMI'NIN YOKSULLUĞUN AZALTILMASINA YAKLAŞIMI: TÜRKİYE ÖRNEĞİ

Şenol, Tuğçe

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülgün Tuna

Temmuz 2009

Bu çalışma, kalkınma alanında tanınmış bir uluslararası örgüt olarak Birleşmiş Milletler Kalkınma Programı'nın (BMKP) yoksulluğun azaltılmasıyla ilgili yaklaşımını analiz etmektedir. Bu çalışma boyunca, kalkınma ve yoksulluk konularının Birleşmiş Milletler'in gündeminde nerede durduğu ve BMKP'nin kalkınma alanına olan katkılarıyla birlikte BMKP'nin rolü tartışılacaktır. Teorik çerçevenin planı ve yoksulluğun azaltılmasıyla ilgili olarak BMKP'nin söylemsel pozisyonu sunulacaktır. Son olarak, BMKP'nin yoksulluğun azaltılması için projeleriyle pratikte nasıl çalıştığı ve bir ülkede yoksulluğun azaltılmasıyla ilgili perspektifinin söylemsel ve teorik pozisyonuyla uyumlu olup olmadığı incelenecektir. Bu bağlamda, BMKP Türkiye'nin yoksulluğu azaltmayı amaçlayan projeleri örnek vaka olarak analiz edilecektir.

Bu çalışma, BMKP'nin daha çok "Washington Uzlaşması Sonrası" (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspektifiyle aynı çizgide durduğunu ve BMKP'nin bu özelliğinin, ağırlıklı olarak liberal ekonomik perspektifler üzerine dayanan küresel ekonomik düzen içerisinde kendisini alternatif bir pozisyona yerleştirdiğini göstermektedir. Bu çalışma, BMKP Türkiye'nin yoksulluğun azaltılmasıyla ilgili projelerinin çerçevesinin büyük ölçüde 4. Bölüm'de sunulan BMKP'nin yoksulluğun azaltılmasına olan kapsamlı yaklaşımıyla ve 3. Bölüm'de tartışılan teorik pozisyonuyla örtüşmekte olduğu sonucuna varmaktadır; bununla birlikte, bu projelerden bazılarının mantığının baskın liberal ekonomik perspektiflerden tamamiyle bağımsız olmadığına da dikkat edilmelidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yoksulluğun Azaltılması, Birleşmiş Milletler Kalkınma Programı (BMKP)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ÖZET .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER II: THE ISSUES OF DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY FROM THE UN PERSPECTIVE AND THE UNDP .....	4
2.1 The Issues of Development and Poverty From the UN Perspective .....	4
2.1.1 How the Issue of Development Matters For the UN .....	4
2.1.2 The Millennium Development Goals .....	9
2.1.3 The Approach of the UN to the Issue of Poverty .....	11
2.2 The UNDP and Its Contributions to the Development Field .....	15
2.2.1 The Role of the UNDP .....	15
2.2.2 UNDP Publications and Indices .....	17
2.2.3 The Concept of “Human Development” .....	21
CHAPTER III: ANALYZING THE UNDP APPROACH WITHIN A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE .....	23
3.1 Theoretical Background .....	24
3.1.1 Liberalism and Its Basic Tenets .....	24
3.1.2 Neoliberalism .....	26
3.1.3 “Post-Washington Consensus” Perspective .....	27
3.2 Explaining the UNDP Approach In A Theoretical Framework .....	31
3.2.1 How Does the UNDP Differ?: Divergences From the Dominant	



Economic Perspectives .....	31
3.2.2 Some Arguments On the UNDP Approach .....	33
CHAPTER IV: THE UNDP APPROACH TO THE ISSUE OF POVERTY REDUCTION .....	37
4.1 Definition(s) of Poverty .....	38
4.2 Human Poverty Index .....	41
4.3 The UNDP Approach to the Issue of Poverty Reduction .....	45
4.4 UNDP In Practice: Example Cases From Zimbabwe, South Africa and Algeria .....	52
4.5 Different Views On the Issue of Poverty Reduction .....	55
4.6 A General Evaluation .....	58
CHAPTER V: THE UNDP TURKEY AND POVERTY REDUCTION .....	60
5.1 Poverty In Turkey .....	61
5.1.1 The Problem of Poverty In Turkey .....	61
5.1.2 The Perspective of the UNDP Turkey .....	65
5.2 Analysis of the Projects of the UNDP Turkey Concerning Poverty Reduction .....	68
5.2.1 Projects of the UNDP Turkey Concerning Poverty Reduction .....	68
5.2.2 Analysis of the UNDP Turkey's Projects Concerning Poverty Reduction .....	87
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION .....	92
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	96

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Conferences of the United Nations .....	6
2. The List of the Millennium Development Goals .....	9
3. A Global Picture of Poverty .....	13
4. Malnourishment As a Worldwide Problem .....	13
5. Human Development Reports According to Their Subjects .....	18
6. The Stand of the UNDP Among All Other International Organizations .....	36
7. Poverty From Various Aspects .....	40
8. Countries According to “Human Poverty” .....	42
9. Some Countries’ Performances In “Human Poverty” .....	45
10. The UNDP and Its Proposals For Reducing Poverty .....	48
11. A General Picture of the Prioritization of the Problem of Poverty .....	51
12. Worldwide Efforts For Reducing Poverty .....	52
13. A General Picture of Economic Well-being In Turkey As of Regions .....	62
14. The Problem of Poverty In Turkey .....	63
15. The List of the UNDP Turkey’s Projects Concerning Poverty Reduction .....	68

# **CHAPTER 1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The United Nations (UN) has been playing an important role in dealing with many different areas and changing issues of the international arena ever since its foundation. In today's world, its role and influence has been increasing in line with the need for nation-states to take a collective and a more effective stand against various global issues.

Poverty is one of the issues that the UN has been intensively dealing with; it also constitutes one of the most serious problems that the world has failed to find a remedy for. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been working on the possible remedies for reducing poverty worldwide. Under the umbrella of the UN, the UNDP has an approach of its own in dealing with development issues, particularly on poverty reduction. In this sense, the main objective of this study is to analyze the particular approach of the UNDP to the issue of poverty reduction. This study is composed of four chapters. The first chapter will initially emphasize where the issues of development and poverty stand in the UN's

agenda and then its focus will shift to the role of the UNDP as well as its contributions to the development field. In the second chapter, the major aim is to discuss the theoretical framework of the UNDP approach to the issues of development and poverty. The third chapter will include the specific UNDP perspective on dealing with the problem of poverty and present the proposals of the UNDP for poverty reduction. The fourth and the final chapter will be constructed on the UNDP approach to poverty reduction in a specific country. Within the scope of this chapter, UNDP Turkey's perspective to the problem of poverty in Turkey as well as its projects concerning reducing poverty will be analyzed and assessed.

This study aims at analyzing the approach of the UNDP to dealing with the problem of poverty both rhetorically and in practice. The research question that will be examined throughout this thesis is that: Are the UNDP's projects in practice compatible with its theoretical and rhetorical position vis-a-vis the issue of poverty reduction? Within the scope of this thesis, this research question can be narrowed down and also formulated as follows: Does the UNDP Turkey's projects concerning poverty reduction reflect the UNDP's relevant theoretical and rhetorical position? In the light of this objective, Chapter 2 touches upon where the issues of development and poverty stand in the UN's agenda and underlines the role of the UNDP as well as its contributions to the development field. Chapter 3 draws an outline of the theoretical framework and Chapter 4 presents the rhetorical position of the UNDP concerning the issue of poverty reduction. Chapter 5 focuses on how the UNDP approach works in practice with its projects for reducing poverty and whether its perspective concerning reducing poverty in a country is compatible with its rhetorical and theoretical position.

In this sense, UNDP Turkey's projects aiming at reducing poverty will be analyzed as an exemplary case in Chapter 5. In other words, this study is an attempt to understand the perspective of the UNDP as a well-known international organization in the field of development regarding the issue of poverty reduction.

This study is significant in the sense that it intensively touches upon the issue of poverty which some regions in the world, particularly some countries in the international arena and even some developed countries suffer from and experience in various degrees. The issue of poverty is of great importance since it constitutes the common concern of all mankind as well as the most serious economic and social problem mostly developing countries have been suffering from. International organizations play an important role in supporting the efforts of developing countries in their fight against poverty. This study fills an important gap in the literature in the sense that the publications directly related with the UNDP's approach to poverty reduction have been smaller in amount compared to other international organizations, particularly the World Bank.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **THE ISSUES OF DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY FROM THE UN PERSPECTIVE AND THE UNDP**

The major aim of this chapter is to draw the framework of how the UN perceives the issues of development and poverty. After this general outline of the UN's approach to these issues, the focal point of this chapter will shift to the importance of the UNDP. In this sense, firstly, the role of the UNDP and secondly, its effects on the global development agenda will be presented.

#### **2.1 THE ISSUES OF DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY FROM THE UN PERSPECTIVE**

##### **2.1.1 How the Issue of Development Matters For the UN**

Karns and Mingst (2004: 97) underline the fact that “Since World War 2, the United Nations has been the central piece of global governance. It is the only IGO with global scope and nearly universal membership whose agenda encompasses the broadest range of governance issues.” Given this significant position of the UN in the international arena (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 97), the issues that can find a place in

the UN's global agenda are considered to be of great importance since they become a part of the group of issues taking most of the attention worldwide.

The development issue has been occupying a very crucial role in the UN's global agenda. One of the significant indicators of this role is the recent UN publication dedicated only to the issue of development which is called "The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All" (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007). This publication (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007) clearly draws the framework of the UN's perspective as well as its priorities in development issues and covers many issues ranging from "combating HIV/AIDS and other major diseases" to "reducing poverty"; from "climate change" to "migration" and from "education and training" to "gender equality". This brings us to the conclusion that the UN embraces and draws attention to many different global issues under the umbrella term "The United Nations Development Agenda" (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007).

Another important signal of the influential position of development-related issues in the UN's agenda is the wide number of "conferences and summits" entitled with issues in the development field as shown in Table 1 (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 3). The World Summit For Social Development (Department of Economic and

Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 5), the International Conference On Financing For Development (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 6) and the Millennium Summit (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 7) are some of the examples of the UN's summit and conference series that are very much related with the field of development.

**Table 1: Conferences of the United Nations**

<b>Global Conferences and Summits</b>	
<b>Event</b>	<b>Year</b>
Children	1990, 2002
Education For All	1990, 2000
Least Developed Countries	1990, 2001
Drug Problem	1990, 1998
Food Security	1992, 1996
Sustainable Development	1992, 2002
Human Rights	1993, 2001
Population and Development	1994
Small Island Developing States	1994, 2005
Natural Disaster Reduction	1994, 2005
Women	1995, 2005
Social Development	1995, 2005
Human Settlements	1996, 2001
Youth	1998
Millennium Summit	2000, 2005
HIV / AIDS	2001
Financing For Development	2002



**Table 1 (cont'd)**

Ageing	2002
Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries	2003
Information Society	2003, 2005

**Source:** Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2007. "Global Conferences and Summits." In *The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All Goals, Commitments and Strategies Agreed At the United Nations World Conferences and Summits Since 1990*. New York: United Nations, 3.

In "The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All" (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 1), it is mentioned that:

Although United Nations forums had long been the locus of policy debates, the conferences and summits of the past two decades were exceptional in responding to calls by leaders from many countries for the United Nations to more actively adopt the normative role outlined in the Charter by defining values, setting goals, articulating strategies and adopting programmes of action in the different dimensions of development.

This "normative role" (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 1) of the UN has been functioning to the extent that its current agenda draws the attention of other global actors and triggers further debate and activities for finding possible solutions and alternative remedies concerning relevant global problems. Furthermore, it is also emphasized that (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 79):

United Nations world summits and conferences have played a crucial role in raising awareness of issues, articulating goals and strategies, and mobilizing political will. They have engaged civil society and the private sector and influenced public opinion...The norms and policies articulated at these global conferences offer principles, standards and strategies to all countries committed to improving the well-being of their peoples.

In the light of all mentioned above (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 79), it can be concluded that the UN has been playing a very vital role in determining and highlighting the global problems that should be prioritized by each and every actor of international arena; from nation-states to international and regional organizations and from non-governmental organizations to multinational corporations. Through its “global conferences” and “summits”, the UN tries to succeed in setting the global agenda and emphasizing the remaining problems as well as seeking possible solutions (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 79).

Moreover, “The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All” (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 1) puts emphasis on Article 55 of the UN Charter. Article 55 (United Nations, Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice, 2003: 37) states that:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

- a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;
- b. solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational co-operation; and
- c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 55 (United Nations, Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice, 2003: 37) clearly defines and summarizes the UN’s responsibilities in achieving global improvement in social and economic conditions.

### 2.1.2 The Millennium Development Goals

The Millennium Summit and the Millennium Declaration can be considered as an important step for the UN in realizing its responsibilities and goals mentioned in Article 55 (United Nations, Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice, 2003: 37).

The Millennium Summit has probably been the most important one among all other UN summits and global conferences since it led to the creation of the widely known Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which attracted the attention of the other actors of the international arena (UNDP Official Website a). MDGs are composed of eight goals each touching upon different aspects of global problems as shown in Table 2 (UNDP Official Website a). Each goal underlines a very important global issue which has not been totally and successfully overcome yet. 2015 has been declared as the deadline for the achievement of these goals (UNDP Official Website a).

**Table 2: The List of the Millennium Development Goals**

<b>Millennium Development Goals</b>
<b>Goal 1</b> Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
<b>Goal 2</b> Achieve universal primary education
<b>Goal 3</b> Promote gender equality and empower women
<b>Goal 4</b> Reduce child mortality
<b>Goal 5</b> Improve maternal health

**Table 2 (cont'd)**

<b>Goal 6</b> Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
<b>Goal 7</b> Ensure environmental sustainability
<b>Goal 8</b> Develop a global partnership for development

**Source:** UNDP Official Website a.

It is also underlined that (UNDP Official Website a): “The MDGs are drawn from the actions and targets contained in the Millennium Declaration that was adopted by 189 nations-and signed by 147 heads of state and governments during the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000.” In the UN Millennium Declaration (United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Millennium Declaration, 2000: 4), it is stated that: “We are committed to making the right to development a reality for everyone and to freeing the entire human race from want.” In this Declaration (United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Millennium Declaration, 2000: 4), it is also mentioned that: “We resolve therefore to create an environment – at the national and global levels alike – which is conducive to development and to the elimination of poverty.” Here, “the right to development” (United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Millennium Declaration, 2000: 4) and “to create an environment...which is conducive to development and to the elimination of poverty” (United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Millennium Declaration, 2000: 4) are two key concepts that require further emphasis to understand the UN’s perspective towards the development issue.

The MDGs are important in the sense that as mentioned in “The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All” (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2007: 7): “The MDGs are a summary of some of the main commitments of the Millennium Summit and are an integral part of the United Nations Development Agenda.” Concerning the MDGs, it is also emphasized that (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 7): “Since their adoption, the MDGs have become the framework for development cooperation, not only of the United Nations but also by other international organizations and bilateral donors.” In most of the global problems, only a collective and an effective stand can bring a real success or at least it can provide a promising picture towards the solution of those global problems. The Millennium Declaration and the MDGs are an example of a collective and an effective stand against serious global issues waiting to be solved. In this sense, the MDGs emphasize global problems that need to be addressed immediately and effectively. Regarding the issue of MDGs, Secretary-General of the UN, Ban Ki-Moon (2008: 3) states that:

The MDGs encapsulate the development aspirations of the world as a whole. But they are not only development objectives; they encompass universally accepted human values and rights such as freedom from hunger, the right to basic education, the right to health and a responsibility to future generations.

### **2.1.3 The Approach of the UN to the Issue of Poverty**

The first MDG is to “eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” (UNDP Official Website a). This goal can be regarded as the most significant one among all the others since a successful result in reducing poverty almost serves as a prerequisite for

the accomplishments in other goals. Poverty is the principal cause or triggering factor of many other serious problems that further lead countries to underdevelopment. As mentioned in the Summary Human Development Report (HDR) 2003 (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 1), two targets have been set related with this goal. The first one is “Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day” (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 1) and the second one is “Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger” (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 1). According to “The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All” (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 36), “Reducing and ultimately eliminating extreme poverty continues to be the single greatest development challenge facing the world and is at the heart of the United Nations Development Agenda.” Consequently, it can be concluded that the poverty issue constitutes one of the major parts of the UN’s global agenda (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All, 2007: 36).

Table 3 (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 28) shows the “number of people living on less than \$1 a day”. This table (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 28) indicates that as of 1999, South Asia has the highest number of such people, then Sub-Saharan Africa comes second and the lowest number belongs to the Arab States.

**Table 3: A Global Picture of Poverty**

<b>Number of people living on less than \$1 a day, 1999 (millions)</b>	
Sub-Saharan Africa	315
South Asia	488
East Asia & the Pacific	279
Arab States	6
Latin America & the Caribbean	57
Central & Eastern Europe & the CIS*	97

\* refers to the proportion of the population living below \$2 a day.

**Source:** Human Development Report Office calculations based on data on GDP at market prices (constant 1995 US\$), population and GDP per capita (PPP US\$) from World Bank 2003i; World Bank 2002f as presented by *Summary Human Development Report 2003 Millennium Development Goals: A Compact Among Nations To End Human Poverty*. 2003. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 28. Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

Table 4 (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 29) shows the “number of malnourished people”. According to Table 4 (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 29), between 1998 and 2000, South Asia has the highest number of people suffering from malnutrition, then East Asia and the Pacific ranks as the second and Central and Eastern Europe and the CIS has the lowest number of people.

**Table 4: Malnourishment As a Worldwide Problem**

<b>Number of malnourished people 1998-2000 (millions)</b>	
Sub-Saharan Africa	183.3
South Asia	333.6
East Asia & the Pacific	193.3

**Table 4 (cont'd)**

Arab States	32.2
Latin America & the Caribbean	54.9
Central & Eastern Europe & the CIS	30.2

**Source:** MDG indicator table 1; FAO 2002b as presented by *Summary Human Development Report 2003 Millennium Development Goals: A Compact Among Nations To End Human Poverty*. 2003. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 29. Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

Taking these into consideration, the focal point of this study will be the issue of poverty reduction and how the UNDP has been dealing with this issue along with its strategies, concepts and its overall approach.

Karns and Mingst (2004: 373-374) point out the areas that the UN has been working on and they sum those up under two headings as they (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 373-374) state that:

With the Bretton Woods institutions having the main responsibility, the central institutions of the UN were left with two general functions—normative and operational...An example of the UN's normative role in development can be seen in the evolution of the idea of sustainable development...On the operational side, the UN took two approaches: creating a series of regional commissions to decentralize planning and programs, and making a commitment to technical assistance—the provision of training programs and expert advice—as its primary contribution to promoting development.

Until now, the “normative role” (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 373-374; Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All*, 2007: 1) of the UN in the field of development has been intensively underlined and from now on, “the operational side” (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 373-374) will be discussed by shifting the central issue to the role and place of the UNDP in development agenda.



## **2.2 THE UNDP AND ITS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT FIELD**

### **2.2.1 The Role of the UNDP**

In its official website (UNDP Official Website b), the UNDP is defined as follows: “UNDP is the UN’s global development network, an organization advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life.” Furthermore, the issues remaining under the UNDP’s concern are stated and listed as follows (UNDP Official Website b):

Our focus is helping countries build and share solutions to the challenges of:

- Democratic Governance
- Poverty Reduction
- Crisis Prevention and Recovery
- Environment and Energy
- HIV/AIDS

Regarding the UNDP’s facilities, it is mentioned that (UNDP Official Website b):

In each country office, the UNDP Resident Representative normally also serves as the Resident Coordinator of development activities for the United Nations system as a whole. Through such coordination, UNDP seeks to ensure the most effective use of UN and international aid resources.

Also Karns and Mingst (2004: 375) point out the role of “UNDP resident representatives” as follows: “UNDP resident representatives are expected to assess local needs and priorities, coordinate programs, function as country representatives for some of the specialized agencies, and serve as the focal point between the UN and recipient government.”

Shifting the debate to the foundation of the UNDP, with the decision of General Assembly in 1965, EPTA and the Special Fund were united and they formed the UNDP as a new separate unit (Bennett and Oliver, 2002: 315). Karns and Mingst

(2004: 375) mention that: “In 1965, the General Assembly established the UN Development Program (UNDP) as the lead organization in the provision of technical assistance.”

Now a detailed description of the EPTA and the Special Fund as two different structures that were brought together and constituted the UNDP (Bennett and Oliver, 2002: 315) will take place. Bennett and Oliver (2002: 313) define the EPTA as follows:

The Expanded Program of Technical Assistance (EPTA) represented a UN endeavor to supplement the scattered technical assistance efforts previously carried out by ECOSOC and the specialized agencies as parts of their regular programs. It involved cooperation and coordination among the UN bodies and most of the specialized agencies to weigh requests from states for technical aid and to allocate the tasks and resources for implementing approved projects to the most appropriate agencies.

On the other hand, the Special Fund is explained by Bennett and Oliver (2002: 314) as follows:

The Special Fund concentrated on preinvestment projects, each of which averaged considerably larger than EPTA projects and which involved modest expenditures for equipment as well as for the provision of experts to carry out surveys of resources, research, training, and pilot projects. A small number of fellowships were also provided by the fund. The main purpose of the fund was to provide the groundwork and then to stimulate investment from internal and external private and public sources to carry out development projects and programs in needy countries.

Constructed on the unification of the EPTA and the Special Fund (Bennett and Oliver, 2002: 315), in today’s world what kind of a role has the UNDP been playing in the making of the global development agenda? St Clair (2004: 178) argues that: “Since its creation in 1965, UNDP has evolved from an agency giving technical and scientific assistance to less developed countries (LDCs) to become a post-project

agency, a policy agency whose role is to provide advice, advocacy and resources to empower the poor.” On the other hand, concerning the UNDP, Karns and Mingst (2004: 375) point out its “norm-development role”: “Although UNDP is primarily an operational agency, it has also played an important norm-development role since the early 1990s with its annual *Human Development Reports* and the HDI.”

### **2.2.2 UNDP Publications and Indices**

The UNDP brings new and different perspectives to the mainstream development agenda with its publications, namely, as pointed out by Karns and Mingst (2004: 375), the “Human Development Reports” (UNDP Official Website c). UNDP publications, namely, “Human Development Reports” (UNDP Official Website c) and the three indices, namely “Human Development Index (HDI)” (UNDP Official Website d), “Human Poverty Index (HPI)” (UNDP Official Website e) and “Gender-related Development Index (GDI) and Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM)” (UNDP Official Website f) are very important tools that support the UNDP’s “norm-development role” (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 375).

The UNDP (UNDP Official Website b) touches upon the importance of “Human Development Reports” as follows:

The annual Human Development Report, commissioned by UNDP, focuses the global debate on key development issues, providing new measurement tools, innovative analysis and often controversial policy proposals. The global Report’s analytical framework and inclusive approach carry over into regional, national and local Human Development Reports, also supported by UNDP.

Below, Table 5 (UNDP Official Website g) shows the issues covered by “Human Development Reports” (UNDP Official Website c) published annually.

**Table 5: Human Development Reports According to Their Subjects**

<p><b>1990 Report:</b> Concepts and Measurements of Development</p> <p><b>1991 Report:</b> National and International Strategies For Development</p> <p><b>1992 Report:</b> International Trade</p> <p><b>1993 Report:</b> Citizens’ Participation In Development</p> <p><b>1994 Report:</b> Human Security</p> <p><b>1995 Report:</b> Gender Inequality</p> <p><b>1996 Report:</b> Economic Growth</p> <p><b>1997 Report:</b> Poverty</p> <p><b>1998 Report:</b> Consumption</p> <p><b>1999 Report:</b> Globalization</p> <p><b>2000 Report:</b> Human Rights</p> <p><b>2001 Report:</b> New Technologies</p> <p><b>2002 Report:</b> Deepening Democracy</p> <p><b>2003 Report:</b> The Millennium Development Goals</p> <p><b>2004 Report:</b> Cultural Liberty</p> <p><b>2005 Report:</b> Aid, Trade and Security</p> <p><b>2006 Report:</b> The Global Water Crisis</p> <p><b>2007/2008 Report:</b> Climate Change</p> <p><b>2009 Report:</b> Migration</p>
---

Source: UNDP Official Website g.

Turning back to indices, as mentioned before, “Human Development Index” (UNDP Official Website d), “Human Poverty Index” (UNDP Official Website e) and “Gender-related Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure” (UNDP Official Website f) are noteworthy to highlight in an in-depth fashion.

Starting with the “HDI”, it is emphasized in the UNDP’s official website (UNDP Official Website d) that: “The first Human Development Report (1990) introduced a new way of measuring development by combining indicators of life expectancy, educational attainment and income into a composite human development index, the HDI...” “HDI” is also defined as follows (UNDP Official Website h): “The HDI –human development index– is a summary composite index that measures a country’s average achievements in three basic aspects of human development: health, knowledge, and a decent standard of living.”

Concerning the “HPI”, it is underlined that (UNDP Official Website e): “The Human Development Report 1997 introduced a human poverty index (HPI) in an attempt to bring together in a composite index the different features of deprivation in the quality of life to arrive at an aggregate judgment on the extent of poverty in a community.” “HPI” is divided into two different types (UNDP Official Website h) and they are explained as follows (UNDP Official Website h):

The HPI-1 –human poverty index for developing countries– measures human deprivations in the same three aspects of human development as the HDI (long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living). HPI-2 –human poverty index for selected high-income OECD countries– includes, in addition to the three dimensions in HPI-1, social exclusion.

Finally, the “GDI” is explained as follows (UNDP Official Website f):

The Human Development Report 1995 introduced two new measures of human development that highlight the status of women. The first, Gender-related Development Index (GDI), measures achievement in the same basic capabilities as the HDI does, but takes note of inequality in achievement between women and men.

“GDI” is also defined as follows (UNDP Official Website h): “The GDI –gender-related development index– is a composite indicator that measures the average achievement of a population in the same dimensions as the HDI while adjusting for gender inequalities in the level of achievement in the three basic aspects of human development.” Then, “GEM” is explained as follows (UNDP Official Website f):

The second measure, Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM), is a measure of agency. It evaluates progress in advancing women’s standing in political and economic forums. It examines the extent to which women and men are able to actively participate in economic and political life and take part in decision-making.

Furthermore, concerning “GEM”, it is emphasized that (UNDP Official Website h):

The GEM –gender empowerment measure– is a composite indicator that captures gender inequality in three key areas:

- Political participation and decision-making, as measured by women’s and men’s percentage shares of parliamentary seats;
- Economic participation and decision-making power, as measured by two indicators –women’s and men’s percentage shares of professional and technical positions;
- Power over economic resources, as measured by women’s and men’s estimated earned income (PPP US \$).

All these indices are of great importance in the sense that they can be used as the basic means for making broader comparisons between countries to see the overall performance of each country in a global spectrum. These indices are also useful in the sense that the level and performance of countries in very crucial issues such as poverty, gender equality or “human development” (UNDP Official Website i)

can be observed through time which can be considered as significant data for researchers of case studies.

### **2.2.3 The Concept of “Human Development”**

Another very important component of the contributions introduced with the UNDP publications is the term “human development” (UNDP Official Website i). It is defined in the UNDP’s official website (UNDP Official Website i) as follows:

Human development is a development paradigm that is about much more than the rise or fall of national incomes. It is about creating an environment in which people can develop their full potential and lead productive, creative lives in accord with their needs and interests. People are the real wealth of nations. Development is thus about expanding the choices people have to lead lives that they value. And it is thus about much more than economic growth, which is only a means –if a very important one– of enlarging people’s choices.

The usage of “human development” (UNDP Official Website i) is of great importance in the sense that it has brought a new angle to the traditional boundaries of the development understanding. The “human development” (UNDP Official Website i) approach reflects more social and humanitarian concerns in defining the frontiers of development. It views development not just as numerical changes in economic indicators but also it values and would like to see the reflections of these positive numerical changes on people’s social and economic conditions (UNDP Official Website i). In this sense, the “human development” (UNDP Official Website i) perspective transcends the limited boundaries and indicators of economic well-being and puts a special emphasis on “...creating an environment in which people can develop their full potential and lead productive, creative lives in accord with their needs and interests” (UNDP Official Website i).

“Human Development Reports” (UNDP Official Website c), indices (UNDP Official Website d, UNDP Official Website e, UNDP Official Website f) and the “human development” (UNDP Official Website i) approach introduced by the UNDP publications are all noteworthy contributions to the global development agenda. To sum up, just as the UN (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 373-374), the UNDP has been working on two different tasks; the first one is about the organization and implementation of “technical and scientific assistance” (St Clair, 2004: 178) and the second one is about bringing new perspectives, analyses, concepts and data to the development field, namely its “norm-development role” (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 375). The UNDP fulfills its “norm-development role” through its publications and indices (Karns and Mingst, 2004: 375). In this sense, the UNDP has been a very influential actor of the global development agenda both as a contributor and as a shaper.



## **CHAPTER 3**

### **ANALYZING THE UNDP APPROACH WITHIN A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE**

The main objective of this chapter is to give a brief outline of the core principles of classical liberalism and neoliberalism respectively and demonstrate how and in what ways the UNDP diverges from the dominant economic approaches, namely the classical liberal rationale as well as the recent neoliberal perspective with its overall approach to development in general and poverty reduction in particular.

This chapter argues that the UNDP approach to the development issue and poverty reduction (see Chapter 4) differs in several aspects from the classical liberal and neoliberal perspectives to these issues and stands more in the line of the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) way of thinking.

## **3.1 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

### **3.1.1 Liberalism and Its Basic Tenets**

At the core of the liberal arguments, there is an assumption that “free trade, specialization, and an international division of labor” are the factors that will enhance the level of development of each country (Gilpin, 1987: 266). Gilpin (1987: 266) underlines this core liberal argument as he states that: “Liberalism maintains that an interdependent world economy based on free trade, specialization, and an international division of labor facilitates domestic development.”

How liberals perceive the existence of the problem of poverty worldwide (Gilpin, 1987: 269) is of great importance within the scope of this chapter. Gilpin (1987: 269) highlights the reasons of poverty according to the liberal point of view as follows:

In summary, in the absence of a commonly accepted body of theoretical ideas, the debate among liberal economists over economic development is focused on strategic choices and alternative routes to economic development, that is, the determination of economic policies to achieve an efficient market economy. They share the conviction that the two foremost causes of international poverty are inadequate integration of the less developed countries into the world economy and irrational state policies that impede the development of a well-functioning market. For most liberal economists, then, the poor are poor because they are inefficient.

Here, answers to these questions gain importance: Is there a global environment that will hinder the process of an “inadequate integration of the less developed countries into the world economy” (Gilpin, 1987: 269) and is the existing global economic atmosphere in favor of developing countries? From the liberal perspective, it is obvious that there is no emphasis on the underlying reasons of the “inadequate

integration of the less developed countries into the world economy” (Gilpin, 1987: 269). Moreover, the developing countries’ problems of maldevelopment are simply considered to be the results of their own failures (Gilpin, 1987: 269). Furthermore, Gilpin (1987: 269) draws attention to the fact that liberalism attaches not much importance to the political background in which economic development emerges and fosters. In this sense, Gilpin (1987: 269) stresses that:

Liberal theory, however, tends to neglect the political framework within which economic development takes place, yet the process of economic development cannot be divorced from political factors. The domestic and international configurations of power and the interests of powerful groups and states are important determinants of economic development. The liberal theory is not necessarily wrong in neglecting these elements and focusing exclusively on the market; rather this theory is incomplete.

On the other hand, the basic rationale of liberal point of view is explained as follows (Gilpin, 1987: 27):

All forms of economic liberalism, however, are committed to the market and the price mechanism as the most efficacious means for organizing domestic and international economic relations. Liberalism may, in fact, be defined as a doctrine and set of principles for organizing and managing a market economy in order to achieve maximum efficiency, economic growth, and individual welfare.

According to the liberal perspective, “maximum efficiency, economic growth, and individual welfare” are the fundamental goals to reach (Gilpin, 1987: 27). However, reducing poverty and inequality is obviously not a part of the liberal agenda (Gilpin, 1987: 45). In this sense, Gilpin (1987: 45) emphasizes that:

Another limitation of liberal economics as a theory is a tendency to disregard the justice or equity of the outcome of economic activities. Despite heroic efforts to fashion an "objective" welfare economics, the distribution of wealth within and among societies lies outside the primary concern of liberal economics.

This mentioned feature of liberalism, namely not including the issue of “the distribution of wealth within and among societies” into its own agenda (Gilpin, 1987: 45) constitutes the main point of divergence between the UNDP approach to poverty reduction (see Chapter 4) and the classical liberal rationale.

### **3.1.2 Neoliberalism**

In this part of the chapter, some of the neoliberal arguments will be highlighted in order to set a background to the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective that will be discussed in the following part. The basic tenet of the neoliberal perspective is summarized as follows (Thomas, 2008: 424):

Neo-liberal development policies are often referred to as the Washington Consensus (WC). These policies are based on the assumption that global economic integration through free trade is the most effective route to promote growth, and that the benefits of growth will trickle down throughout society.

This mentioned neoliberal argument underlining the principle of “the benefits of growth will trickle down throughout society” (Thomas, 2008: 424) is also an indicator of a point of view not prioritizing how egalitarian the process of “trickle down” will be; in other words, how “the benefits of growth” will be allocated to all segments of society (Thomas, 2008: 424). Furthermore, Öniş and Şenses (2005: 2) draw the framework of neoliberalism and its major principles as follows:

The central tenet of neo-liberal thinking and the associated 'Washington Consensus' was 'getting the prices right'. The state, itself, was conceived as the problem rather than the solution. The universal policy proposal was to pursue a systematic program of decreasing state involvement in the economy through trade liberalization, privatization and reduced public spending, freeing key relative prices such as interest rates and exchange rates and lifting exchange controls.

As Öniş and Şenses (2005: 2) and Thomas (2008: 424) point out, there is a linkage between the neoliberal rationale and the “Washington Consensus” strategies. Moreover, Öniş and Şenses (2005: 1-2) emphasize that the crucial international organizations are under the considerable effect of the neoliberal perspective. In this sense, Öniş and Şenses (2005: 1-2) state that: “Neo-liberal thinking, in turn, exercised a key practical influence on the policy discourse of key Bretton Woods institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank.”

According to Öniş and Şenses (2005: 27), the strong position of neoliberal perspective which has a significant effect on crucial international organizations such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund has fallen down and the remaining problematic issues are considered to have a linkage with the existing neoliberal implementations. At this point, Öniş and Şenses (2005: 27) argue that:

The very foundations of the neo-liberal orthodoxy that informed the thinking of the key Bretton Woods institutions have been dramatically shaken in the context of the 1990s. The process of neo-liberal restructuring has been associated with a weak growth performance, persistent poverty, rising inequality and endemic crises with costly ramifications.

Although there may be some question marks raised in recent years concerning the effectiveness of neoliberal prescriptions (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 27), the fact that the neoliberal point of view dominates the global economic order seems to remain valid.

### **3.1.3 “Post-Washington Consensus” Perspective**

This part aims at identifying the main differences of the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) from the previous

perspectives. Öniş and Şenses (2005: 16) emphasize how the understanding of the “Post-Washington Consensus” differs from its predecessor:

In retrospect, a key element that distinguishes the PWC from the early neo-liberal agenda involves recognition of the importance of a change in institutions as an essential component of the new development strategies. Creating effective institutions becomes part and parcel of successful development. Similarly, much more emphasis is given to social and income distributional consequences of economic policies.

The stress on the “social and income distributional consequences of economic policies” placed by the “Post-Washington Consensus” perspective (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 16) constitutes its major difference from the neoliberal rationale.

On the other hand, recent changes in the approaches and policies of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund are considered to be the reflections of “the emerging Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 13). In this sense, Öniş and Şenses (2005: 13) argue that:

It is possible to discern a noticeable shift in the policy focus of the key Bretton Woods institutions in recent years away from a hard-core neo-liberalism to a new kind of synthesis which could be described as the emerging Post-Washington Consensus. Arguably, the process in this direction started in the World Bank at an earlier stage than the IMF. There has been a renewed interest in poverty and governance issues at the Bank beginning in the early 1990s...Similarly, there was some recognition at the Bank that persistent poverty could not be eliminated simply through the expected trickle-down effects of improved efficiency and rising growth.

Realizing that the conventional “trickle-down” rationale was a failure in eliminating poverty and bringing equality to the society (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 13) should be regarded as a significant signal of change in the traditional stand of the World Bank.

However, at this stage, it is important to note that this mentioned “trickle-down” rationale which is mostly associated with neoliberal perspective (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 13; Thomas, 2008: 424) is not a recent concept discussed in the literature; relevant discussions can be traced back to the arguments of Simon Kuznets (1955) as one of the prominent scholars examining the question of “income distribution” (Martinussen, 1997: 60). In this sense, Martinussen (1997: 60) mentions that:

*Simon Kuznets* was one of the few who stated in more explicit terms his opinion on this subject (Kuznets, 1955). He claimed that economic growth under average circumstances would lead to increased inequality in the beginning, but that this tendency would flatten out and to some extent turn to steadily increasing equality in income distribution.

Furthermore, Öniş and Şenses (2005: 27-28) stress that “Post-Washington Consensus” is composed of two separate perspectives and provides a mixture of these in its own structure:

The basic precepts of the emerging post-Washington Consensus represent a novel synthesis of the two previously dominant paradigms in development theory and policy, namely national developmentalism with its emphasis on the critical role of the state in overcoming market failures and neo-liberalism with its unfettered belief in the benefits of the free market. The new approach recognizes the importance of the state in the context of open markets and a more liberal policy environment. But, at the same time, it recognizes the need to avoid state failure which in turn, requires institutional innovation and democratic governance.

The most significant point that has been a part of the “Post-Washington Consensus” agenda is the emphasis on the issue of “poverty” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 28). Öniş and Şenses (2005: 28) draw attention to this as they state that:

Furthermore, the new approach places significant weight on the need to tackle poverty and inequality issues, as objectives in their own right, hence, moving away from an exclusive pre-occupation with growth and efficiency objectives at all cost. In all these respects, the emerging PWC represents a more progressive approach to development as compared with the naive and unqualified application of the Washington Consensus.

It is important to note that prioritizing “poverty and inequality issues” within the “Post-Washington Consensus” perspective (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 28) is a signal of a considerable change as well as a challenge against the dominance of neoliberal rationale. This understanding of the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005: 28) is a point of convergence with the UNDP approach to the issue of poverty (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 18, 20).

Thomas (2008: 435) points out the fundamental differences of this new perspective as follows:

Whereas the WC aimed for growth, the PWC stresses that growth alone is not enough, it must be made ‘pro-poor’; and that poverty reduction is crucial for development. Under the WC, the IMF and World Bank decided on the universal development blueprint; but under the PWC, national governments must own development strategies, and civil society must *participate* in their formulation. Blueprints must not be imposed by external actors. Conditions should relate to *processes* rather than *policies*. A new emphasis on *governance* – in other words, *who decide* – was a distinctive feature of the PWC.

The mentioned approaches of this new perspective to “growth”, “development” and “governance” (Thomas, 2008: 435) entirely overlap with that of the UNDP which will be analyzed in the following chapter. In the light of this fact, it can be argued that the overall UNDP approach (see Chapter 4) has been more in line with the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective.



## **3.2 EXPLAINING THE UNDP APPROACH IN A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **3.2.1 How Does The UNDP Differ?: Divergences From The Dominant Economic Perspectives**

The major goal of this part is to identify the main areas of divergence from the dominant economic approaches, namely the classical liberal and neoliberal perspectives, in the UNDP approach vis-a-vis the issue of poverty in particular and the issue of development in general. Of course, the areas of divergence cannot be constrained with the ones that are listed below; there may be other issues of divergence that are not included within the scope of this list. However, it is important to note that the listed areas of divergence are the products of an analysis of the main UNDP publications that are related with the issue of poverty which will be presented in Chapter 4. In this sense, the aim here is to demonstrate and emphasize the different position of the UNDP in a dominantly liberal global economic order with some clear exemplary areas of divergences rather than grasp and list all the diverging issues with the most inclusive manner. Below, there is the list of the areas where the UNDP approach diverges from the dominant liberal economic approaches and converges more with the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective as derived from various sources (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998; UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000; HDR 1997, 1997; Summary HDR 2003, 2003; UNDP Official Website j). This may not be a comprehensive set; however, it still serves to delineate the major areas of divergence that distinguish the UNDP approach. The specific UNDP approach regarding each of these issues will be analyzed in detail in the following chapter. This list shows the areas where the UNDP approach diverges from the dominant economic approaches and converges

with the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective.

- Poverty definition (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 22; HDR 1997, 1997: 2, 15)
- “Nationally-owned solutions” for poverty reduction (UNDP Official Website j)
- The rationale for “economic growth” (UNDP Official Website j)
- Putting the issue of poverty at the top of the agenda (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 18, 20)
- Higher social spending and an emphasis on social policies (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 4, 7, 8)
- A bottom-up strategy (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19, 83)

A more humanitarian and social approach to the issue of poverty (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 22; HDR 1997, 1997: 2, 15), adopting poverty reduction strategies that are unique to each of the relevant countries (UNDP Official Website j), defining “economic growth” by emphasizing that it would be more fruitful if the economic outcomes of it are distributed in the most egalitarian manner (UNDP Official Website j), placing a robust stress on the issue of poverty among all the other crucial issues (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 18, 20), recommendations on higher social spending and social policies (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 4, 7, 8) and finally, strongly highlighting the vital role of “participation” which is an important indicator of a bottom-up strategy (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19, 83) are all signals of how the UNDP approach to the issues of development and poverty diverges from the dominant economic perspectives; from the classical liberal and neoliberal rationales respectively and

converges more with the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective.

### **3.2.2 Some Arguments On The UNDP Approach**

The objective of this part is to present the main arguments in the literature concerning how to classify the perspective of the UNDP. In general, as two UN organizations, the World Bank and UNDP often function as the objects of comparisons since they both work concerning development-related issues. Martinussen (1997: 302-303) is one of the scholars who makes such a comparison and points out the different positions of these two organizations as he states that:

Although the World Bank...has in recent years incorporated important aspects of a poverty-focused approach, neither its analyses nor its policies and practices can be seen as representing alternative approaches to development. In this respect, the emphases and priorities recently proposed by UNDP come much closer to challenging mainstream thinking.

However, Martinussen (1997: 304) also makes a critique of the UNDP’s overall stand. In this sense, Martinussen (1997: 304) stresses that:

UNDP’s work on human development contains some attempts at identifying causal relationships and obstacles to the enhancement of welfare and the enlargement of opportunities and choices on an equitable basis. Strategies for overcoming these obstacles are also discussed. In these respects, UNDP’s studies may be regarded as contributing to theory formation concerning the preconditions for, and obstacles to, particular patterns of development. But beyond that, most of the studies undertaken or commissioned by the organisation are purely descriptive and normative, rather than explanatory. They are based on moral standards which are used as ideal-type models to describe the generally low levels of human development achieved throughout the Third World.

Boas and McNeill (2004: 217) are other scholars who compare the perspectives of the World Bank and UNDP:

From the late 1980s, a more political (or at least ethical) concept of poverty favoured by the UNDP counterposed a more economic, technocratic concept

favoured by the World Bank. The UNDP (or perhaps more accurately, the *Human Development Report*) initially sought actively to be distinct from the established position, associated with the World Bank; but over the subsequent years the World Bank and UNDP seem to have moved closer to a common position.

Boas and McNeill (2004: 217) conclude that the differing positions of the World Bank and UNDP have been in the process of convergence through time although they (2004: 217) also strongly point out how the UNDP defines “poverty” is not similar to the World Bank approach. St Clair (2004: 178) summarizes the UNDP approach as follows:

...UNDP has moved – at the conceptual level – from endorsing an *economic view* of poverty and development to increasingly include an *ethically formulated perspective* that conceptualizes and evaluates the role of development in terms of securing the freedom, well-being and dignity of all people, and framing these goals in terms of social justice.

This “ethically formulated perspective” (St Clair, 2004: 178) is what distinguishes the UNDP from all the other international organizations and it is most likely for this reason that the UNDP publications are sometimes defined as “descriptive and normative” (Martinussen, 1997: 304). However, only “an economic view of poverty and development” (St Clair, 2004: 178) will be helpful to understand only a small part of the whole picture. Consequently, an approach with more humanitarian and social concerns would be more all-embracing to analyze particularly the issue of poverty. As St Clair (2004: 178) argues, the UNDP approach is more compatible with this one.

However, St Clair (2004: 187-188) is another scholar who analyzes the UNDP approach in a sceptical manner:

The conceptual evolution of UNDP from focusing on poor countries to focusing on the enabling environment that encourages and allows – or does not encourage or allow – for the self-realization of people’s ways of life, is an ambitious project

that has become more and more explicitly normative. This project has increasingly included ethical concerns, which some claim are the product of Western values. Also, some may see UNDP's ideas as technocratic, grounded only in Northern knowledge and science. UNDP's evolution may thus be marked by a tension provoked by the many possible ways to answer the question: Who, and for what reasons, decides what is best for the poor?

The most significant counter-argument for the functioning of the UNDP would be the one proposed by St Clair (2004: 187-188) above. In the UNDP publications (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19, 83), there is an emphasis on the "participation" of poor people to each and every activity that will affect themselves in the end which would also serve as an answer to the above-mentioned question (St Clair, 2004: 187-188).

What Boas and McNeill (2004: 212) point out is of great importance in order to understand the factors affecting the position of international organizations in the international arena:

A strong claim is thus that the most powerful multilateral institutions, in terms of the resources at their command, are controlled by the donor countries (and most particularly the USA), promote neoliberal ideas, and are dominated by an economic perspective.

In this sense, Table 6 of Boas and McNeill (2004: 212) below constructs a categorization for well-known international organizations. According to this table (Boas and McNeill, 2004: 212), the International Monetary Fund and World Bank have a more influential position if we compare it to that of the UNDP. On the other hand, this table (Boas and McNeill, 2004: 212) also verifies the argument of this chapter emphasizing that the UNDP approach has diverging points from the neoliberal perspective. Finally, this table (Boas and McNeill, 2004: 212) clearly shows that the stand of the UNDP is different from other well-known and influential

international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank in all dimensions included.

**Table 6: The Stand of the UNDP Among All Other International Organizations**

<b>Classification of Multilateral Institutions</b>				
	<b>Donor Control</b>	<b>Power</b>	<b>Neoliberal</b>	<b>Economics</b>
<b>WTO</b>	High	High	High	High
<b>IMF</b>	High	High	High	High
<b>World Bank</b>	High	High	High-Medium	High
<b>UNDP</b>	Low	Low	Medium-Low	Medium-Low
<b>ILO</b>	Low	Low	Low	Medium-Low
<b>UNFPA</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low

**Source:** Boas, Morten, and Desmond McNeill. 2004. Table 15.1 “Classification of Multilateral Institutions” In “Ideas and Institutions Who Is Framing What?.” In Morten Boas and Desmond McNeill, eds., *Global Institutions and Development: Framing The World?*. London and New York: Routledge, 212.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **THE UNDP APPROACH TO THE ISSUE OF POVERTY REDUCTION**

Today, poverty constitutes one of the most serious problems that the world has failed to cope with successfully for years. The main objective of this chapter is to draw the framework of how the UNDP views the issue of poverty and what kind of strategies and policies it suggests for developing countries struggling with the problem of poverty. In other words, this chapter aims at examining the UNDP approach to the issue of poverty reduction.

In this sense, the outline of this chapter is as follows. Firstly, the possible meaning(s) of poverty will be underlined along with different definitions from varying aspects. Secondly, the role and importance of the Human Poverty Index will be analyzed. Thirdly, strategies, policies and activities of the UNDP concerning the issue of poverty reduction will be investigated to observe the overall UNDP approach to the problem of poverty. Then, in order to observe what the UNDP has

been doing in practice, exemplary cases from UNDP activities in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Algeria will be presented respectively. After a section for different points of view in the literature regarding the issue of poverty reduction, the chapter will be concluded with a section including a general evaluation.

#### **4.1 Definition(s) of Poverty**

Having a better understanding of poverty reduction requires a better insight of the concept of poverty. There are different approaches and perspectives on how to define the concept of poverty. This section aims at giving a general and an all-embracing idea concerning the concept of poverty.

Sudhir Anand and Amartya Sen (1997: 4) define poverty as: “Poverty is, in many ways, the worst form of human deprivation. It can involve not only the lack of necessities of material well-being, but also the denial of opportunities of living a tolerable life.” On the other hand, Gita Sen (1997: 182) tries to give the portrait of poverty by giving its social borders: “The face of poverty is disproportionately female, very old or very young, or belongs to someone from a scheduled caste, a racial or ethnic minority or an indigenous group.”

However, how the UNDP shapes the meaning of poverty and how it views this concept is of particular interest here. In the UNDP Poverty Report 2000, Box 1.3 “The Multidimensional Nature of Poverty” (2000: 22) points out how poverty should be understood as follows:



UNDP's *Human Development Report 1997* introduced the concept of human poverty. It argued that if income is not the sum total of well-being, lack of income cannot be the sum total of poverty. Human poverty does not focus on what people do or do not have, but on what they can or cannot do. It is deprivation in the most essential capabilities of life, including leading a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable, having adequate economic provisioning and participating fully in the life of the community.

Also Human Development Report (HDR) 1997 (1997: 2) draws the framework of from which angle poverty is viewed:

*Human Development Report 1997* reviews the challenge to eradicate poverty from a human development perspective. It focuses not just on poverty of income but on poverty from a human development perspective—on poverty as a denial of choices and opportunities for living a tolerable life.

HDR 1997 (1997: 15) also underlines the linkage between the definitions of “human development” and “poverty”:

If human development is about enlarging choices, poverty means that opportunities and choices most basic to human development are denied—to lead a long, healthy, creative life and to enjoy a decent standard of living, freedom, dignity, self-respect and the respect of others.

Furthermore, in HDR 1997, Box 1.1 “Three Perspectives on Poverty” (1997: 16) emphasizes three different approaches to poverty. These are “income perspective”, “basic needs perspective” and “capability perspective” (HDR 1997, 1997: 16). The rationale of “income perspective” is defined as follows (HDR 1997, 1997: 16): “A person is poor if, and only if, her income level is below the defined poverty line.” According to the “basic needs perspective” (HDR 1997, 1997: 16): “Poverty is deprivation of material requirements for minimally acceptable fulfilment of human needs, including food.” From the point of view of “capability perspective” (HDR 1997, 1997: 16): “Poverty represents the absence of some basic capabilities to function—a person lacking the opportunity to achieve some minimally acceptable

levels of these functionings.” In this sense, HDR 1997 (1997: 16) stresses the dominance of “capability perspective” on defining poverty:

Poverty in the human development approach draws on each of these perspectives, but draws particularly on the capability perspective. In the capability concept the poverty of a life lies not merely in the impoverished state in which the person actually lives, but also in the lack of real opportunity—due to social constraints as well as personal circumstances—to lead valuable and valued lives.

In a nutshell, HDR 1997 (1997: 2, 15, 16) draws attention to the meaning of poverty as ability or inability of people to reach/achieve some basic living conditions rather than defining it simply as lacking material well-being.

As shown in Table 7 (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 16), there are some varieties in defining what poverty really means and each definition covers a different dimension of poverty. However, in HDR 1997, the “human poverty” concept is preferred to be used (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 22).

**Table 7: Poverty From Various Aspects**

<b>Some Basic Poverty Definitions</b>
<b>Human Poverty:</b> The lack of essential human capabilities, such as being literate or adequately nourished.
<b>Income Poverty:</b> The lack of minimally adequate income or expenditures.
<b>Extreme Poverty:</b> Indigence or destitution, usually specified as the inability to satisfy even minimum food needs.
<b>Overall Poverty:</b> A less severe level of poverty, usually defined as the inability to satisfy essential nonfood as well as food needs. The definition of essential nonfood needs can vary significantly across countries.
<b>Relative Poverty:</b> Poverty defined by standards that can change across countries or over time. An example is a poverty line set at one-half of mean per capita income—implying that the line can rise along with income. Often this term is used loosely to mean overall poverty.

**Table 7 (cont'd)**

**Absolute Poverty:** Poverty defined by a fixed standard. An example is the international one-dollar-a-day poverty line—which is designed to compare the extent of poverty across different countries. Another example is a poverty line whose real value stays the same over time so as to determine changes in poverty in one country. Often this term is used loosely to denote extreme poverty.

**Source:** Box 1.2 “Some Basic Poverty Definitions” In *United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 1998 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 1998. New York: United Nations Development Programme, 16.

#### **4.2 Human Poverty Index**

This section mainly aims at discussing the significance of the Human Poverty Index (HPI). HPI is of particular importance in the sense that it allows a researcher to compare a wide number of countries with each other and specifically for case studies, it enables the researcher to observe the relevant country’s stand among all the others. UNDP Poverty Report 1998 (1998: 81) underlines the essence of HPI as:

The HPI includes the adult illiteracy rate, the percentage of the population not expected to reach age forty, and a third dimension, which is labelled “overall economic provisioning,” that is a composite of three indicators: the percentage of people without access to safe water, the percentage of people without access to health services, and the percentage of children under five years of age who are underweight. Since it does not include income as a component, the HPI offers the opportunity not only to measure human poverty but also to make comparisons with income poverty.

In HDR 1997 (1997: 5), HPI is explained as follows:

*The human poverty index combines basic dimensions of poverty and reveals interesting contrasts with income poverty.* This Report introduces a human poverty index (HPI). Rather than measure poverty by income, it uses indicators of the most basic dimensions of deprivation: a short life, lack of basic education and lack of access to public and private resources. Like all measures the HPI has weaknesses—in data and in concept. Like all measures it cannot capture the totality of human poverty. But by combining in a single poverty index the concerns that often get pushed aside when the focus is on income alone, the HPI makes a useful addition to the measures of poverty.

HPI came with the HDR 1997 (HDR 1997, 1997: 5) and repeatedly it is reminded that HPI is a new tool for measurement of poverty which is different from the ones that deal with “income poverty” (HDR 1997, 1997: 5, 19; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 81). It is strongly underlined in the HDR 1997, Box 1.3 “The HPI–Useful For Policy-makers?” (1997: 19) that poverty cannot be totally understood only by observing numerical changes in incomes and other dimensions of poverty that are measured with HPI can also be helpful to wholly figure out the problem of poverty. In this sense, it is stated in HDR 1997, Box 1.3 “The HPI–Useful For Policy-makers?” (1997: 19) that:

The HDI provides an alternative to GNP, for assessing a country’s standing in basic human development or its progress in human development over time. It does not displace economic measures but can serve as a simple composite complement to other measures like GNP. The HPI can similarly serve as a useful complement to income measures of poverty. It will serve as a strong reminder that eradicating poverty will always require more than increasing the incomes of the poorest.

Table 8 (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 108) is an example of “Human Poverty Index” and it shows the countries’ performances in “human poverty” with percentages as of 1997.

**Table 8: Countries According to “Human Poverty”**

<b>Human Poverty Index, 1997 (%)</b>			
<b>Differences in human poverty across countries.</b>			
Algeria	29	Ethiopia	56
Bangladesh	44	Gambia	50
Benin	51	Ghana	36
Bolivia	21	Guatemala	28
Botswana	28	Guinea	51
Brazil	16	Haiti	46
Burkina Faso	59	Honduras	25
Burundi	46	India	36
Cameroon	38	Indonesia	28
Central African Republic	54	Iran, Islamic Rep. of	20

**Table 8 (cont'd)**

Chad	52	Jamaica	14
Chile	5	Jordan	10
China	19	Kenya	28
Colombia	11	Lao People's Dem. Rep.	39
Costa Rica	4	Lebanon	11
Cote d'Ivoire	47	Lesotho	23
Cuba	5	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	16
Dominican Republic	18	Malawi	42
Egypt	33	Malaysia	14
El Salvador	21	Mali	53
Mauritania	48	Thailand	19
Mauritius	12	Togo	38
Mongolia	18	Tunisia	23
Morocco	39	Turkey	17
Mozambique	50	Uganda	41
Myanmar	32	United Arab Emirates	18
Namibia	25	Uruguay	4
Nepal	52	Venezuela	12
Nicaragua	28	Viet Nam	29
Niger	66	Yemen	49
Nigeria	38	Zambia	38
Oman	24	Zimbabwe	29
Pakistan	42		
Panama	9		
Paraguay	16		
Peru	17		
Philippines	16		
Senegal	50		
Sierra Leone	58		
South Africa	19		
Sri Lanka	20		
Sudan	37		
Syrian Arab Republic	20		
Tanzania,U.Rep.of	30		

**Source:** UNDP 1999a as presented by Table 10.1 "Human Poverty Index, 1997 (%)" In *United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 2000 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 2000. New York: United Nations Development Programme, 108.

However, as HDR 1997, Box 1.3 “The HPI—Useful For Policy-makers?” (1997: 19) points out, it is also important to note that:

The HPI provides a measure of the incidence of human poverty in a country (or among some other group), say 25%. This means that judged by the HPI, an “average” of some 25% of the country’s population is affected by the various forms of human poverty or deficiency included in the measure. But unlike with a headcount measure, it is not possible to associate the incidence of human poverty with a specific group of people or number of people.

Moreover, HDR 1997 (1997: 6) emphasizes some important facts indicating the difference between “income poverty” and “human poverty”:

Comparing the HPI with income measures of poverty based on a \$1-a-day poverty line reveals interesting contrasts:

- Both income poverty and human poverty are pervasive, affecting a quarter to a third of the people in the developing world.
- Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia have the highest incidence of both income and human poverty – at about 40%.
- Most of the Arab States have made remarkable progress in reducing income poverty, now a mere 4%, but face a large backlog of human poverty (32%).
- Latin America and the Caribbean, with an HPI of 15%, has reduced human poverty in many countries, but income poverty is still 24%.
- In Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Pakistan and 10 other countries the proportion of people in human poverty exceeds the proportion in income poverty.
- In Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Kenya, Peru and Zimbabwe the proportion of people in income poverty exceeds the proportion in human poverty.

What can be derived from these worldwide poverty trends is that Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are the geographical regions that mostly suffer from poverty, and Arab countries are successful in dealing with “income poverty” whereas Latin America and the Caribbean perform well in coping with “human poverty” (HDR 1997, 1997: 6). Below, Table 9 (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 108) shows some countries’ overall performances in “human poverty” as well as their performances in three specific indicators.

**Table 9: Some Countries' Performances In "Human Poverty"**

<b>Human Poverty Indicators</b>				
<b>The dimensions of human poverty can vary in intensity across countries.</b>				
	<b>Human Poverty Index (%) 1997</b>	<b>People Not Expected To Survive To Age 40 (As A % Of Total Population) 1997</b>	<b>Adult Illiteracy Rate (%) 1997</b>	<b>Underweight Children Under Five (%) 1990-97</b>
Bangladesh	44	22	61	56
Benin	51	29	66	29
Chad	52	37	50	39
Guinea	51	38	62	26
Haiti	46	27	54	28
India	36	16	47	53
Nepal	52	23	62	47
Nicaragua	28	12	37	12
Niger	66	36	86	43
Pakistan	42	15	59	38
Sierra Leone	58	51	67	29
Yemen	49	22	58	39

**Source:** UNDP 1999a as presented by Table 10.2 "Human Poverty Indicators" In *United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 2000 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 2000. New York: United Nations Development Programme, 108.

#### **4.3 The UNDP Approach To The Issue of Poverty Reduction**

The objective of this section is to give an outline of the UNDP approach to the issue of poverty reduction. What kind of solutions and strategies the UNDP proposes vis-a-vis the problem of poverty constructs the major question and concern

of this part. HDR 1997 (1997: 113) estimates that the poverty issue will be one of the few issues that will occupy the agenda of the international arena in the future:

What has dominated the global economic agenda? So far, trade, property rights, finance, financial stability and governance. What's off the radar:

- Poverty eradication.
- Unemployment and the need for a long-term employment strategy.
- Marginalization of the poorest and least developed countries, and the need to achieve a long-run balance in the global economy.
- The need for environmental sustainability in the global economy.

The issue of poverty reduction has a worldwide priority and significance since it constitutes one of the dimensions of the Millennium Development Goals (UNDP Official Website a). The first goal is to “eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” (UNDP Official Website a). As mentioned in Summary HDR 2003 (2003: 1), two targets have been set related with this goal. The first one is “Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day” (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 1) and the second one is “Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger” (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 1). So, what does the UNDP do in order to alleviate poverty? UNDP (UNDP Official Website j) defines its areas of responsibility for the issue of reducing poverty as follows:

Our core services to support national efforts to reduce poverty and inequities involve: (1) Policy advice and technical support; (2) Strengthening capacity of institutions and individuals (3) Advocacy, communications, and public information; (4) Promoting and brokering dialogue; and (5) Knowledge networking and sharing of good practices.

Furthermore, UNDP (UNDP Official Website j) emphasizes that it is committed to work on these specific fields concerning the problem of poverty:



Developing countries are working to create their own national poverty eradication strategies based on local needs and priorities. UNDP advocates for these nationally-owned solutions and helps to make them effective through ensuring a greater voice for poor people, expanding access to productive assets and economic opportunities, and linking poverty programmes with countries' international economic and financial policies. At the same time, UNDP contributes to efforts at reforming trade, debt relief and investment arrangements to better support national poverty reduction and make globalisation work for poor people.

The core values of the UNDP regarding the issue of poverty are summarized as follows (UNDP Official Website j):

UNDP's work on the strategies and policies for poverty reduction is anchored in three basic principles – the multidimensionality of poverty, the centrality of gender equality and the critical importance of an integrated approach. We believe that economic growth is necessary for sustained poverty reduction, but it is not a sufficient condition. The quality of economic growth is as important as the rate of growth. Poor people should not only benefit equitably from economic growth, they should have the opportunity to actively contribute to its generation.

The way the UNDP considers and perceives the significance of “economic growth” (UNDP Official Website j) is a good example of how it diverges from the dominant neoliberal development perspective. In the above-mentioned views of the UNDP, participation and collaboration of the poor in promoting the “economic growth” which is meaningful for all segments of society is clearly emphasized (UNDP Official Website j).

Moreover, UNDP Poverty Report 1998 (1998: 62) touches upon some important aspects of UNDP's tasks related with reducing poverty:

Often, UNDP provides assistance more to building national capacity to reduce poverty than to directly reducing poverty. Thus it is widely involved in supporting reforms of governance systems to promote greater popular participation. This support often takes two major complementary forms. From one direction, UNDP advises governments on how to decentralize operations and devolve authority to regional and local levels—to increase responsiveness and accountability to popular demands. From the other direction, it also gives a great deal of support to civil society—building up people's organizations and strengthening their ability to participate in local and national decision-making.

The question of to what extent the UNDP considers the problem of poverty as an urgent issue that should be placed at the top of its agenda finds an answer to itself as it is stated that (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 18):

Over the last three years UNDP has sharpened its focus on poverty. In 1995, UNDP's Executive Board made poverty eradication the organization's 'overriding priority'. In consultation with its development partners, the organization has therefore made poverty a more central part of all its activities.

Another indicator of how seriously the UNDP takes the issue of poverty reduction into consideration is pointed out in the UNDP Poverty Report 1998 (1998: 20):

A substantial share of UNDP's resources is now devoted to poverty reduction. The estimate for the current programming cycle is that the proportion of UNDP's total resources that are specifically classified under poverty reduction is at least 30 per cent. However, if one also includes programmes classified under other headings (governance, gender and environment) that also have a clear positive impact on the poor, the proportion would rise to 50 per cent.

Below, Table 10 (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 20) gives a brief summary of UNDP's targets that are determined for the objective of tackling the problem of poverty.

**Table 10: The UNDP and Its Proposals For Reducing Poverty**

<b>UNDP Corporate Goals For Poverty Reduction</b>
<p>To shape its efforts for poverty reduction, UNDP has set the following goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Fostering an enabling environment for pro-poor economic growth.</li> <li>● Securing sustainable livelihoods for the poor through access to productive assets.</li> <li>● Advancing gender equality and the status of women.</li> <li>● Ensuring sustainable food security for the poor, including regeneration of the environmental resources on which the poor depend.</li> <li>● Supporting pro-poor governance, including empowerment of the poor.</li> </ul>

**Source:** Box 1.3 "UNDP Corporate Goals For Poverty Reduction" In *United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 1998 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 1998. New York: United Nations Development Programme, 20.

“UNDP Corporate Goals For Poverty Reduction” (see Table 10; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 20) briefly summarize the UNDP’s approach to poverty reduction and support the theoretical position of the UNDP presented in Chapter 3. On the other hand, Summary HDR 2003 (2003: 4) proposes some strategies to deal with the problem of poverty:

Six policy clusters can help countries break out of their poverty traps:

- Invest early and ambitiously in basic education and health while fostering gender equity. These are preconditions to sustained economic growth. Growth, in turn, can generate employment and raise incomes—feeding back into further gains in education and health gains.
- Increase the productivity of small farmers in unfavourable environments—that is, the majority of the world’s hungry people. A reliable estimate is that 70% of the world’s poorest people live in rural areas and depend on agriculture.
- Improve basic infrastructure—such as ports, roads, power and communications—to reduce the costs of doing business and overcome geographic barriers.
- Develop an industrial development policy that nurtures entrepreneurial activity and helps diversify the economy away from dependence on primary commodity exports—with an active role for small and medium-size enterprises.
- Promote democratic governance and human rights to remove discrimination, secure social justice and promote the well-being of all people.
- Ensure environmental sustainability and sound urban management so that development improvements are long term.

These above-mentioned strategies (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 4) are useful for acquiring an in-depth insight of the UNDP approach to the issue of poverty reduction. There are also other solutions designed for the aim of overcoming poverty that are suggested by the UNDP Poverty Report 1998 (1998: 91-92):

First, as countries increase their determination to combat poverty, the aid community must provide greater support, and also refocus its assistance, taking into account the special needs of the least developed countries and, within developing countries, of the poorest groups and regions...Second, the efforts made by countries to approach poverty reduction through cross-sectoral strategies and programmes need to be supported by donors in ways that promote more cohesive, integrated approaches...Third, political stability, economic growth, and poverty reduction must be tackled together in a coordinated manner—and not regarded as three separate agenda items competing for attention...Fourth, poverty eradication requires everyone’s involvement.

UNDP Poverty Report 2000 (2000: 109) places a special emphasis on including the poor in efforts to reduce poverty:

The poor are often excluded from poverty assessments—as they are from poverty programmes. Whether expensive or cheap, rapid or slow, surveys that fail to incorporate the views of the poor are likely to miss the essence of the problem. After all, they are the people most directly affected—keenly aware of the problems they face and probably the most knowledgeable about solutions.

What is highlighted in the UNDP Poverty Report 1998 (1998: 19) serves as a signal of a discourse supporting the importance of “participation” of the poor in poverty-related issues:

Most poverty-reduction action has typically been top-down in its design and implementation – with the risk of causing dependency and further stigmatization of the poor. The only real solution is to empower the poor – to give them the opportunity and the tools to escape from poverty. This will require increased organization and participation of all people in decision-making, and the mobilization of social energy.

Moreover, in the Summary HDR 2003 (2003: 7), it is argued that “Countries can usually spend more on education as their economies grow. But the poorest countries need to spend more on education to escape their poverty traps.” Also another recommendation is given to “governments” in the report (Summary HDR 2003, 2003: 8): “Governments in poor countries must rank health spending higher than other types of spending, such as defence.”

Table 11 (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 22) shows a general picture of “Number of Countries with National Poverty Plans”. The overall picture highlights that out of 130 countries, only 43 have a working “national poverty plan” (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 22). On the other hand, Table 12 (UNDP Poverty Report

2000, 2000: 19) indicates that in every geographical region, the percentage of “countries with targets” is seriously lower than the percentage of “countries with estimates”.

**Table 11: A General Picture of the Prioritization of the Problem of Poverty**

<b>Number of Countries with National Poverty Plans</b>			
	<b>Total Number of Countries</b>	<b>National Poverty Plan In Place</b>	<b>Poverty Addressed Within National Planning Framework</b>
Africa	42	15	7
Asia/Pacific	26	10	12
Arab States	15	4	2
E.Europe/CIS	22	5	6
Latin America/Caribbean	25	9	8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>43 (33%)</b>	<b>35 (27%)</b>

**Source:** Table 2.1 “Number of Countries with National Poverty Plans” In *United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 1998 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 1998. New York: United Nations Development Programme, 22.

**Table 12: Worldwide Efforts For Reducing Poverty**

<b>Progress on Poverty Plans, Estimates and Targets by Region, December 1999</b>			
<b>More than three-quarters of countries have poverty estimates, and more than two-thirds have anti-poverty plans, but fewer than a third have set targets.</b>			
	<b>Countries With Poverty Plans or Poverty In National Planning (%)</b>	<b>Countries With Estimates (%)</b>	<b>Countries With Targets (%)</b>
Arab States	53	59	6
Asia and the Pacific	71	83	50
Europe and the CIS	61	64	14
Latin America and the Caribbean	81	88	27
Sub-Saharan Africa	73	82	42
Total	69	77	31

**Source:** UNDP country offices as presented by Table 1.1 “Progress On Poverty Plans, Estimates and Targets By Region, December 1999” In *United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 2000 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 2000. New York: United Nations Development Programme, 19.

#### **4.4 UNDP In Practice: Example Cases From Zimbabwe, South Africa and Algeria**

In order to analyze what the UNDP has been doing in practice for the aim of reducing poverty, example cases from Zimbabwe, South Africa and Algeria will be presented respectively. These countries are selected for the reason that they clearly reflect the examples of how and in what ways the UNDP tackles the problem of poverty in three different countries within their unique conditions. These cases demonstrate that the UNDP activities with the goal of reducing poverty can vary from one country to another while keeping the overall UNDP approach suggesting

social and humanitarian solutions to the issue of poverty constant. It is emphasized in Zimbabwe's Country Profile included in the UNDP Poverty Report 2000 (2000: 138) that:

UNDP supports the government's action plan in microfinance, community development and poverty monitoring and assessment. For community development, the largest of the three components, UNDP concentrates on piloting projects that other donors can replicate.

The Country Profile of Zimbabwe (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138) also stresses that:

UNDP has been trying to improve coordination by helping the government create an Integrated Poverty Monitoring and Assessment System that brings together all the government agencies and donor institutions, such as UNDP, UNICEF and the World Bank, that have been involved in monitoring.

Finally, as a successful example for UNDP activities in Zimbabwe, it is stated that (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138):

One of UNDP's most promising initiatives is the Poverty Reduction Forum, created in 1996 to bring together representatives from government, civil society and donors to discuss poverty issues, programmes and areas of collaboration. In 1998, the forum worked with the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, the National Chamber of Commerce and the National Council of Churches to develop pro-poor budget recommendations, which it then presented to a pre-budget seminar for parliamentarians. One immediate result: an increase in the budget of the Ministry of Health.

However, the case of South Africa constitutes an invaluable exemplary occurrence in poverty reduction efforts with its robust emphasis on reaching out each and every comment on the issue of poverty (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 78):

In 1998 a unique series of public meetings enabled poor people throughout South Africa to talk to decision-makers about their hardships. These meetings were the first stage of the strategy of the War on Poverty Forum, a partnership of civil society organizations, the government and such donor organizations as UNDP. The South African NGO Coalition organized 35 day-long "Speak out on Poverty" hearings in 29 locations. More than 10.000 came to the first set of hearings alone. Poor people, most of whom had had little or no contact with government representatives, spoke about their experiences and their ideas for improving their

lives -at the speak-out meetings and through toll-free telephones and the mail...Through this participatory partnership, the forum put local experiences of poverty on the national agenda. Plans to replicate the "speak-out" model, tremendously effective and requiring little money, are under way elsewhere in Sub-Saharan Africa. The challenge now is finding ways to translate the forum's recommendations into action.

Another unique example is from Algeria which recognizes the merits of involving women in working life as a way to enhance the prosperity in rural areas (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 73):

UNDP is supporting a new initiative to help provide livelihoods for unemployed women and youth in remote areas of Algeria. With the assistance of a national volunteer association, a pilot project has been launched to support the development of livestock and other income-generating activities in arid zones and on high plateaux...The project's innovation is to use a knowledge transfer approach to link illiterate women with young female professionals, such as veterinarians and agricultural technicians, to build skills for raising animals. Families receive a small number of sheep or goats and sell the milk, wool and meat not needed for household consumption.

If we analyze the approaches and activities of the UNDP for poverty reduction in Zimbabwe (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138), South Africa (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 78) and in Algeria (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 73), we can observe a discourse including a more alternative development approach rather than mainstream prescriptions proposed by neoliberal economic development perspectives. To give an example, for Zimbabwe, the UNDP approach suggests a participation platform including each of the relevant parties concerning the issue of poverty reduction; and instead of a top-down strategy, the UNDP tries to set a discussion platform that brings both local and global institutions around the same table (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138). The Poverty Reduction Forum which is a UNDP initiative founded to tackle the problem of poverty in Zimbabwe is a noteworthy occurrence since it is an attempt aimed at bringing all relevant parties around a discussion table to have a debate on poverty-related issues (UNDP Poverty



Report 2000, 2000: 138). Given the participating parties in Zimbabwe cooperating with the Poverty Reduction Forum in 1998 and the successful result of their attempt (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138), it should be noted that the UNDP gives much importance to local participation and believes in the possible success of including local institutions in its attempts targeting the alleviation of poverty in that specific country (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138).

It can be concluded that the UNDP's approach can be defined with a bottom-up project understanding and with more social ways to overcome the problem of poverty taking into consideration its activities in Zimbabwe (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138), South Africa (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 78) and in Algeria (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 73).

#### **4.5 Different Views On The Issue of Poverty Reduction**

The problem of poverty is one of the most significant developmental issues in developing countries. It is just simply one of them but perhaps the most important one; the one that can affect the success of all other developmental issues in a developing country. Most of the problems that a developing country faces have a direct or indirect, implicit or explicit linkage with the problem of poverty in that country. There are a wide number of views about how poverty reduction and economic development can be achieved in developing countries and the aim of this section is to give a brief literature review of these views.

Glewwe and van der Gaag (1988: 43) highlight some important steps in coping with the problem of poverty:

To formulate poverty-reducing policies in developing countries, poverty must be defined, the poor must be identified, and policies must be chosen that best help the poor, given available resources. Information on the socioeconomic characteristics of the poor, and on the population as a whole, is crucial.

Furthermore, the questions that Öniş and Şenses (2005: 3) ask actually shed a light on the grass-roots solutions to the problem of poverty:

Is it possible to accomplish significant poverty alleviation without altering the underlying asset or wealth distribution? Is it possible to deal effectively with issues regarding unemployment, poverty, and the broader and even more challenging distributional issues through growth alone without taking into account considerations relating to ownership structures? Similarly, is it possible to reform the key Bretton Woods institutions, in a meaningful way, without tackling the underlying structure of power at the global level? A meaningful encounter with the development issues of the post-neo-liberal era requires a serious consideration of fundamental questions of this nature.

On the possible remedies for dealing with the problem poverty, Sachs and McCord (2008: 8) point out two different ways:

Theories on how to tackle extreme poverty are varied and controversial. For the most part, they can be divided into two camps: strategies that focus on promoting market-oriented economic growth, and strategies that focus on directly addressing the needs of the poor. Of course the two approaches can be combined.

As Sachs and McCord (2008: 8) mention, these two perspectives can co-exist and they are not necessarily mutually-exclusive. Kakwani (2006: 20) explains the meaning of “economic growth” as follows:

Economic growth provides greater command over goods and services and thus, on average, gives people greater choices. However, this does not necessarily imply higher wellbeing for everyone; the benefits of economic growth are never shared equally. Increasing per capita income is not an appropriate indicator of changes in the aggregate wellbeing. Economic growth is a means and not an end of development and thus must be supplemented with indicators that are more closely related to individual lives.

In other words, Kakwani (2006: 20) argues that “economic growth” is never adequate to change the whole picture into a better one without a meaningful and an egalitarian reflection of it to the whole society and the measurement of it will never

indicate the actual prosperity of a society without the support of more human-focused measurements. In this sense, the argument of Fukuda-Parr (2004: 396) is explanatory and encompasses the whole debate:

Economic development can be ruthless, by benefiting some at the expense of others; voiceless, by excluding the voice of people; jobless, by creating wealth but not jobs; futureless, by exhausting the next generation's resources; and rootless, by destroying cultural traditions and identities.

On the other hand, Barnaby (2001: 172-173) proposes a discourse relying intensively on highlighting the importance of “economic, social and cultural rights” as a starting-point of alleviating poverty. Barnaby (2001: 172-173) places emphasis on the international protection of “rights” as a way of overcoming the problem of poverty:

Efforts to reduce poverty would be greatly assisted if NGOs such as Amnesty International, Oxfam, the World Development Movement, and so on, would use their influence to focus attention on violations of economic, social and cultural rights rather than concentrating simply on violations of civil and political rights. It is important that economic, social and cultural rights are, like civil and political rights, regarded as 'real' rights, taken seriously in international law. It should be recognised that citizens have a legal right to enough subsistence to live and maintain a life of dignity.

Nelson (2007: 2051) explains the rationale of “human rights” perspective as follows:

The rights-based approach begins, like the MDGs, from aspects of human well-being: health, nutrition, education, and other desirable conditions. For human rights-based practitioners, however, these are in turn grounded in internationally agreed standards, contained in human rights covenants and treaties. The first difference, then, is philosophical: the human rights standards are not indicators or goals but legally binding statements about rights to which humans are entitled by virtue of their humanity.

The arguments of Barnaby (2001: 172-173) and Nelson (2007: 2051) may cause us to raise some questions concerning the effectiveness of international norms on influencing nation-states' actions and discourses in the international arena. The argument of Barnaby (2001: 172-173) brings another question: To what extent, do

the international civil society organizations make a meaningful impact on the specific policies of nation-states? It is not a matter of discussion that the international norms and civil society organizations as shapers of these norms have a role to play in overcoming global problems; however, we should not underestimate the vital role that nation-states play as the implementers and sometimes shapers of those international norms.

#### **4.6 A General Evaluation**

As a general evaluation, it can be concluded that the UNDP approach has a tendency to diverge from the dominant neoliberal development prescriptions and suggests different paths such as in the case of Zimbabwe (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 138), South Africa (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 78) and in Algeria (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 73). The UNDP tries to propose some social suggestions with bottom-up projects rather than entirely economic prescriptions to developing countries. The UNDP's linkage with alternative development approaches can also be clearly observed in its particular perspective concerning "economic growth" and the role of the poor in it (UNDP Official Website j).

Finally, what Martinussen (1997: 297) argues is also important to emphasize here since it tries to point out the evolving visions concerning the poor people:

First, the poor were almost invisible in the statistics as well as in theory formation. Then they became visible as a passive category of clients that had to be assisted by others. Finally, in the third stage, they appeared as visible *and* as living, active human beings, who mostly took care of themselves without external support.

Considering the UNDP discourse that has been mentioned throughout this chapter, one can come to the conclusion that the UNDP's perception of the poor fits well into the third category in which the poor are viewed as underlined by Martinussen (1997: 297) above. To sum up, it is important to note that the UNDP recognizes the importance of including the views, comments and "participation" of the poor people in poverty reduction activities and project facilitation in developing countries (UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19; UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109).

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **THE UNDP TURKEY AND POVERTY REDUCTION**

The objective of this chapter is to analyze the UNDP approach to poverty reduction in one selected country which is Turkey. The focal point of this chapter is to examine to what extent the UNDP's rhetorical position vis-a-vis the issue of poverty reduction discussed in the previous chapter is applied to the relevant country's context in practice. In this sense, firstly, a brief outline of the problem of poverty in Turkey will be presented; secondly, how the UNDP Turkey perceives the problem of poverty in Turkey and what kind of activities it has been working on accordingly will be summarized. Finally, the projects of the UNDP Turkey concerning poverty reduction will be listed and analyzed in order to observe to what extent the projects in practice reflect the UNDP's rhetorical position regarding the issue of poverty in particular (see Chapter 4) and if the rationale of these projects is compatible with the theoretical framework defining the UNDP approach to the issues of poverty and development (see Chapter 3).

## **5.1 POVERTY IN TURKEY**

### **5.1.1 The Problem of Poverty In Turkey**

Poverty constitutes one of the most serious economic and social phenomena in Turkey and it appears that no long-standing and effective solution has been found until now. According to the Turkish Statistical Institute's study (Turkish Statistical Institute, Press Release Results of the 2007 Poverty Study, 2008), "The ratio of individuals who live below the food poverty line which was to 0.74 % in 2006 decreased to 0.54 % in 2007. In response to the ratio of individuals who live below the complete poverty line increased from 17.81 % in 2006 to 18.56 % in 2007."

Table 13 (Turkish Statistical Institute. Regional Statistics) below gives a general picture of "Gross Domestic Product per capita" according to the regions of Turkey as of 2001. This table (Turkish Statistical Institute. Regional Statistics) shows that "Eastern Marmara (TR4)" region has the highest "Gross Domestic Product per capita" for both two columns as of 2001; whereas, "North Eastern Anatolia (TRA)" region has the lowest as of 2001. This ranking also applies to the "GDP per capita according to Purchase Power Parity (\$)" as of 2001 (Turkish Statistical Institute. Regional Statistics).

**Table 13: A General Picture of Economic Well-being In Turkey As of Regions**

<b>Gross Domestic Product per capita</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Region Code</b>	<b>Region Name</b>	<b>Gross Domestic Product per capita (Million TL)</b>	<b>Gross Domestic Product per capita (\$)</b>	<b>GDP per capita according to Purchase Power Parity (\$)</b>
2001	TR2	Batı Marmara	2907	2399	6855
2001	TR3	Ege	3082	2545	7270
2001	TR4	Doğu Marmara	3959	3268	9336
2001	TR5	Batı Anadolu	2802	2313	6608
2001	TR6	Akdeniz	2472	2041	5831
2001	TR7	Orta Anadolu	1917	1582	4521
2001	TR8	Batı Karadeniz	2068	1707	4878
2001	TR9	Doğu Karadeniz	1730	1428	4081
2001	TRA	Kuzeydoğu Anadolu	1114	919	2626
2001	TRB	Ortadoğu Anadolu	1297	1071	3059
2001	TRC	Güneydoğu Anadolu	1437	1186	3389

**Source:** Turkish Statistical Institute. Regional Statistics. Accessed online: <http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/Bolgesel/tabloOlustur.do> 14.05.2009.

On the other hand, Table 14 (Turkish Statistical Institute, Press Release Results of the 2007 Poverty Study, 2008) “The Poverty Rates According to Poverty



Line Methods” shows the “percentage of poor individuals” from 2002 to 2007 for Turkey and also reveals the percentages for both “urban” and “rural” areas separately for each category. According to this table (Turkish Statistical Institute, Press Release Results of the 2007 Poverty Study, 2008), it can be concluded that there has been an almost steady decrease in the “percentage of poor individuals” from 2002 to 2007 for “food poverty” in Turkey. Furthermore, this table (Turkish Statistical Institute, Press Release Results of the 2007 Poverty Study, 2008) clearly shows and verifies the fact that “rural” areas are poorer than “urban” areas in Turkey.

**Table 14: The Problem of Poverty In Turkey**

<b>The Poverty Rates According to Poverty Line Methods</b>						
<b>Methods</b>	<b>Percentage of Poor Individuals (%)</b>					
	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>TURKEY</b>						
Food Poverty	1.35	1.29	1.29	0.87	0.74	0.54
Complete Poverty (food+nonfood)	26.96	28.12	25.60	20.50	17.81	18.56
Below 1 \$ per capita per day (1)	0.20	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
Below 2.15 \$ per capita per day (1)	3.04	2.39	2.49	1.55	1.41	0.63
Below 4.3 \$ per capita per day (1)	30.30	23.75	20.89	16.36	13.33	9.53
Relative poverty based on expenditure (2)	14.74	15.51	14.18	16.16	14.50	14.43

**Table 14 (cont'd)**

	<b>URBAN</b>					
Food Poverty	0.92	0.74	0.62	0.64	0.04	0.09
Complete Poverty (food+nonfood)	21.95	22.30	16.57	12.83	9.31	10.61
Below 1 \$ per capita per day (1)	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Below 2.15 \$ per capita per day (1)	2.37	1.54	1.23	0.97	0.24	0.10
Below 4.3 \$ per capita per day (1)	24.62	18.31	13.51	10.05	6.13	4.89
Relative poverty based on expenditure (2)	11.33	11.26	8.34	9.89	6.97	8.20
	<b>RURAL</b>					
Food Poverty	2.01	2.15	2.36	1.24	1.91	1.32
Complete Poverty (food+nonfood)	34.48	37.13	39.97	32.95	31.98	32.18
Below 1 \$ per capita per day (1)	0.46	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.00
Below 2.15 \$ per capita per day (1)	4.06	3.71	4.51	2.49	3.36	1.53
Below 4.3 \$ per capita per day (1)	38.82	32.18	32.62	26.59	25.35	17.45
Relative poverty based on expenditure (2)	19.86	22.08	23.48	26.35	27.06	25.89

(1) Here, 618 281 TL, 732 480 TL, 780 121 TL and 0.830400 TRY, 0.921 TRY and 0.926 TRY, which are the equivalents of 1 \$ purchasing power parity (PPP), are used for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 respectively.

(2) It's based on the 50% of equalised median consumption expenditure.

**Source:** Turkish Statistical Institute, Prime Ministry, Republic of Turkey. December 5, 2008. *Press Release. Results of the 2007 Poverty Study.* Number: 192.

Table 13 (Turkish Statistical Institute. Regional Statistics) reveals the unequal distribution of wealth among the regions of Turkey; secondly, Table 14 (Turkish Statistical Institute, Press Release Results of the 2007 Poverty Study, 2008) underlines the fact that poverty remains a huge problem to solve for Turkey, particularly more problematic for the “rural” areas. Given the general framework of poverty in Turkey, the next step will be to present from which angle the UNDP Turkey observes the problem of poverty in Turkey.

### **5.1.2 The Perspective of the UNDP Turkey**

This part aims at giving a general outline of how the UNDP Turkey perceives the problem of poverty in Turkey and which aspects of poverty are highlighted for the case of Turkey. The concept of “new poverty” has been introduced for the case of Turkey (UNDP Turkey Official Website a):

According to various poverty research carried out under the auspices of the UNDP, it appears that there is an increase in “new poverty” in Turkey -- poverty which is long-term and not easily remedied by access to traditional support networks of family and friends. This demonstrates the great need for state-provided social assistance for addressing poverty.

In UNDP Turkey’s Official Website (UNDP Turkey Official Website a), it is highlighted for the case of Turkey that “A striking aspect of inequality in Turkey is regional disparity, with the Eastern and South-eastern regions less prosperous than the west.” There is also a clear emphasis on the position of “women” (UNDP Turkey Official Website a): “One of the population groups who have traditionally been economically disadvantaged in Turkey have been women, particularly in distant rural areas and in the shanty towns of large cities.” “Youth” is another underlined segment

of society according to the UNDP Turkey (UNDP Turkey Official Website a): “Another population group which is mostly affected from migration trends and the economic downturns is youth.” It can be concluded that the UNDP Turkey prioritizes and places “women” and the “youth” at their focal point (UNDP Turkey Official Website a).

It should be highlighted that for the UNDP Turkey (UNDP Turkey Official Website a), “reducing the disparities between Turkey’s regions” constitutes the most significant aspect of poverty reduction activities carried out in Turkey:

UNDP Turkey is supporting the Turkish Government’s own poverty reduction goals. The ultimate aim is to create sound policies for reducing the disparities between Turkey’s regions. In particular, UNDP Turkey helps to design and finance projects that complement the Government’s Southeast Anatolia project (GAP) as well as the GAP Action Plan launched in 2007, and its policies for Eastern Anatolia Region. In addition, UNDP supports policy development to address regional disparities.

It is mentioned that “regional and gender disparities” constitute the most problematic areas in Turkey (Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, Draft Country Programme Document For Turkey (2006-2010), 2005: 2-3):

One of the main issues facing Turkey is serious regional and gender disparities not evident in countrywide aggregates. Recently, the World Bank/State Institute of Statistics noted that 27 per cent of the country lives in poverty (based on methodology related to expenditures on food and non-food basic items), a high figure for a middle-income country although extreme poverty is low. The report highlights that poverty and inequalities are more prevalent in the eastern part of the country, in rural versus urban settings, and in low-educated versus highly educated populations.

The framework of UNDP activities in Turkey aiming at tackling the problem of poverty is pointed out as follows (Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, Draft Country Programme Document For Turkey (2006-2010), 2005: 3):

The regional development programmes in southeast and eastern Anatolia have been the centrepiece of UNDP activities for reducing disparities in line with government priorities. The UNDP southeast Anatolia programme contributed to shaping government approaches to regional development, transforming it from focusing solely on infrastructure investments into a holistic approach based on sustainable human development. As a result, regional development efforts include economic development through SMEs and entrepreneurship, social and economic empowerment for youth and women, and rural development.

In the “Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results Turkey” (United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office, Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results Turkey, 2004: 47), it is emphasized that the dimension of poverty in Turkey should not be constrained with the poverty in rural parts of Turkey concentrating on “the Southeast and Eastern Anatolia” but also the problem of poverty in big cities should be a concern for the UNDP:

Even though the percentage of poor in the population is lower in the urban and developed western areas of Turkey than in the less developed sections such as the Southeast and Eastern Anatolia, the absolute number of poor people in these more advanced regions is actually larger than those in the poorer regions. Therefore, poverty reduction should also become an explicit goal of development policy for the western metropolitan centres, including İstanbul. This provides the UNDP with the new challenge of developing urban-based pilot projects.

The objective of this part was to draw a framework of how the UNDP Turkey makes an analysis of the problem of poverty in Turkey. “Reducing the disparities between Turkey’s regions” seems to shape the UNDP Turkey’s poverty reduction agenda for Turkey with an intensive emphasis on “women” and the “youth” (UNDP

Turkey Official Website a). In the following parts, the projects of UNDP Turkey with the goal of reducing poverty will be listed and analyzed.

## 5.2 ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECTS OF THE UNDP TURKEY CONCERNING POVERTY REDUCTION

### 5.2.1 Projects of the UNDP Turkey Concerning Poverty Reduction

In this part, the major goal is firstly to give a brief information about the projects of the UNDP Turkey with the aim of reducing poverty and secondly, to make an analysis of these projects in order to observe the UNDP’s approach in practice. The projects that are included in this part are separated into two as “ongoing projects” (UNDP Turkey Official Website r) and “UNDP recently completed programmes” (UNDP Turkey Official Website s) as declared on the UNDP Turkey’s official website. Table 15 (UNDP Turkey Official Website r, UNDP Turkey Official Website s) shows the projects of UNDP Turkey with the goal of reducing poverty.

**Table 15: The List of the UNDP Turkey’s Projects Concerning Poverty Reduction**

<b>Projects of the UNDP Turkey Concerning Poverty Reduction</b>	
<b>Ongoing Projects</b>	<b>UNDP Recently Completed Programmes</b>
<p><b>Policy Advice and Capacity Building:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swiss-UN (S-UN) Fund for Youth Project (April 2008-April 2010)</li> <li>• Innovations for Women’s Empowerment in the GAP Region (March 2008-March 2011)</li> </ul> <p><b>MDGS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Localizing the UN Millennium Development Goals in Turkey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC) Phase 2</li> <li>• Promotion of Cooperation in the Area of Social Assistance</li> <li>• Microfinance Sector Development</li> </ul>

**Table 15 (cont'd)**

<p>through the Local Agenda 21 Governance Network (December 2006-December 2009)</p> <p><b>Regional Development and SME:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alliances for Culture Tourism in Eastern Anatolia (November 2008-December 2010)</li> <li>• Industrial Restructuring of Şanlıurfa Project (Technical Assistance Component) (August 2008-November 2010)</li> <li>• Competitiveness Agenda for Southeast Anatolia</li> <li>• Eastern Anatolia Tourism Development Project (2007-2009)</li> </ul> <p><b>South South Cooperation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridging South-South Cooperation and Emerging Donor Roles (March 2008-March 2011)</li> </ul> <p><b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website r.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linking Human Rights to Turkey’s Localizing MDG’s Programme</li> <li>• GAP-GIDEM – Small and Medium Enterprise Development in Southeast Anatolia</li> <li>• LEAP – Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress</li> <li>• Reduction of Socio-Economic Differences in the GAP Region</li> </ul> <p><b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website s.</p>
---	--

Each project will be presented starting from the “UNDP recently completed programmes” (UNDP Turkey Official Website s) and then moving on to the “ongoing projects” (UNDP Turkey Official Website r) respectively.

**Project 1**

<p><b>Project Name:</b> <u>Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries (TCDC)</u></p>
<p><b>Phase 2</b></p>
<p><b>Budget:</b> USD 1.098.263</p>
<p><b>Timeline:</b> 1998-2006</p>
<p><b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website b.</p>

For this project, it is mentioned that (UNDP Turkey Official Website b) “With TCDC 2 in Turkey, UNDP is continuing its overall mission of bringing experience and expertise from the global network of international development into projects and programmes.” Inclusion of all relevant parties in the project is essential and the project content is compatible with Turkey’s own conditions and strategies (UNDP Turkey Official Website b):

The executing agency of Turkey’s TCDC Project is the State Planning Organization (SPO), part of the Prime Minister’s Office. While executing this Project SPO collaborates closely with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), the Turkish International Development Agency (TICA), and key ministries. Implementation agencies include universities, Turkish public institutions and NGO’s and their counterparts in the other developing countries. Technical cooperation areas are identified based on the Turkish Government’s Five-year Development Plans, UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme.

The main objective of this project is summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website b): “The Project will support and enhance the emerging role of Turkey as an aid donor in the region by sharing technical expertise and experience.”

## **Project 2**

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Promotion of Cooperation In the Area of Social Assistance</u>
<b>Budget:</b> USD 124.000
<b>Timeline:</b> October 2005-December 2006
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website c.

In UNDP Turkey Official Website (UNDP Turkey Official Website c), the UNDP’s approach to poverty reduction is explained as follows:

The draft Country Program Document for Turkey (2006-2010) identifies advocacy and action for poverty reduction as a clear UNDP portfolio for the years specified. For this reason, UNDP will prioritise increased support to policy dialogue on poverty to ensure that Turkey’s social and economic transformations yield pro-poor results and achievements of the MDGs for all citizens. To do this, UNDP will bring together a national community of practice involving a multitude



of actors in the areas of poverty and social policy, social assistance, micro finance and private sector to inform pro-poor policy-making.

The most important merit of this project is that it tries to construct a platform for discussing poverty-related issues which will be fruitful to produce a considerable number of different ideas to existing problems (UNDP Turkey Official Website c).

This project is based on these steps (UNDP Turkey Official Website c):

1. Establishing a poverty combat portal – an interactive resource house for poverty practitioners in the government, civil society and the academia
2. Supporting structured debate among practitioners around poverty assistance and social inclusion policies, leading to policy advice to government actors
3. Supporting original and innovative research on poverty and social policy

The main goal of this project is highlighted as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website c):

Networking among practitioners and pooling of knowledge on poverty will allow policy makers to improve poverty reduction and social assistance schemes – strengthening Turkey’s poverty and social assistance practice, resulting in better services to the poor, increasing their choices and opportunities.

The idea of “networking among practitioners and pooling of knowledge on poverty” (UNDP Turkey Official Website c) will definitely have a crucial role in filling the gap in Turkey concerning this issue. In Turkey, there is still an urgent need for both “structured debate among practitioners around poverty assistance and social inclusion policies” and “original and innovative research on poverty and social policy” (UNDP Turkey Official Website c).

### **Project 3**

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Microfinance Sector Development</u>
<b>Budget:</b> USD 160.000
<b>Timeline:</b> March 2005-March 2006
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website d.

This project draws attention to the significance of “local poverty initiatives”

(UNDP Turkey Official Website d):

A central feature of UNDP’s presence in Turkey is poverty reduction. UNDP’s government partners recently acknowledged the Assessment of Development Results recognition of UNDP’s programmatic and policy impact on poverty-related issues. Government partners further supported UNDP’s continued and enhanced role in poverty related programming, including the small and medium enterprise (SME) programmes in Southeastern Anatolia and its increased emphasis on engaging the private sector to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). With this high-level recognition and UNDP’s priorities in line with government priorities, UNDP focuses on achieving the MDGs and Reducing Human Poverty through local poverty initiatives, including microfinance, and pro-poor policies for achieving the MDGs.

This project depends on the rationale that the problem of poverty should firstly be dealt with “local poverty initiatives” (UNDP Turkey Official Website d). The role of “microfinance” in attempts to tackle the problem of poverty is underlined within the scope of this project (UNDP Turkey Official Website d):

In addition, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the year 2005 as the International Year of Microcredit to recognize microcredit’s contribution to poverty alleviation, further highlighting that people living in poverty in rural and urban areas need access to microcredit and microfinance that enhance their ability to increase income, build assets, and mitigate vulnerability in times of hardship. UNDP Turkey therefore starts activities to support dialogue around microfinance and promote debate on how microfinance can be used as a tool for poverty reduction.

This project depends on these two aspects (UNDP Turkey Official Website d):

1. Recognition of the Year of Microcredit, and
2. Supporting the Virtual Microfinance Information Center.

The objective of this project is explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website d):

By the end of the project period, there will be a common understanding on microfinance among a wide range of stakeholders including policy makers, potential service providers, academicians and government institutions. The

project also aims to support an enabling environment for microfinance service providers, which will be through policy support for the current Draft Law on Microfinance Institutions.

#### **Project 4**

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Linking Human Rights To Turkey's Localising MDGs Program</u> <b>Budget:</b> USD 100.000
<b>Timeline:</b> Jan-Dec 31 2007
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website e.

The main rationale of this project is pointed out as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website e):

The under-pinning objective of the project at hand is to complement the 'Localizing MDGs in Turkey through the Local Agenda 21' program with a set of pilot activities, that will strengthen the application and the use of duty bearer and claim holder definitions by service providers and by civil society in Turkey's localized (i.e. municipal) MDG planning. It is envisaged that poverty reduction strategies are strengthened to incorporate MDG attainment goals with social inclusion and human rights practices at national and local level.

For this project, it is also mentioned that (UNDP Turkey Official Website e):

Through the DGTTF funded set of activities, UNDP will provide technical guidance, advocacy tools, national and international partnerships for the actors of 'Localizing MDGs' to link human rights principles to their local level MDG plans and budgeting processes.

The possible effects of this project are emphasized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website e):

The primary direct beneficiaries of the Project will be the local authorities and municipal services participating in the Project, as well as the Citizens', Women's and Youth Councils and Bar Associations in LA 21 networking cities. In the light of the positive impacts of linking human rights to the MDGs, the ultimate beneficiaries of the Project will be the local communities at large, with particular repercussions upon the capacity building of women and youth.

Along with this project, there is an emphasis on “the capacity building of women and youth” (UNDP Turkey Official Website e) which reflects the UNDP Turkey’s general approach (UNDP Turkey Official Website a).

### Project 5

<b>Project Name: <u>Small and Medium Enterprise Development In Southeast Anatolia (GAP-GIDEM)</u></b> <b>Budget: 7.590.000 Euro</b>
<b>Timeline: May 2002-November 2007</b>
<b>Source: UNDP Turkey Official Website f.</b>

The goal of this project is mentioned as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website f):

The long-term vision is to improve the competitiveness of southeastern Anatolia in national and international markets. Our mission with the GIDEM programme is to improve the entrepreneurial, operational and managerial capacities of existing entrepreneurs, small, medium and micro-enterprises by providing information, training and advisory services.

The organization of this project is explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website f):

UNDP has established GIDEM offices in the four provincial capitals of the GAP region: Adiyaman, Diyarbakir, Mardin and Sanliurfa. In addition, we have set up a central project coordination and management unit at the headquarters of our Turkish counterpart, the GAP Regional Development Administration. (GAP – in English, the Southeast Anatolia Project, started in 1977, with the support of UNDP).

The activities carried out under this project are summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website f): “The local GIDEM offices provide a wide range of business development services including **training, information services** and **consultancy**. GIDEM offices can also develop and implement larger-scale projects

called “**opportunity windows**”.” The concept of “opportunity window” is explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website f):

An “Opportunity Window” can be defined as creating special clusters of GIDEM services geared towards meeting the specific needs of local SMEs by achieving best practices in their region. Opportunity Windows generally involve the active participation of local communities including business associations, universities etc. GIDEM offices have so far developed the following Opportunity Windows:

- Textile Training Centre (Adiyaman)
- Development of agro-based industries – garlic (Adiyaman)
- Development of Women Entrepreneurship (Diyarbakir)
- Dicle University Entrepreneurship Center (Diyarbakir)
- Development of House Wine Sector (Mardin)
- Development of Silver Handcrafting Sector (Mardin)
- Development of agro-based industries – aromatic plants (Sanliurfa)
- Development of Organic Agriculture (Sanliurfa)

The main rationale of this project is highlighted as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website f):

By improving the competitiveness of small and medium enterprises in southeastern Anatolia, GIDEM will help to alleviate regional disparities in Turkey. By promoting the investment opportunities in the region and facilitating investments through the development of feasibility studies and business plans, GIDEM will help create new jobs and thus contribute to poverty reduction.

“Reducing the disparities between Turkey’s regions” has been the primary concern of the UNDP Turkey poverty reduction agenda (UNDP Turkey Official Website a). It appears that this project is a part of this agenda with the aim of promoting the prosperity of the “southeastern Anatolia” region in general (UNDP Turkey Official Website f).

## **Project 6**

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Linking Eastern Anatolia To Progress (LEAP)</u>
<b>Budget:</b> 2.959.404 USD
<b>Timeline:</b> January 2001-May 2006
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website g.

The outline of this project is summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website g):

The programme aims to support the areas of rural development, local entrepreneurship and rural tourism by helping to set up Sustainable Human Development models. These models will help to increase income and reduce socioeconomic disparities in the area while improving gender balance and safeguarding the environment. The models being developed will be comprehensive, effective, repeatable, extendable, and participatory. They will be relevant to the economic and social needs of the target population and environmental needs of the project area and shared with the major stakeholders of the programme.

Inclusion of all relevant parties is also a vital feature of this project (UNDP Turkey Official Website g):

LEAP promotes close working relations with central and local government institutions in the design and implementation of project activities. It also cooperates closely with local NGO's and other institutions to encourage strong ownership of the program and to ensure sustainability of the policies and structures developed.

The most significant aspect of this project is that a wide of range of involvement is ensured (UNDP Turkey Official Website g). For this project, it is also emphasized that (UNDP Turkey Official Website g):

Phase 1 of the LEAP program was launched in mid-2001, focusing on three main areas of activity:

- Participatory Rural Development
- Business Development
- Rural Tourism

The major aim of this project is stressed as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website g):

The development models produced by this programme -- which are repeatable, extendable, participatory and tailored to the economic and social needs of the target communities in the region -- will be a valuable means for both government and non-governmental bodies to maximize the use of scarce resources in other regions in an effective way for local development. Enhanced capacity will benefit the communities in the region, allowing them to make use of local, national and international sources for their own sustainable development efforts.

The fact that the content of this project is “tailored to the economic and social needs of the target communities in the region” which means it is compatible with the unique conditions of the relevant area is of great importance (UNDP Turkey Official Website g).

### Project 7

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Reduction of Socio-economic Disparities In the GAP Region (GAP Phase 2)</u>
<b>Budget:</b> Approximately 5.4 million USD (overall), Approximately 1.4 million USD (phase 2)
<b>Timeline:</b> Phase 2: December 2004-November 2007
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website h.

Concerning this project, it is stated that (UNDP Turkey Official Website h):

The two-phase program, “Reduction of Socio-economic Differences in Southeastern Anatolia”, aims to mobilize public resources into the social development needs of the Region. The program has a strong focus on human-based development. Phase 1 of the program has achieved some tangible results such as establishment of a database of cultural heritage of Mardin, increased communication among young people, and translation of the Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) project into an EC funded project (GIDEM).

For this project, it is also underlined that (UNDP Turkey Official Website h): “UNDP Turkey is working together with the GAP Regional Development Agency and local stakeholders in the region. This includes including Governor’s offices, municipalities, relevant public institutions and non-governmental institutions.” Again for this project, it can be emphasized that the involvement from all segments of society is ensured which constitutes one of the merits of this project (UNDP Turkey Official Website h).

The activities of the UNDP within the scope of this project are summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website h):

In this partnership, UNDP helps to:

- Assess development needs in the region
- Provide support to develop mechanisms for good governance and development of institutional capacities at the government and non-governmental level.
- Provide technical support for the capacity development of the target group of people, including women and young people
- Develop NGO's working on social development.

The possible effects of this project are explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website h):

This program is enhancing the Government of Turkey's regional development policies in south eastern Anatolia by adding a human development perspective. The interventions in the region will continue to contribute to build good models of integrated regional development with the support of networks established under the Local Agenda 21 programme at a local level.

The idea of "adding a human development perspective" (UNDP Turkey Official Website h) is invaluable in the sense that focusing entirely on attempts to promote economic development in the region would be insufficient to respond the problems with long-lasting solutions.

### **Project 8**

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Swiss-UN (S-UN) Fund For Youth Project</u> <b>Budget:</b> USD 750.070
<b>Timeline:</b> April 2008-April 2010
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website i.

In the UNDP Turkey Official Website (UNDP Turkey Official Website i), it is mentioned that:



The S-UN Fund for Youth is a grant and technical assistance fund that supports young people to develop and implement their projects, which focus on the opportunities created by culture and tourism sectors while utilizing information and communication technologies and demonstrating commitment to the core UN values.

The details of the project are explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website

i):

The S-UN Fund for Youth Project has been launched in three pilot provinces, Konya, Muğla and Kocaeli, which are marked with abundant cultural and touristic resources, active youth potential and institutionalized structures of existing Youth Centers, as well as being among the cities that have received the highest amount of migration in the past 20 years.

The goals of the project are highlighted as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website

i):

Young women and men from 18 to 24 age groups are direct beneficiaries of the S-UN Fund for Youth. Forming project teams, young people will gain project management learning and experience, whereas the funded projects will benefit targeted communities. Apart from these direct gains, the ultimate benefit of project will be measured in terms of policy impact through generating workable models for the inclusion of youth.

This project basically depends on the idea of “the inclusion of youth” (UNDP Turkey Official Website i) which reflects the general approach of the UNDP Turkey pointing out the importance of “youth” (UNDP Turkey Official Website a).

## **Project 9**

<b>Project Name: <u>Innovations For Women’s Empowerment: A Workable Model For Women In Turkey’s Southeast Anatolia Region</u></b> <b>Budget: USD 907.360</b>
<b>Timeline: March 2008-March 2011</b>
<b>Source: UNDP Turkey Official Website j.</b>

UNDP Turkey (UNDP Turkey Official Website a) places an intensive emphasis on “women” by underlining the fact that “One of the population groups who have traditionally been economically disadvantaged in Turkey have been women...”

The project is constructed on the idea that (UNDP Turkey Official Website j):

This project aims at women’s empowerment in Southeast Anatolia in social and economic life through innovative production-marketing related strategies and re-branding. This aim is planned to be pursued through a multi-dimensional approach focusing on enhancing institutional capacities and women’s labour market participation, branding of the Southeast Anatolia and developing new sales and marketing opportunities.

The main rationale of this project is summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website j):

The implementation strategy is premised on women’s empowerment and institutional capacity development targeting women’s own capacity to associate and network for income generation purposes. This will be done by financial and technical assistance support to production workshops and ateliers managed by women and for women. In particular, financial support will be in the form of supply of small machinery and material for women managed workshops to produce goods for national and local markets. Technical assistance will focus on design elements that will add to the marketability of the goods. The association model for the workshops is generally in the form of cooperatives. Cooperatives will also receive technical support in strengthening their internal governance structures.

This project emphasizes the most effective solution for tackling the problems of women in Turkey which is ensuring “women’s labour market participation” (UNDP Turkey Official Website j).

## **Project 10**

<p><b>Project Name: <u>Localizing the UN Millennium Development Goals In Turkey Through the Local Agenda 21 Governance Network</u></b> <b>Budget: USD 1.500.000</b></p>
---

## Project 10 (cont'd)

<b>Timeline:</b> December 2006-December 2009
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website k.

The main rationale of this project is summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website k):

Since 1997, UNDP in Turkey has been cooperating with its national counterparts in the area of local governance through the Local Agenda 21 Program. The overall objective of the LA-21 program has been to strengthen local governance and enabling mechanisms by ensuring that individuals and civil society participate in decision-making and influence local investments. A direct impact of the LA-21 Program have been the establishment of “City Councils” which have been incorporated in Article 76 of the new Law on Municipalities (No. 5393).

The major objective of this project is stated as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website k): “Building on the momentum of the third phase of the LA-21 Turkey Program, this project aims at localizing the Government’s MDG commitments by advocating the prioritization of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in local action.” On the other hand, regarding the goal of this project, it is stressed that (UNDP Turkey Official Website k): “Specifically, the project aims to encourage adoption of legislation to enable the participation of civil society organizations in the formulation and implementation of economic and social programs at the local level.” The project is constructed on the idea that (UNDP Turkey Official Website k):

The project strategy rests on participatory local governance as the basic means for the civil society and citizenry to mobilize local level action for achieving the MDGs and rendering account for shortcomings; advocating the critical role of local authorities in promoting gender equality, and engaging broader segments of the society, including the private sector, in localizing the Government’s MDG commitments.

Concerning this programme, it is also emphasized that (UNDP Turkey Official Website k): “The Local Agenda 21 Program of Turkey upon which this project is built was highlighted as a global “best practice” during the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg.” This project is a crucial example of how the UNDP Turkey places an emphasis on the issue of “participatory local governance” (UNDP Turkey Official Website k).

## Project 11

<b>Joint Program Title:</b> <u>Alliances for Cultural Tourism (ACT) in Kars</u> <b>Timeline:</b> November 2008-December 2010
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website l.

This project is based on the idea that (UNDP Turkey Official Website l):

The joint program will mobilize the culture sector in Turkey’s Eastern Anatolia. It will result in increased incomes for the people of Kars contributing to the realization of poverty reduction at a localized level. In specific the joint program will develop the cultural tourism sector in Kars contributing to social cohesion by recognizing pluralism and by reducing income disparities between people of Kars and the rest of the country.

Changes that will be brought by this project are emphasized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website l):

The Joint Program contributes to the achievement of poverty reduction in Kars and its environs through leveraging the cultural tourism sector in a way which fosters social cohesion and creates income opportunities for the poor. The Joint Program will create a developmental change, albeit confined to the province of Kars.

The effects of this project are summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website l):

The three joint program outputs are:

- A model for strategic direction, prioritization and safeguarding of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and cultural tourism delivery in Turkey’s less developed regions produced and implemented in Kars

- Capacities of communities and enterprises in Kars increased for income generation job creation in the culture based tourism sector
- Local authorities and civil society in Kars and its environs and other relevant provinces, promote social cohesion and dialogue through recognizing of pluralism

In a nutshell, it can be concluded that this project is based on the rationale that poverty reduction can be achieved by effectively utilizing the unique potentials and conditions of each city or region (UNDP Turkey Official Website l).

## Project 12

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Industrial Restructuring of Şanlıurfa Project (Technical Assistance Component)</u>
<b>Budget:</b> € 2.620.000
<b>Timeline:</b> August 2008-November 2010
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website m.

Regarding this project, it is stated that (UNDP Turkey Official Website m):

The project is expected to produce the following results:

- An Integrated Industrial Development Plan developed for Sanliurfa,
- The investment opportunities in the 2nd OIZ (Organised Industrial Zone) promoted,
- Incumbents of the 2nd OIZ selected fairly, competitively and transparently,
- Capacity of the local enterprises developed,
- Capacity of the local and national institutions improved.

The goal of this project is explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website m):

The overall objective of the Technical Assistance for Industrial Restructuring of Sanliurfa Project is to reduce regional disparities in Turkey, by contributing to social stability and economic development in the Southeast Anatolia Region. More specifically the Project will identify strategic sectors for Sanliurfa OIZ and will establish an operating environment for the enterprises in the OIZ, in which such enterprises can operate competitively.

The impact of this project is underlined as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website m):

Improved competitiveness of the Southeast Anatolia Region in general, and Sanliurfa in specific, will contribute to elimination of regional disparities and to

improvement of regional and national wealth through creating of new investment and employment opportunities and improving regional competitiveness in national and international markets.

### Project 13

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Competitiveness Agenda For Southeast Anatolia (Short-term Action Plan)</u>
<b>Budget:</b> \$ 552.000
<b>Timeline:</b> 18 months
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website n.

Concerning this project, it is stated that (UNDP Turkey Official Website n):  
“The competitive agenda is based on two main strategies and three “cross-cutting” and supporting “sectoral” action lines.” These are explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website n):

The main strategies are:

- Sustainable production strategy
- Entrepreneurship development strategy

On the other hand, there are three aspects of “supporting action lines” (UNDP Turkey Official Website n):

The supporting action lines are:

- Internationalization strategy
- Applied technology strategy
- Clustering and networking strategy

The details of this project are summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website n):

While these two strategies and three action lines will be effective across all sectors, and are in essence aimed at enhancing the underlying productive capabilities of the region, the following industries will have a major role to play in the Region’s future.

- Agriculture: combining the region’s water, land, and people to create sustainably produced food products, cotton, and other fibers, maximizing the use of renewable energy sources and organic farming methods;

- Textiles and apparel: accelerating innovation, international market linkages and “clean tech” to establish a competitive edge in textiles and apparel; and
- Tourism: coordinating the region’s people and historical/cultural authenticity to excel in creating a “tourism brand”

For this project, it is also emphasized that (UNDP Turkey Official Website n):

The short-term action plan will initially support the following specific action lines:

- Action 1: Institutionalization of the Competitiveness Agenda
- Action 2: Pilot Investment on Renewable Energy Generation
- Action 3: Pilot Study on Organic Textile and Clothing
- Action 4: Access to Int’l Networks for Renewable Energy Research
- Action 5: Planning and Due Diligence

#### **Project 14**

<b>Project Name:</b> <u>Eastern Anatolia Tourism Development Project</u>
<b>Timeline:</b> 2007-2009
<b>Source:</b> UNDP Turkey Official Website o.

The main rationale of this project is explained as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website o):

First, the organizational capacity in the Coruh region is strengthened through established Local Tourism Boards, which will act as the planning and monitoring mechanism at the local level. The action plans will be developed by the Local Tourism Boards with the support of UNDP. The tourism potential is promoted both in the region as a potential income line, and to the outside partners, which will organize trips to the region/visit Coruh Valley. This will be done through preparation of tourism products and promotional materials. Specific training programs will be designed for the local stakeholders to improve their awareness of the potential and their business capacities to make income out of the tourism sector.

Furthermore, concerning this project, it is highlighted that (UNDP Turkey Official Website o):

UNDP partners with Ministry of Culture and Tourism at the central level, and the district governors/mayors/civil society organizations at the local level. The project is financially supported by Efes Pilsen. The Efes Group also provides assistance in terms of Public Relations and Promotion of the region/project.

The objective of this project is stated as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website o):

This project will build a demonstrative model for regional/rural development strategies of Government of Turkey. The Eastern Anatolia Region, more specifically Coruh Valley will receive support to develop income generating sectors that are alternative to agriculture and ultimately the income of the residents will increase.

This project is based on the strategy of extending the range of “income generating sectors” for “the Eastern Anatolia Region, more specifically Coruh Valley” and drawing attention to “tourism sector” for promoting the prosperity of the relevant area (UNDP Turkey Official Website o).

### **Project 15**

<b>Project Name: <u>Bridging South-South Cooperation and Emerging Donor Roles: Strengthen Turkey’s Participation In International Development Cooperation</u></b>
<b>Budget: 1.973.000.00 USD</b>
<b>Timeline: March 2008-March 2011</b>
<b>Source: UNDP Turkey Official Website p.</b>

In the UNDP Turkey Official Website (UNDP Turkey Official Website p), it is underlined that: “Turkey is a pivotal country of technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC), a framework of cooperation among developing countries which is recently better captured conceptually in “South-South Cooperation”.” The aim of this project is summarized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website p):

The overall objective of the project is to strengthen national capacities for the Government of Turkey as an emerging donor, through the capacity development of TİKA, as the Turkish Agency for Development. It will (1) promote the leadership of Turkey’s emerging donor role within the international development architecture, and it will (2) contribute to the capacity development of TİKA in preparing and managing Turkey’s development assistance programs, in order to increase the effectiveness of Turkish Official Development Assistance (ODA) in line with the “Paris Declaration Principles.”



The possible effect of this project is emphasized as follows (UNDP Turkey Official Website p): “This project will help the government of Turkey to contribute to the achievement of Millennium Development Goals to developing countries by sharing with other donors the experience and “best practices”, as an emerging donor.”

### **5.2.2 Analysis of the UNDP Turkey’s Projects Concerning Poverty Reduction**

In this part, an analysis of the UNDP Turkey’s projects concerning the issue of poverty reduction will be presented. Below, there is the list of key phrases of the UNDP Turkey’s projects presented in the previous part (UNDP Turkey Official Website s, UNDP Turkey Official Website r):

- “emerging role of Turkey as an aid donor” (UNDP Turkey Official Website b); “Turkey’s emerging donor role within the international development architecture” (UNDP Turkey Official Website p)
- “Networking among practitioners and pooling of knowledge on poverty” (UNDP Turkey Official Website c)
- “activities to support dialogue around microfinance and promote debate on how microfinance can be used as a tool for poverty reduction” (UNDP Turkey Official Website d)
- “linking human rights to the MDGs” (UNDP Turkey Official Website e)
- “the competitiveness of southeastern Anatolia in national and international markets” (UNDP Turkey Official Website f)
- “local development” (UNDP Turkey Official Website g)
- “strong focus on human-based development” (UNDP Turkey Official Website h)
- “inclusion of youth” (UNDP Turkey Official Website i)
- “women’s empowerment in Southeast Anatolia in social and economic life” (UNDP Turkey Official Website j)

- “participatory local governance” (UNDP Turkey Official Website k)
- “realization of poverty reduction at a localized level” (UNDP Turkey Official Website l)
- “elimination of regional disparities” (UNDP Turkey Official Website m)

It is crucial to remind that “reducing the disparities between Turkey’s regions” seems to shape the UNDP Turkey’s poverty reduction agenda for Turkey with an intensive emphasis on “women” and the “youth” (UNDP Turkey Official Website a). UNDP Turkey’s projects with the aim of reducing poverty in Turkey intensively concentrate on this rationale mentioned above (UNDP Turkey Official Website a). Looking back UNDP Turkey’s projects presented in the previous part (UNDP Turkey Official Website s; UNDP Turkey Official Website r), it can be concluded that the common feature of almost all projects is the wide range of involvement from various parts of the society which reflects the main understanding of the UNDP underlining the significance of “participation” with a bottom-up strategy (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19, 83). Particularly, “Linking Human Rights To Turkey’s Localising MDGs Program” (UNDP Turkey Official Website e) and “Localizing the UN Millennium Development Goals In Turkey Through the Local Agenda 21 Governance Network” (UNDP Turkey Official Website k) projects are good examples indicating this general approach of the UNDP (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19, 83). Also, the UNDP Turkey’s projects concerning the issue of poverty reduction are compatible with the UNDP’s principle of “nationally - owned solutions” for poverty reduction (UNDP Official Website j).

These two dominant features of the UNDP Turkey's poverty reduction projects, namely inclusion of the public institutions, private sector and civil society in the implementation of projects in line with the main understanding of the UNDP emphasizing the importance of "participation" with a bottom-up strategy (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19, 83) and designing projects according to the needs, unique circumstances and priorities of Turkey in line with the principle of "nationally - owned solutions" for poverty reduction (UNDP Official Website j), reflect the aspects of "Post-Washington Consensus" (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective.

In Chapter 3, it is concluded that the UNDP's approach to poverty and development diverges from the dominant economic perspectives and converges more with the "Post-Washington Consensus" (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) way of thinking; however, some aspects of the UNDP Turkey's projects concerning reducing poverty reflect some aspects of classical liberal and neo-liberal perspectives. For example, the "Small and Medium Enterprise Development In Southeast Anatolia (GAP-GIDEM)" project emphasizing "the competitiveness of southeastern Anatolia in national and international markets" (UNDP Turkey Official Website f) seems to adopt these perspectives at least rhetorically. Similarly, these projects also reflect some convergences with the classical liberal and neo-liberal perspectives in their proposals for overcoming the problem of poverty; the main idea of all these projects is incorporating the individuals and regions into the market and converting them into the actors of the market by utilizing from their own unique

features: “Competitiveness Agenda For Southeast Anatolia (Short-term Action Plan)” (UNDP Turkey Official Website n), “Industrial Restructuring of Şanlıurfa Project (Technical Assistance Component)” (UNDP Turkey Official Website m), “Innovations For Women’s Empowerment: A Workable Model For Women In Turkey’s Southeast Anatolia Region” (UNDP Turkey Official Website j), “Linking Eastern Anatolia To Progress (LEAP)” (UNDP Turkey Official Website g), “Microfinance Sector Development” (UNDP Turkey Official Website d). The major rationale of these above-mentioned projects is that some regions, some cities and individuals living in these regions and cities in particular should be incorporated into the free-market system by means of their own unique features and abilities and that these abilities and features should be converted into the products that can be sold in the free-market system; it is believed that through this way, economic development and poverty reduction will be achieved in the relevant regions and cities. This way of thinking is what makes the UNDP Turkey’s above-mentioned projects compatible with the classical liberal and neoliberal perspectives.

To sum up, it can be concluded that the framework of the UNDP Turkey’s projects concerning reducing poverty mostly overlaps with the UNDP’s overall approach to poverty reduction presented in Chapter 4; however, it should be noted that the rationale of some of these projects is not totally independent of the dominant liberal economic way of thinking. It is important to emphasize that the “UNDP Corporate Goals For Poverty Reduction” (see Table 10; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 20) which summarize the UNDP’s approach to poverty reduction are successfully applied to the UNDP Turkey’s projects.

The remaining question here is that why the issue of poverty still occupies a crucial position among all other economic and social phenomena in Turkey despite a wide number of efforts emanating from various sources and institutions and aiming at reducing poverty. Poverty is a problem that can be overcome in the long-term and only with long-standing and effective solutions. In order to have a total success over the issue of poverty in a country, government in power should prioritize the issue of poverty reduction among all other economic and social problems in its agenda. A long-term national plan for poverty reduction is essential. Without these, the efforts of international organizations alone are not adequate to deal with the problem of poverty in the relevant country. The issue of poverty can be observed in its various dimensions in every country; therefore, tackling the issue of poverty requires different solutions in each country addressing their own circumstances. For the case of Turkey, the problem of unemployment among particularly young population is one of the factors that hinder the process of reducing poverty throughout Turkey. High rates of unemployment deepen the problem of poverty both in urban and rural settings of Turkey. Another factor that affects the process of reducing poverty is the social structures that are embedded in the traditional background of some parts of Turkey mainly located in the East, predominantly in rural settings. Mainly these social structures construct the obstacles in front of the improvements of the conditions of women both in social and economic terms. Solutions that fail to address the women's poverty and create a replacement of traditional social structures that draw an inferior framework for women's conditions will be insufficient to reach a comprehensive accomplishment in reducing poverty in Turkey.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **CONCLUSION**

The major aim of this study is to analyze the approach of the UNDP to dealing with the problem of poverty both rhetorically and in practice. In other words, this study is an attempt to understand the perspective of the UNDP as a well-known international organization in the field of development regarding the issue of poverty reduction. The research question examined throughout this thesis is that: Are the UNDP's projects in practice compatible with its theoretical and rhetorical position vis-a-vis the issue of poverty reduction? Within the scope of this thesis, this research question can be narrowed down and also formulated as follows: Does the UNDP Turkey's projects concerning poverty reduction reflect the UNDP's relevant theoretical and rhetorical position?

Chapter 2 touches upon where the issues of development and poverty stand in the UN's agenda and then its focus shifts to the role of the UNDP as well as its contributions to the development field. Chapter 3 draws an outline of the theoretical

framework and Chapter 4 presents the rhetorical position of the UNDP concerning the issue of poverty reduction. Chapter 5 focuses on how the UNDP approach works in practice with its projects for reducing poverty and whether its perspective concerning reducing poverty in a country is compatible with its rhetorical and theoretical position. In this sense, UNDP Turkey's projects aiming at reducing poverty are analyzed as an exemplary case in the final chapter.

Chapter 2 argues that with the “Human Development Reports” (UNDP Official Website c), various indices (UNDP Official Website d, UNDP Official Website e, UNDP Official Website f) that rank the countries and give a comparative picture in a global spectrum and finally, with one of the most important contributions to the field, the concept of “human development” (UNDP Official Website i), the UNDP continues to bring a new breath to the development literature. In Chapter 3, it is concluded that the UNDP's approach to poverty and development diverges from the dominant economic perspectives and converges more with the “Post-Washington Consensus” (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective. In Chapter 4, “UNDP Corporate Goals For Poverty Reduction” (see Table 10; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 20) briefly summarize the UNDP's approach to poverty reduction and support the theoretical position of the UNDP presented in Chapter 3. This brings us to the conclusion that these “goals” (see Table 10; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 20) are successfully applied to the UNDP Turkey's projects.

The two dominant features of the UNDP Turkey's poverty reduction projects, namely inclusion of the public institutions, private sector and civil society in the implementation of projects in line with the main understanding of the UNDP emphasizing the importance of "participation" with a bottom-up strategy (UNDP Poverty Report 2000, 2000: 109; UNDP Poverty Report 1998, 1998: 19, 83) and designing projects according to the needs, unique circumstances and priorities of Turkey in line with the principle of "nationally - owned solutions" for poverty reduction (UNDP Official Website j), reflect the aspects of "Post-Washington Consensus" (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective. However, in Chapter 5, it is also underlined that some aspects of the UNDP Turkey's projects concerning reducing poverty reflect some features of classical liberal and neo-liberal perspectives. It can be concluded that the framework of the UNDP Turkey's projects concerning reducing poverty mostly overlaps with the UNDP's overall approach to poverty reduction presented in Chapter 4; however, it should be noted that the rationale of some of these projects is not totally independent of the dominant liberal economic perspectives. In other words, it should be highlighted that the theoretical and rhetorical position of the UNDP is generally reflected in the UNDP Turkey's projects concerning reducing poverty although it is equally crucial to note that some proposals of these projects are not totally irrelevant to the dominant liberal economic perspectives. This verifies the categorization of Boas and McNeill (2004: 212) in Table 6 where the UNDP occupies "medium-low" in the "neoliberal" column. This study reveals that the UNDP is more aligned with the "Post-Washington Consensus" (Öniş and Şenses, 2005; Thomas, 2008: 434-439) perspective and this feature of the



UNDP places itself in an alternative position in a global economic order which is predominantly based on liberal economic perspectives.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Articles

- Anand, Sudhir, and Amartya Sen. 1997. "Concepts of Human Development and Poverty: A Multidimensional Perspective." In *Human Development Papers 1997 Poverty and Human Development*. New York: Human Development Report Office, The UNDP, 1-19.
- Barnaby, Frank. 2001. "Can Poverty Be Made A Crime Against Humanity?." In Neil Middleton, Phil O'Keefe and Rob Visser, eds., *Negotiating Poverty New Directions, Renewed Debate*. London and Sterling: Pluto Press, 162-173.
- Boas, Morten, and Desmond McNeill. 2004. "Ideas and Institutions Who Is Framing What?." In Morten Boas and Desmond McNeill, eds., *Global Institutions and Development: Framing The World?*. London and New York: Routledge, 206-224.
- Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko. 2004. "Millennium Development Goals: Why They Matter," *Global Governance* 10: 395-402.
- Kakwani, Nanak. December 2006. "Poverty and Wellbeing." In *International Poverty Centre Poverty In Focus What Is Poverty? Concepts and Measures*. Brazil: United Nations Development Programme International Poverty Centre, 20-21. Accessed online: <http://www.undp-povertycentre.org/pub/IPCPovertyInFocus9.pdf> 10.01.2009.
- Nelson, Paul J. 2007. "Human Rights, the Millennium Development Goals, and the Future of Development Cooperation," *World Development* 35(12): 2041-2055.
- Öniş, Ziya, and Fikret Şenses. 2005. "Rethinking the Emerging Post-Washington Consensus: A Critical Appraisal." *Development and Change* 36(2): 1-37. Accessed online: <http://portal.ku.edu.tr/~zonis/OnisZiyaandSensesFikret-Post-WashingtonConsensus.pdf> 10.01.2009.

Sachs, Jeffrey D., and Gordon McCord. 2008. "Extreme Poverty." In Steven N. Durlauf and Lawrence E. Blume, eds., *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics Online. Palgrave MacMillan. 12 May 2008. [http://www.dictionaryofeconomics.com/article?id=pde2008\\_E000293](http://www.dictionaryofeconomics.com/article?id=pde2008_E000293)

Sen, Gita. "Empowerment As An Approach To Poverty." 1997. In *Human Development Papers 1997 Poverty and Human Development*. New York: Human Development Report Office, The UNDP, 175-194.

St Clair, Asuncion Lera. 2004. "The Role of Ideas in the United Nations Development Programme." In Morten Boas and Desmond McNeill, eds., *Global Institutions and Development Framing the World?*. London and New York: Routledge, 178-192.

### **Chapters In Books**

Bennett, A. LeRoy, and James K. Oliver. 2002. "Promoting Economic Welfare." In A. LeRoy Bennett and James K. Oliver, *International Organizations Principles and Issues* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Pearson Education, 297-330.

Gilpin, Robert. 1987. "Three Ideologies of Political Economy." In Robert Gilpin (with the assistance of Jean M. Gilpin), *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 25-64.

Gilpin, Robert. 1987. "The Issue of Dependency and Economic Development." In Robert Gilpin (with the assistance of Jean M. Gilpin), *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 263-305.

Karns, Margaret P., and Karen A. Mingst. 2004. "The United Nations: Centerpiece of Global Governance." In Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst, *International Organizations The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 97-144.

Karns, Margaret P., and Karen A. Mingst. 2004. "Promoting Human Development and Economic Well-Being." In Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst, *International Organizations The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 355-412.

Kuznets, Simon. 1955. "Economic Growth and Income Inequality." *American Economic Review*. March. In Martinussen, John. 1997. "Theories of Growth and Modernisation." In John Martinussen, *Society, State, and Market: A Guide To Competing Theories of Development*. London: Zed Books, 56-72.

Martinussen, John. 1997. "Poverty and Social Development." In John Martinussen, *Society, State, and Market: A Guide To Competing Theories of Development*. London: Zed Books, 296-308.

Martinussen, John. 1997. "Theories of Growth and Modernisation." In John Martinussen, *Society, State, and Market: A Guide To Competing Theories of Development*. London: Zed Books, 56-72.

Thomas, Caroline. 2008. "Globalization and Development In The South." In John Ravenhill, ed., *Global Political Economy* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 410-447.

## **Interview**

Bayazit Baran, Berna. Programme Associate, Poverty Reduction Portfolio. United Nations Development Programme Turkey. April 17, 2009. Interview with the author. Ankara.

## **Reports and Official Documents**

Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2007. *The United Nations Development Agenda: Development For All Goals, Commitments and Strategies Agreed At the United Nations World Conferences and Summits Since 1990*. New York: United Nations. Accessed online: [http://www.un.org/esa/devagenda/UNDA\\_BW5\\_Final.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/devagenda/UNDA_BW5_Final.pdf) 19.11.2008.

*Human Development Report 1997 Human Development To Eradicate Poverty*. 1997. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Accessed online: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1997/chapters/> 19.11.2008.

Ki-Moon, Ban. 2008. "Foreword." In *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2008*. New York: United Nations, 3.

Accessed online:  
<http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/The%20Millennium%20Development%20Goals%20Report%202008.pdf> 19.11.2008.

*Summary Human Development Report 2003 Millennium Development Goals: A Compact Among Nations To End Human Poverty*. 2003. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Accessed online: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr03-summary.pdf> 19.11.2008.

Turkish Statistical Institute, Prime Ministry, Republic of Turkey. December 5, 2008. *Press Release. Results of the 2007 Poverty Study*. Number: 192. Accessed online: <http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=2080> 14.05.2009

United Nations. 2003. Art. 55, Chapter 9. *Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice*. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.

United Nations. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund. 13-24 June 2005. DP/DCP/TUR/1. *Draft Country Programme Document For Turkey (2006-2010)*. Annual Session 2005. New York. Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda. Country Programmes and Related Matters.

United Nations. General Assembly. 18 September 2000. A/RES/55/2. *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. Resolution Adopted By the General Assembly [without reference to a Main Committee (A/55/L.2)]. Fifty-fifth Session Agenda Item 60 (b). Accessed online: <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf> 19.11.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Evaluation Office. 2004. *Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results Turkey*. New York. Accessed online: [http://www.undp.org.tr/docAndPucDocuments/ADR\\_Turkey.pdf](http://www.undp.org.tr/docAndPucDocuments/ADR_Turkey.pdf) 24.04.2009.

*United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 1998 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 1998. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

*United Nations Development Programme Poverty Report 2000 Overcoming Human Poverty*. 2000. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

## **Websites**

Turkish Statistical Institute. Regional Statistics.

Accessed online: <http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/Bolgesel/tabloOlustur.do> 14.05.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website a.

“Millennium Development Goals”; “About the MDGs: Basics What Are the Millennium Development Goals?.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org/mdg/basics.shtml> 14.08.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website b. “About UNDP”; “A

World of Development Experience.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org/about/> 21.10.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website c. “Human Development

Reports”; “Human Development Reports.” Accessed online: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/> 21.10.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website d. “Human Development

Reports”; “The Human Development Index (HDI).” Accessed online: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/hdi/> 21.10.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website e. “Human Development

Reports”; “The Human Poverty Index (HPI).” Accessed online: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/hpi/> 21.10.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website f. “Human Development

Reports”; “Measuring Inequality: Gender-related Development Index (GDI) and Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM).” Accessed online: [http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/gdi\\_gem/](http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/gdi_gem/) 21.10.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website g. “Human Development

Reports”; “Global Research Themes.” Accessed online: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/research/> 21.10.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website h. “Human Development Reports – Frequently Asked Questions.” Accessed online: [http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR\\_FAQs.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_FAQs.pdf) 20.11.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website i. “Human Development Reports”; “The Human Development Concept.” Accessed online: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/humandev/> 21.10.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Official Website j, “Poverty Reduction”; “Overview: UNDP and Poverty Reduction.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org/poverty/overview.htm> 14.08.2008.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website a, “Poverty Reduction.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem.aspx?WebSayfaNo=93> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website b. “Sharing Turkey’s Expertise – TCDC 2.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=32> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website c. “Promotion of Cooperation In the Area of Social Assistance.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=29> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website d. “Microfinance Sector Development.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=28> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website e. “Linking Human Rights to MDGs In Turkey.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=996> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website f. “Small and Medium Enterprise Development In Southeast Anatolia (GAP-GIDEM).” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=30> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website g. “Linking Eastern Anatolia to Progress.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=27> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website h. “Reducing Socio-Economic Differences In Southeastern Anatolia.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=31> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website i. “Swiss-UN (S-UN) Fund For Youth Project.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=1744> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website j. “Innovations For Women’s Empowerment In the GAP Region.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=1426> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website k. “Localizing the MDGs In Turkey.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=956> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website l. “Alliances For Culture Tourism (ACT) In Eastern Anatolia.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=1741> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website m. “Industrial Restructuring of Şanlıurfa Project (Technical Assistance Component).” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem.aspx?WebSayfaNo=1719> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website n. “Competitiveness Agenda For Southeast Anatolia (Short-term Action Plan).” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=1435> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website o. “Eastern Anatolia Tourism Development Project.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=883> 30.04.2009.



United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website p. “Bridging South-South Cooperation and Emerging Donor Roles.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=1439> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website r. “Ongoing Projects.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem.aspx?WebSayfaNo=93> 30.04.2009.

United Nations Development Programme Turkey Official Website s. “UNDP Recently Completed Programmes.” Accessed online: <http://www.undp.org.tr/Gozlem2.aspx?WebSayfaNo=669> 30.04.2009.

### **Working Papers**

Glewwe, Paul, and Jacques van der Gaag. 1988. “Conclusion.” In Paul Glewwe and Jacques van der Gaag, *Confronting Poverty In Developing Countries Definitions, Information, and Policies*. LSMS Working Paper Number 48. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 43-44.