IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND ENERGY DEMOCRACY FOR SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

Ozge Yalciner Ercoskun ozgeyal@gazi.edu.tr Ebru Vesile Ocalir-Akunal ebruocalir@gazi.edu.tr

Gazi University Faculty of Architecture Department of City and Regional Planning, Ankara-TURKEY

ABSTRACT

Energy is a hot topic today with the reasons of increased consumption, increased cost, depleted natural resources, our dependence on foreign sources and the impact on the environment and the danger of global warming. Something has to change. In recent years, many countries have implemented policy measures to promote renewable energy. However, the policy makers face with subjective opinions on energy and environment policy. Assessment of environmental impacts in specific projects or sites often are necessary. Any site selection should consider the economic, social and environmental aspects.

Energy consumption in Turkey is expected to double from 2010 to 2020. To facilitate this necessary increase in energy production, the government has made several critical decisions, including changes in laws, privatization of state-owned companies, and the invitation of foreign energy companies to invest in Turkey. These policies have facilitated a massive increase in construction of electricity production and in energy infrastructure during the last years (Knudsen, 2015).

Governments that implement aggressive economic development strategies within the neoliberal framework may tend to ignore demands that environmental groups raise. These governments may even try to repress environmental protesters who raise environmental demands that pose challenges to their policies shaped around economic interests (Ozen, 2014). However, since environmental issues have turned at the global level into prominent social issues of public participation in the last few decades, it has been increasingly hard for these governments to declare themselves against environmental demands. The surge of environmental protest in Turkey has been interpreted as above politics activism that strengthens civil society, fosters alternative expressions of identity, and creates new forms of agency outside the state.

Over the last twenty years, a number of local protest movements have emerged in Turkey against new investments and power plants, planned to be constructed all over the country. Most of these movements have been considerably effective in terms of mobilizing communities both at the local and national level, attracting the attention of the mass media and the wider public to some extent, and winning court decisions in their favor. Some villagers, activists, chamber of city planners and metropolitan municipalities are rallying against the threat of land expropriation for the construction of new power plants. Some campaigns and petitions are on the way.

This study queries how the greatest environmental protests happened in the last twenty years in Turkey, how the process was progressed, who participated in this process and what needs to be made for solutions. The concept of 'Energy Democracy' is being discussed which aims to meet the energy needs of the regions for developing social issues between the private and the public sector within the scope of the public participation and social interaction. The empirical data for this study was collected using interview with environmental advocates and academicians, and documentary sources. The documentary sources of the study mainly include newspaper and internet reports circulating between 2003 and 2016.

The main selected environmental protests are:

- 1. Izmir Bergama Gold Mining Protest,
- 2. Mersin Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant Protests,
- 3. Gezi Protests,
- 4. Artvin Cerattepe Mining Protests and
- 5. Amasra Thermal Power Station Protest in Turkey.

Research questions of the study are:

- What are the reasons for the protests?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the project?
- Who are the shareholders? Who are the opponents?
- What is the result of the protests?

Keywords: Important Environmental Protests in Turkey, Energy Democracy, Public Participation, Sustainable Communities.

1. INTRODUCTION

Energy is a hot topic today with the reasons of increased consumption, increased cost, depleted natural resources, our dependence on foreign sources and the impact on the environment and the danger of global warming.

On going discussions about energy range from energy access to climate justice and from antiprivatisation to workers' rights. People develop ideas against the rules of the market and how energy might be produced, distributed and used. For many movements involved in struggles around energy, the concept of energy democracy is proving increasingly useful as a means of bringing together disparate but clearly linked causes under a shared discourse (Angel, 2016).

Energy democracy traces the origins of the "Energiewende (an energy turnaround or transformation) movement" in Germany from the Power Rebels of Schönau to German Chancellor Angela Merkel's shutdown of eight nuclear power plants following the 2011 Fukushima nuclear accident. This movement gave community groups the courage to be the key actors in the bottom-up fight against climate change (Morris & Jungjohann, 2016)

Something has to change. In recent years, many countries have implemented policy measures to promote renewable energy. However, the policy makers face with subjective opinions on energy and environment policy. Assessment of environmental impacts in specific projects or sites often are necessary. Any site selection should consider the economic, social and environmental aspects.

The term "energy democracy" clearly evokes a desire for collective control over the energy sector, counterposed with the dominant neoliberal culture of marketisation, individualisation and corporate control. Energy democracy is concerned with shifting power over all aspects of the sector – from production to distribution and supply, from finance to technology and knowledge – to energy users and workers. Movements deploying the concept of energy democracy also demand a socially just energy system, meaning universal access, fair prices and secure, unionised and well-paid jobs. They want an energy system that works in the public interest, with the profit motive giving way to social and environmental goals. And they seek a transition from high to low carbon energy sources, ultimately meaning a world powered by 100 percent renewable energy. On this basis, there have been various

attempts to offer a tight definition of energy democracy, for instance by the German climate justice movement and the Trade Unions for Energy Democracy alliance (Angel, 2016). Their definitions provide a seeming blueprint for a future energy sector: a sector powered by renewables, controlled collectively, with an ethos of social justice and oriented towards the public interest. There are certainly good reasons to undertake the task of a shared definition: this offers a clear direction of travel for struggle, as well as a framework for critiquing endeavours that use the term in diluted or co-opted ways. Yet there are, perhaps, some limitations of thinking about energy democracy as a welldefined end goal to be realised in the future. For political theorist Timothy Mitchell (2011), the imperialist imposition of the Western ideal of liberal democracy on the rest of the world has been enabled by an understanding of democracy as a pre-designed set of principles and structures, to be exported around the world regardless of historical and geographical context. When thinking about democracy with regard to energy, we must avoid fetishising concepts in this way, acknowledging that what works in the rural areas of Laos will likely be very different to what works in the city of London. Indeed, while the concept of energy democracy has gained significant purchase in debates across Western Europe and the US, it has thus far had little usage or relevance in the Global South, where ideas of energy sovereignty and energy justice have been more prevalent. There is, then, a real risk that energy democracy becomes a Eurocentric agenda. In response, any attempt to push ideas of energy democracy on the Global South by European activists must very clearly be avoided. Instead, the question to ask is how the energy democracy imaginary can be made relevant to the questions and priorities of struggles in the Global South, so that those who deploy the concept can cultivate solidarity, and so that the concept can be rendered more useful to southern struggles, should southern activists decide that they want to explore ways of using or adapting it. Activists in Europe and the US can similarly enrich their struggles by learning from and deepening their understanding of the framings of energy justice and energy sovereignty used in the Global South. For activist and researcher Kolya Abramsky, energy democracy – understood as an abstract vision of a future energy sector - is "a fantasy". The existing balance of power under neoliberal capitalism is profoundly anti-democratic. Thus, any kind of emancipatory energy transition would require a fundamental transformation of the existing geometries of power – and, as such, would demand a concrete and ambitious political strategy for how this kind of transformation might be achieved.

Therefore, we might wonder whether the more pressing question is not the precise details of what a future energy utopia might look like but, rather, how we might build collective power and organisation. If we want to foreground these political questions, it might be more productive to conceive of energy democracy as an ongoing process of democratisation. Seen this way, energy democracy becomes the question of how we might go about organising to craft a more socially just, sustainable and collectively controlled energy arrangements, within the historical and geographical circumstances we inhabit. Conceived as such, energy democracy is not a future utopia to be won but, rather, is itself an ongoing struggle or, perhaps more precisely, an ongoing series of multiple struggles over who owns and controls energy and how, where and for whom energy is produced and consumed.

It is, perhaps, through a fluid movement and ongoing conversation between these diverging understandings of energy democracy – as blueprint and as process – that progress can be made. For just as struggles need to be guided by an idea of what kind of energy sector we want, a detailed vision of a future sector is no use without concrete strategies for how this future might be won. In this spirit, this report will oscillate between these different questions, contributing to debates around what we ought to be fighting for and how our fights might be won.

Energy democracy is a political, economic, social, and cultural concept that strengthens and transforms technological energy transformation with democracy and public participation. It depends on encouraging local energy ownership within the framework of energy efficiency and decentralization (Wikipedia website). As green technologies increase, new actors will emerge in transformation such as

prosumers (producer + consumer), renewable energy cooperatives, and municipal or community power stations, centralized power units. This concept is adopted by the renewable energy sector, local people, workers' associations, think tanks and NGOs. At the German climate camp in 2012, energy democracy has offered 'sufficient energy for everyone', it has to be produced without destroying the environment and communities, socialization and democratization in production, and change in attitude and vision in energy consumption. In 2014, energy democracy was defended in the city of Boulogne-Billancourt in France and the city stated its vision of independency from fossil fuels and reducing energy consumption citywide. This concept will lead to new discourses for ecological movements and social, economic justice.

Energy democracy proposes change in the resource and ownership of energy. The management of energy systems must be operated by the public in a transparent, accountable manner. In this concern, the citizens should have the right to say (Transnational Institute website). It is important that communities contribute to energy production through cooperatives. Equity in the distribution of energy, fair distribution regardless of socio-economic situation, and governance of energy systems are indispensable for energy democracy (Renewableenergy World website). In many places, small-scale cooperatives are supported that generate renewable energy.

The General Directorate of Cooperatives of the Ministry of Customs and Trade made an attempt in Turkey. It will be possible to establish Renewable Energy Production Cooperatives, where at least seven members of the cooperative will be able to produce electricity up to 5MW in the same local distribution area (YEUK, 2016).

In summary, democracy is an important indicator for sustainability. Everyone is equal (horizontal and heterarchical approach, no hierarchical and no top to bottom) (Joubert & Alfred, 2007). Socially and ecologically sustainable communities are equitable, diverse, connected and democratic and provide a good quality of life. It is not possible to reach ecological sustainability and social interaction by globalized firms, which aim to increase their profits, international competitiveness and economic growth. It can be succeeded by small local communities to meet their requirements from local resources. This will happen if communities develop economic cultures to improve their quality of life within the limits of their own locales, while building the integrity and stability of the ecological world. Today's global economic model succeeds in creating competition by dividing people from one another. To build cooperative, harmonious societies we need an approach that creates more opportunities for people from different places and ages to interact- work together, have social interaction together. A happy society is one that encourages close ties and mutual interdependence, granting each individual a net of unconditional emotional support. A happy society includes caring about future generations.

Research questions of the study are:

- What are the reasons for the protests?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the project?
- Who are the shareholders? Who are the opponents?
- What is the result of the protests?

2. CASE STUDIES

The main selected environmental protests in Turkey are (Map 1):

- 1. Izmir Bergama Gold Mining Protest,
- 2. Mersin Akkuyu and Nuclear Power Plant Protests,
- 3. Gezi Protests,

- 4. Artvin Cerattepe Mining Protests and
- 5. Amasra Thermal Power Station Protest in Turkey.



Map 1. The main selected environmental protests in Turkey

2.1. Izmir Bergama Gold Mining Protest

Bergama protest is a movement born at the very beginning of the 1990's against the gold mine Project proposed by Eurogold, a multinational mining company which wanted to operate in an area between Ovacik, Çamköy and Narlica villages in Bergama, İzmir. Eurogold's mining project has been operating for recent years in the Bergama region, containing about 2.5 million tons of ore containing ore and extracting ore in the mining facilities (Horuş, 2009).

What is the reason behind this movement?

The project not only would demolish some natural assets, but also would threat public health because of the cyanide to be used.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the project?

Advantages;

- opportunities to work in the gold mine facility for the people of the region,
- development of the region,
- obtain export revenue.

Disadvantages;

- that cyanide is a vital threat to 106,000 people living in that area, resulting in a dynamite explosion to reach the gold mines about 6 Richter is going to experience a tremor that is equally distressing,
- depriving people of their homes and livelihoods of agriculture,
- degradation of ecology.

Who are the shareholders? Who are the opponents?

The project was supported by Eurogold company on August 16, 1989, followed by British company Golder Associated Ltd., TÜBİTAK (Turkish Scientific Research Institute), Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of Forestry and Environment ministries, Koza Gold Mine operation company and Prime Ministry. (Horuş, 2009).

The actions and efforts of a number of organic intellectuals with strategic positions such as the mayor of Bergama, some local politicians and trade union leaders, opposed to the project played a critical role in the birth of this campaign. However, the protest campaign was not only a campaign carried out by these actors, but it soon grew up with the participation of people living in villages close to the mine site (Cangi, 2014).

In the first period of the conflict, in addition to the people of Bergama, the social groups included in the Bergama movement were the Environmentalist Lawyers group in İzmir, the İzmir branches of various Engineer Chambers, various professional groups such as the İzmir branch of the Classes Union, academicians from various universities in İstanbul and İzmir, community organizations and professional organizations such as the Turkish Union of Doctors (TTB) and the Union of Chambers of Architects and Engineers of Turkey (Cangi, 2014).

Result of the Protests

Despite all of the protests, mines go on their activities.

2.2. Mersin Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant protests

Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant is the nuclear power plant to be constructed at the Akkuyu location of the Gülnar district of Mersin province. If the construction is completed, it will be the first nuclear power plant of Turkey.

It is surrounded by the 200 m high hills forming a natural border around the Project Site. The ground area occupied by the default Project Site is shown in the site plan. Transportation to the project site of Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant is provided from the access road of approximately 4.5 km long separated from the Adana-Antalya highway. The closest ports to the Sahara are Mersin and Taşucu ports. The nearest airport to the Project Site is Adana City Center, 200 km away in the north-east direction of the motorway. The Project Site of the Nuclear Power Plant (NGS) covers an area of administrative and social structures belonging to the institution which has been assigned to the Electricity Generation Company (EÜAŞ) according to the ground license given in 1976 and is now surrounded by an auditorium.

A number of engineering works are being considered to protect the surface water that may come from the mountainous side in the production area, the landslide and the mud seller. In the middle of the production area are facilities such as a reactor building, turbine building and adjoining treatment plant building and normal operation power supply buildings. The reactor units of the energy units are directed to the north and the turbine buildings to the south, towards the sea. There are some hydrotechnical structures on the side of turbine buildings. It is planned to find radioactive waste storage and treatment facilities and supervised access workshops in the northeastern area of the site. The buildings are maximized to each other and combined with the galleys. According to the studies of Envy Energy and Environmental Investments Company, there are no industrial or commercial entities that could create a hazard or risk within the 30 km radius of the region that is considered for Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant. The Göksu Delta Special Environmental Protection Area is located in the Taşkent Municipality borders to the northwest of the Project Site and is in disuse since 2002 and is planned to be organized as Tourism

Center and Yacht Harbor in the near future. Therefore, there is no industrial investment in the nearby region. Other industrial establishments concentrate on the line between Mersin and Adana provinces, which are at least 80 km away from the region (EIA Application Report, 2011).

What is the reason for environmental protests?

The protests are related with a general reaction to nuclear power plants, and in particular in local, the site selection.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the project?

Advantages;

- The benefits of nuclear energy are to achieve high levels of electrical energy,
- It will be made up of four 1200 MW units and with an installed power of 4800 MW alone it will be able to meet about 6% of Turkey's electricity production. To illustrate an example, a unit of Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant easily meets the whole electricity needs of a big city.

Disadvantages;

- There is a risk that the damage of nuclear energy can be exhausted.
- The waste generated by nuclear power plants is dangerous.
- It is a risky technology, it can cause accidents, the risk of nuclear power plants becoming targets of terror attacks, facilitating the spread of nuclear weapons, and the exhaustion of uranium which is a nuclear energy source.

Who are the shareholders? Who are the opponents?

The project is supported by the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, Mersin Governorship, and the Russian State Nuclear Company ROSATOM. The Russian public company will build a nuclear power plant with the financial resources it will find and sell the electricity it produces to the Turkish side with a purchase guarantee of 15 years.

Opponents of the project are environmental NGOs, anti-Nuclear platform members of Mersin, some political parties and bars, and Silifke Municipality (portal.nukleerkarsitiplatform.org, 02.12.2014).

Results of the Protests

Project is under construction.

2.3. Gezi Protests

What is the reason for environmental protests?

On May 27, 2013, the 3 meter section of the wall overlooking the Military Spot of the Gezi Park was demolished at around 22:00 and 5 trees were dismantled (Akşam Newspaper, 12.06.2013). The reason behind was, a project which proposed a shopping mall by renovating an historical building inside the Gezi Park. The members of Taksim Solidarity (an NGO) have prevented the demolition of buildings by moving ahead of the construction machinery. Then 50 people from this group set up a tent in the park and kept guard until morning. By the May 28, event being heard from social media, the number of protesters increased in the morning hours. The municipal team wanted to continue the demolition at noon. However, the debate between the teams and the demonstrators began and intervened. Some politicians also supported the protesters.

The events grew. The Prime Minister, at the groundbreaking ceremony of the 3rd Bridge said, "Whatever you do, we gave you the decision for the place". The events grew even bigger. Also in other cities the actions started. The events of the Gezi protests continued 19 days, 12 people are dead and there are

thousands of injuries. Not only in this park but also in many cities all around Turkey protest continued day and night. Finally the protest was stopped by police intervention.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the project?

The proposed shopping mall could attract more tourists to the city center and could bring viability and vitality however, people need open and green spaces in the city center.

Who are the shareholders? Who are the opponents?

The stakeholders of the project are Prime Minister Erdoğan, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, Ministry of Culture.

Opponents of the project were the some NGOs, some sport fans' groups, some actors and actresses as well as anti-government parties and many civilians (Öztürk, 2014).

Results of the Protests

The planned project was postponed

2.4. Artvin Cerattepe Protest

The mining exploration work in the area was initiated in 1992 by the Canada-based Cominco Mining company, which is in search of a license.

What is the reason for environmental protests?

The effort to prevent mining attempts and related initiatives in the region, which includes the urban settlement area and the Artvin Caucasus Tourism Conservation and Development Zone, and the end of the Hatila Valley National Park, began in the 1990s (TMMOB Cerattepe Report, 2015). The Cerattepe protest was held on 16 February 2016 in order to prevent mining activities planned to be carried out in forested areas at the Cerattepe site within the boundaries of the province of Artvin province. The activities carried out since 21 June 2015 before the intervention of soldiers and police events (TMMOB Cerattepe Report, 2015). After the publication of the report prepared by the Artvin Governorate and containing the negative opinions in the Official Gazette in February 1996, drawing attention to the landslide risks of the area licensed for the mine, and the Forest Regional Directorate of the period, The work was stopped by the governor (Yavuz, 2014).

The company, which has a search license for gold, silver, copper and zinc, transferred its license in 2004 to Canada-based Inmet Mining, which operates Çayeli Bakır. The company that established Artvin Copper Enterprises has announced that it will remove copper from the public rather than gold. Green Artvin Association established in 1995 and Artvin Chamber of Lawyers filed a lawsuit in 2005 for the cancellation of the owner's license with the risk of landslide and the threat of deteriorating the health of the people of the region. The said lawsuit resulted in the cancellation of the license in 2008 and the decision was approved by the Council of State in 2009 (Yavuz, 2014).

With the new Mining Law, which entered into force on June 24, 2010, it became possible to license to search for mines in Cerattepe and the mine operation license was re-exported in 2012. Ozaltin Construction Company acquired its rights to Eti Bakır A.Ş. Company. Following the bidding process, the ministry also approved the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the copper mine. However, a lawsuit was filed in Rize in response to the cancellation and suspension of the execution of the EIA positive report. The court decided on November 20, 2014 to stop the execution. The court has also canceled the positive EIA report issued by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanism. However, the

mining company changed the project in June 2015 and submitted it again to the ministry again and received a positive EIA report (Yavuz, 2014).

Artvin activists, who took action on the acceptance of the new EIA report by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and the mining company coming to the region and requesting delivery to the containers and work machines, declared that on 19 June the Forest District Directorate would start guarding against the tree massacre on foot. The people who made a cottage to stay at Cerattepe started the guard action on June 21st. The resistance machines of the actors are separated from the work machines. Repeated attempts to remove the work machine in the presence of the gendarmerie during the activity were prevented by the people gathered in the seizure seizure area. On July 8, 2015, 761 people and 60 lawyers filed a lawsuit to stop re-execution and to cancel the EIA report. In addition to Artvin, protests were held in Istanbul and Izmir. The court has decided to reschedule. On 16 February 2016, once again, police and soldiers were in the company of Cerattepe, where the activists were on guard. Approximately 300 people have been intervened with gas bombs and plastic bullets against the group of people who closed the way to Cerattepe by vehicles. The fight between the demonstrators and the security forces continued. In some other cities like Bursa, Sinop, Trabzon, Sakarya also support activities such as Cerattepe protests were made. Approximately 700 people gathered in front of Artvin Courthouse have made a criminal complaint against the Artvin governor, the gendarmerie regiment commander and the provincial police chief, who are responsible for the attempt to put the mining company's vehicles into Cerattepe without any legal reason to create an actual situation. On 24 February 2016, members of the Green Artvin Association agreed to stop the activities of the mining company in the Cerattepe region until the completion of the legal process with the two-hour meeting with Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoglu (Yavuz, 2014).

Who are the shareholders? Who are the opponents?

Project supporters are Cominico Madencilik, Inmet Miting, Cengiz Holding Eti Bakır A.Ş, President and Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (BBC;27.02.2016, Sabah;27.02.2016). The opponents are the villagers, Artvin activists, the Green Artvin Association, Artvin Chamber of Lawyers, TMMOB Union of Engineers and Architects.

Results of the protests

The negotiations are ongoing.

2.5.Amasra Thermal Power Station Protest

Amasra Thermal Power Plant will be installed in Çapak Coast of Amasra district in Bartın province. Amasra Thermal Power Plant will be established in 1100 MW. In the study of the site selection for the thermal power station; the proximity of the project site to the coal extraction area, the land characterization of the site, geological, seismic and topographic conditions are taken into account. The hard coal to be used will be supplied from Zonguldak coal mine basin. It has been determined that 265 million tons of economic reserves are located in the coal mine of the Amasra thermal power plant Project.

As a result of all these evaluations, it was concluded that the area determined as the field of activity is the most economical and most suitable field for the project.

What is the reason for environmental protests?

Fishing activities are being carried out in the project domain. The fishing activity close to the project site is made in the area immediately behind the fisherman's bar. Tarlaağzı and Gömü Villages Water

Products Cooperative, total of 32 boats, are the opponents of this invesment (Hema Electricity Production Co. Final EIA Report, 2014). Fishermen are against the project.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the project?

Advantages;

- because of the use of coarse coal, savings are achieved, cheap electricity production is provided,
- thermal power plants can be installed in every area where the cargo can move,
- unlimited electric energy is produced thanks to water vapor, production is easy and costless.

Disadvantages;

- Gases cause destruction on agricultural products, animals, water resources and forests, they cause negative effects on people's nervous systems because they contain sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particles coming from thermal power plants. Ashes from the chimneys increase the risk of cancer in people living in the region. As a result of the diffusion of gases in the chimneys The triggering of the formation of rains, the formation of soil structure due to the falling rain, trees are affected and the livestock areas are adversely affected.
- Underground waters, rivers or sea waters are used for the purpose of cold water source to cool the heat in power plants. As a result of the release of hot water, it kills the surrounding living things and plants. As a cause of water pollution, the green leaves completely dry (Demir, 2008).
- Amasra is one of the most beautiful places of the world and our country with its historical and natural beauties. Every year hundreds of thousands of people come to Amasra, a UNESCO heritage site with 3,500 years of history to see the region and rediscover nature.
- 19 coal-fired thermal power plants operating in 2010 caused 7900 people to lose their lives. Unfortunately, this number continues to grow every year. Currently, there are 71 power plant plans in Turkey including Amasra. That means more poison will get into the air (Greenpeace, 2016).

Who are the shareholders? Who are the opponents?

Hema Electricity Production Co. is the investor and the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization approved the EIA.

CHP (Main opposition party) Bartin deputy, Green Peace, people of Bartin oppose the project (İndigo Journal, 19.11.2016). The number of 2020 poeple as Bartin Paltform filed a süit aganist the plant which is the biggest opposition in the country.

Results of the Project

The Project could not be impemented so far.

CONCLUSION

The five important projects which raised important societal reaction in Turkey during the last years are examined in detail. Two of the projects are about energy power plant projects (Mersin Akkuyu and Nuclear Power Plant and Amasra Thermal Power Station), two of them are mining projects (Izmir Bergama Gold Mining Project and Artvin Cerattepe Mining Project) and a shopping mall project inside a park. A summary of the main findings are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of the main findings

Research	The Projects/The Protests					
Questions	Izmir Bergama	Mersin	Gezi Protests	Artvin	Amasra	
	Gold Mining	Akkuyu		Cerattepe	Thermal Power	
	Protest	Nuclear Power Plant		Mining Protests	Station Protest	
		Protests		11010515		
Reason	Environmental	Very valuable	Reaction to	Very valuable	Very valuable	
behind	risks and risks	environmental	trnsforming an	environmental	environmental	
environmental	against public	assets	historical site to	assets	assets	
protest	health		a shopping mall	Risk of	Fishermen's	
			Activists'	landslide	reaction to the	
			dismantling and	desire to	project	
			demolishing of	extract gold		
			some buildings	or cupper		
			for construction			
Advantages	opportunities to	High level of	Shopping mall		savings from	
	work in the gold	electricity			coal	
	mine facility for	Less			production	
	the people of the	atmospheric			easy installation	
	region,	pollutants			unlimited	
	development of				electric energy	
	the region,				production, easy	
	obtain export				production	
	revenue				production	
Disadvantages	that cyanide is a	Rsk of nuclear	Lost of cultural	threat of	negative effects	
	vital threat to	exhausting	(historical	the health of	nervous systems	
	106,000 people	Dangerous	buiding)	the people of	many	
	area resulting in	nuclear wastes	Lost of opern	the region,	environmental	
	a dynamite	Risky	green area in the	loss of green	problems	
	explosion to	technology	city centre	spaces	pollution of	
	reach the gold		historical trees		waters, rivers	
	mines about 6		in the park		and sea	
	Richter is going		Contribution to		explosure of	
	to experience a		traffic in city		Amasra, a	
	tremor that is		centre		UNESCO	
	equally				site to many	
	distressing,				risks	
	depriving people					
	of their homes					
	and livelihoods					
	of agriculture					
	1 1 1 1 1 1					
	degradation of ecology					
Shareholders	company on	Ministry of	Prime Minister,	Cominico	Hema Electricity	
	August 16, 1989,	Energy and	Istanbul	Madencilik,	Production Co.	
	British company	Resources. the	Municipality.	Cengiz	and the Ministrv	

	Golder Associated Ltd., TÜBİTAK (Turkish Scientific Research Institiute), Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of Forestry and Environment ministries, Koza Gold Mine operation company and Prime Ministry	Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, Mersin Governorship, and the Russian State Nuclear Company ROSATOM	Ministry of Culture	Holding Eti Bakır A.Ş, President and Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs	of Environment and Urbanization approved the EIA
Opponents	people of Bergama, the social groups included in the Bergama movement were the Environmentalist Lawyers group in İzmir, the Izmir branches of various Engineer Chambers, various professional groups such as the İzmir branch of the Classes Union, academicians from various universities in Istanbul and Izmir, community organizations and professional organizations such as the Turkish Union of Doctors (TTB) and the Union of Chambers of Architects and	environmental NGOs, anti- Nuclear platform members of Mersin, some political parties and bars, and Silifke Municipality	some NGOs, some sport fans' groups, some actors and actresses as well as anti- government parties and many civilians	Artvin people, NGOs	CHP (Main opposition party) Bartin deputy, Green Peace, people of Bartin

	Engineers of Turkey				
Results	Mines go on their activities	Construction is ongoing	Project was postponed	Negotiations are ongoing	Project could not be implemented so far

The results show that, these projects tend to locate in places where natural assets are unique. However, this is not the only reason for rationale behind the protests. People react to the projects especially when their health is under certain risks. In this case, the protests return to an environmental movement. Some of the movements attract even more protesters from other cities. In the case of Gezi Protests, for example, it returned to a country-wide protests against government. The reaction of the government to these protests and movements is tough most of the time although some of the projects were postponed or a way of negotiation was searched. In the current situation, the ways for communication are not completely closed, which is a key componet of happy societies.

References:

Akşam Newspaper, 12.06.2013

Angel, J. (2016). Towards an Energy Politics In-Against-and-Beyond the State: Berlin's Struggle for Energy Democracy. *Antipode*, 49(3), 557-576.

BBC, (27.02.2016). Erdoğan'dan Cerattepe çıkışı: 'Bunlar yavru Geziciler, http://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2016/02/160227_erdogan_cerattepe

Cangı, A. (December, 2014). Bergama Direnişi Çevre Hukukunu Nasıl Değiştirdi, http://bianet.org/bianet/ekoloji/160776-bergama-direnisi-cevre-hukukunu-nasil-degistirdi

Demir, M., Erkan M., Kamar S. (December 2016). Siyanürle Altın Arama Bergama Altın Madeni, http://siyanuraltin.tripod.com/id9.html

EIA Application Report (2011). Mersin Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant

Greenpeace (December, 2016). Amasra'da Kömürlü Termik Santrale Yer Yok! https://imza.greenpeace.org/amasra?b?b

Hema Electricity Production Co. Final EIA Report, 2014.

Horuş, M. (2009, Haziran). 20. Yılında Bergama Davası, Elektrik Mühendisliği, 436, 80-83

İndigo Journal, (November, 2016). Amasra ile Karadeniz termik santral cehennemine dönüşecek!, https://indigodergisi.com/2016/11/amasra-karadeniz-termik-santral/

Joubert, K. A., & Alfred, R. (2007). Beyond You and Me: Inspirations and Wisdom for Building Community. Hampshire, Permanent Publication/Gaia Education.

Knudsen, S. (2015). Protests Against Energy Projects in Turkey: Environmental Activism Above Politics?. British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 43(3), 302-323.

Morris, C., Jungjohann, A. (2016). Energy Democracy-Germany's Energiewende to Renewables. Palgrave Macmillan.

Öztürk, B. (May, 2014). Gezi Parkı Protestolarının Yıldönümünde Akılda Kalan, https://onedio.com/haber/gezi-311358

Ozen, H. (2014). Overcoming Environmental Challenges by Antagonizing Environmental Protesters: The Turkish Government Discourse against Anti-hydroelectric Power Plants Movements. Environmental Communication, 8(4), 433-451.

portal.nukleerkarsitiplatform.org, 02.12.2014

Renewableenergy World website, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/articles/ucg-content/2016/08/22/a-new-logo-and-a-definition-of-energy-democracy.html, 24/10/2016

Sabah, (27.02.2016) Veysel Eroğlu'ndan Cerattepe açıklaması: Çevre ile uyumlu olacak, http://www.sabah.com.tr/gundem/2016/02/27/veysel-eroglundan-cerattepe-aciklamasi-cevre-ileuyumlu-olacak

TMMOB, (March, 2015) TMMOB Cerratepe Report https://www.tmmob.org.tr/sites/www.tmmob.org.tr/files/cerattepe.pdf

Transnational Institute website, https://www.tni.org/files/publicationdownloads/energy_democracy_workshop_report_for_web-2.pdf, 24.10.2016

Wikipedia website, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Energy_democracy, 25.10.2016

Yavuz, Y. (February, 2016). Artvin 22 yıldır Ali Cengiz oyunlarına direniyor http://haber.sol.org.tr/blog/serbest-kursu/yusuf-yavuz/artvin-22-yildir-ali-cengiz-oyunlarina-direniyor-103662

YEUK (2016). http://koop.gtb.gov.tr/data/51f8f4a5487c8e0cd860782d/BROSUR-YEUK.pdf, 30.12.2016