

Debate of Statism
During Construction of Turkish Modern Republic:
The Experience of “Kadro” (1932-1934)

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Kuruluşu Sürecinde Devletçilik Tartışması:
Kadro Dergisi Örneği (1932-1934)

Zeynep Ekin Bal

109674016

Thesis Instructor: Prof. Dr. R. Mehmet Türkay

Jüri Üyesi: Prof. Dr. E. Ahmet Tonak

Jüri Üyesi: Doç. Dr. Bülent Bilmez

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: August, 25, 2011

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 88

Key Words

1. Cadre
2. Statism
3. Third Way Ideology
4. Turkish National Independency Movement
5. Great Depression

Anahtar Kelimeler

1. Kadro
2. Devletçilik
3. Üçüncü Yol
4. Kurtuluş Savaşı
5. Büyük Bunalım

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for any award or any other degree or diploma in any university or other institution. It is affirmed by the candidate that, to the best of his (or her) knowledge, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the thesis is to provide a discussion on “statism” at the time of emergence of the Turkish Republic as a nation state with respect to the case of “Cadre (Kadro)”, the journal published between the years 1932 and 1934. In this work we will try to analyse Kadro with its emphasis on statism within 1930s’ socio-political atmosphere. Relationship between statism practices developed with emergence of Kadro and socio-political conjuncture of the term and emergence of Kadro shall be discussed.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the thesis is to provide a discussion on “statism” at the time of emergence of the Turkish Republic as a nation state with respect to the case of “Cadre (Kadro)”, the journal published between the years 1932 and 1934. In this work we will try to analyse Kadro with its emphasis on statism within 1930s’ socio-political atmosphere. This study provides an analysis on reflection of discussions of statism during Formation Period of Turkish Republic on today’s policies and content analysis of discussions. Content analysis is made within Kadro Journal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

ABSTRACT

SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. 1920's Turkey- First Years of Turkish Republic
 - 2- 1930's Turkey and Emergence of Kadro
 - 2-1 Conditions Prepared the Emergence Of Kadro
 - 2-2 Kadro's Comments About the Effects of the Great Depression on Turkey
 - 2-3 Kadro's Ideal and Suggestions on Turkey's Development and Sources Of Kadro
 - 2-4 Third Way Ideology
- 3 Statism From The Point Of Kadro
 - 3-1 Debate on Statism
 - 3-1.1 Ahmet Ağaoğlu
 - 3-1.2 Ahmet Hamdi Başar
 - 3-1.3 Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın
- 4 Conclusion

INTRODUCTION

Kadro journal (1931-1934) emerged just after the first decade of Turkish Republic. It is an organization formed with the purpose of making a theoretic contribution to establishing infrastructure of the regime in order to create an ideological structure for young Republic based on the thesis that Turkish Revolution continues, and it refers a newly “cadre” representing ideological efforts. This cadre emerged with clear goals such as providing support for efforts of establishing national unity as they believed in eliminating other ideological options from ideological structure of the commanding regime. It could maintain its mission only for a short time. Approximately two years from the date it was first published, it was stopped by the regime itself with a law. Kadro journal and the group of its publishers and authors emerged as one of the actors of the new regime to be established. They defined themselves in the framework of an alternative ideological way they call Third Way in the axis of statism discussions of the period, which is also the subject of this study. The meaning of their Third Way is explained in the sections of the study where statism discussions are included. At the same time, Kadro took the side of ‘discontinuity’ in the discussions of ‘continuity vs discontinuity’ in the first years of new Republic.

In this study, socio-political and socio-economic dynamics of 1920s and 1930s will be discussed, dialogues of the authors of the journal and criticisms the group recieved will be compared by taking Kadro journal as a reference.

1- 1920's Turkey: First Years of the Turkish Republic

Turkey in 1920s was preparing to establish the ideological infrastructure of the newly formed Republic where ideological discussions had been at peak.

According to Turkey (2009), critical point indicates the start of a capital accumulation that started in the last period of Ottomans and an unequal capitalist transition. To this extent, the background of nation state process discussed in 1920s is formation of a nation state when accumulation period since Ottomans came to a break point. However, continuity and discontinuity happened at the same time and the process wasn't shaped by only one of these key elements. Emergence of nation state includes and covers both continuity and discontinuity: "Here critical point is the fact that as a social relationship, capitalist accumulation provides and protects the continuity. In other words, accumulation in the process of capitalising went through a "national" transition without losing this aspect. In this sense, form and actors of reproduction causes this continuity that either changes or occurs as a discontinuity" (Türkay, 2009, p.202).

According to Turkey (2009), discussions of "discontinuity vs continuity" should be based on 'capital accumulation' as a social process. When it's approached in this sense, the Independency war following the World War I and the processes of nation building and ideological changes during national redevelopment of institutions indications of discontinuity and the reason is the capital itself. Hence approaching to capital accumulation as an actor requires approaching to concepts of discontinuity and continuity together. Moreover, the concept of nation itself includes capital accumulation historically and it emerges as a result of it (pp.200-209). "The idea of 'nation' and process of creating a nation, developing in parallel with emergence of capitalism as a historical or social system, have differences in accordance with time and place. Here, the common ground is the fact that capital accumulation shall be maintained under one

sovereignty. National borders defined with this process are equal to national borders in terms of economics” (Türkay, 2009, pp.200-201).

Kadro took the side of ‘discontinuity’ argument in discussion of continuity vs discontinuity and defined the formation of the process of the Republic with definite breaking apart from the Ottoman Empire strategies. Capital accumulation had started in the last period of the Ottomans and continued as the capital accumulation of the new nation state. With the definition of discontinuity Kadro had not regarded capital accumulation together with the class issue. When it is considered separate from capital accumulation, it is clear that Turkish Republic was based on a political, social and economic system different than feudal system of the Ottoman Empire. Changes and continuity are defined together (Acun, 2007, pp.40-42): ‘Example’ for evaporation of water used by Acun in ‘discontinuity vs continuity’ discussion on Turkish Republic falsifies the ‘discontinuity’ thesis. Changes that occur in water are changes to become vapor at 100 degrees, and ice at 0 degree; however they cannot change the quantitative structure of water. These changes are only the evidence for the similarities in the structure of vapor and ice with water and the fact that water can not be subject to any kind of treatment that will entirely change its content. Similarly, when ice or vapor states of water are subject to heat changes again, they can change back into “water”. On the other hand when vapor is condensed and ice is melted it becomes water again. Water of which composition can not be changed by any kind of heat exposure is a metaphor used by Acun in order to define social processes. When we adapt these changes and transitions into social events, it is seen that qualitative changes are possible in a society. However, by means of these changes, it’s impossible to change the social structure entirely or turn it into a totally different social structure. Acun argues that ‘continuity’ within the changes is the reason of all. Qualitative social changes have to

contain the core elements of previous structure. In essence, changes and continuity occur together (Acun, 2007, p.41). Therefore, when ‘continuity vs discontinuity’ discussions are considered as two separate situations in denial of each other, it turns into a false argument that should be based on a different ground.

Different than Trkay, Boratav defines discontinuity vs continuity thesis by dividing it into periods; accordingly, he argues that in the 1908-1922 and 1923-1929 periods, there is remarkable continuity, and in the 1930-1939 period, a significant discontinuity occurred when compared with the previous terms. This discontinuity did not have a revolutionary aspect according to Boratav (Boratav, 1988, p.46) and it represented a relativistic and limited discontinuity. This discontinuity was an attempt for transferring the colony economy to an ‘underdeveloped country economy’ and for nationalizing it. This attempt made for establishing a national economy of an underdeveloped country and laying the grounds of capitalism were applied together with ‘a limited protectionism practise’. As one of the most important means of creating national capital accumulation, this practise is called statism representing ‘limited protectionism practises’ in Boratav’s terminology. This practise adapted in Turkey in 1930s was defined with the following sentences: “ If we will talk about discontinuity within the framework of 1930’s Turkey, this will only be true in a limited way to provide a synthesis protectionism and statism effectively and together for the first time (Boratav,1988, p.46).

“Turkey Economy Congress held in Izmir in 1923 was a forum where reorganization issue was discussed under the principles of liberalism and decisions were taken in order to create a dynamic domestic market” (kn, 1971, p.397). In the congress, farmers, merchants, businessman and worker groups presented their ideas by formulazing them in a form of economic proposals. Proposals of each group were accepted upon approval of each article by all groups (Yanardağ, 2008, p.53).

Heper (1977) defined that Izmir Economy Congress was held in order to regulate bureaucracy according to the requirements of economic entrepreneurial groups. When Congress was held, national bourgeoisie of entrepreneurial economic groups in Republic period had not emerged yet. Yanardağ (2008) also argued that the Congress was held in order to regulate bureaucracy in accordance with its own interests and requirements. This atmosphere was followed by the establishment of Is Bank in 1924 and 1926 Law of Encouragement of Industry performed the functions of improving the connections between the capital owners, the entrepreneurs and bureaucracy. Reaction towards foreign capital was moderate in that period since the intended improvement was not thought to be adequate (Ertan, 1994, pp. 16-17). Law of Encouragement of Industry consists of encouragement of industrial companies deemed appropriate, benefiting from foreign investments and granting the same privileges to foreign companies, as well. Moreover, instead of the government, businessmen decided which raw materials shall be imported and decision was taken for giving priority to use of domestic products, even if they were 20% more expensive than foreign goods (Keyder, 1993, p.77): The number of companies benefited from the law before 1923 was 341 and in 1926, 299 new firms were added in the list, and between 1927 and 1929, 443 companies received incentive certificate (Keyder, 1993, pp.78-80).

“It is possible to say that the strategy followed by the Turkish Republic until 1931 was established in the Izmir Economy Congress” (Yanardağ, 2008, p. 54). Is Bank, intended to be a bridge between the bureaucracy of state and the industrialist/entrepreneurial foreign/local economic groups was established and started its activities during this period. In 54th issue of Peace World (Barış Dünyası) magazine, Ahmet Hamdi Basar stated that he sees the goals of union as nationalizing commerce under free competition conditions. Since it is hard to achieve this under free competition conditions, the state

should provide aid to private enterprises and should not avoid from intervening (Yanardağ, 2008, p.52).

In his closing speech in the Izmir Economy Congress, Kazim Karabekir accepted private enterprises and foreign investment and defined its deliberate aspects: “Our country kindly accepts foreign capitals but it will make use of its own sources first, to benefit from the foreign investments and products only when national/domestic sources/tools are not satisfactory... And from now on we will leave wrapping ourselves in foreign goods from cradle to the grave and from getting foreign milk into our stomachs starting from the moment we were born. Our economic darkness collaborated with our political vagrancy and preyed, preyed and preyed on our people” (Afetinan, 1989, pp.86-87).

Turkey stated that capital accumulation as a social relationship maintained consistency by changing its actors. Statism was applied as a requirement to improve the primitive capital accumulation and provided the continuity of the accumulation. In the discussion of statism practice, Kadro emerged as a party in this discussion (2009, p.202).

2- 1930's Turkey and the Kadro Movement

Turkey had been declared as a Republic in 1923. According to Kadro, the Turkish Independency War as a national movement had emerged as a reaction against the imperialist world order (Tökin, 1933, p.30). In his article published in Kadro journal, Tör argued that Bolshevik revolution where and fascistic revolutions are ideologies planned for serving benefits of the class society. Tör positioned independency war of Turkey separately: “First revolution in the history speaking in the name and for the benefit of all nation is Turkish National Independence Revolution” (1933, p.14-18) and Aydemir also declared that “Turkish Independence Movement shall be example for other exploited countries” (1932-b, pp. 11-12).

Kadro authors asserted that the Great Depression was a sign of a deep structural change in the capitalist system and it could not be explained by classical theories (Özgür, 2006). According to Burhan Asaf (1932, p.30) for the first time in the history of capitalism, this crisis was not the result of market conditions, but of both economic and social conflicts, which were induced by the national liberation movements. As a result of them most of the national markets closed their doors to the western producers (Tökin, 1932, p.41).

Özgür (2006, p.94) pointed out that Kadro authors also viewed the Great Depression as an industrialization opportunity for undeveloped countries since the prices of capital goods declined in the world market.

Kadro declared that Turkish government should find some long-run solutions thinking that the depression would be a long lasting one. However, the infrastructure of foreign trade was not considered as fit for development during constitution of Turkey. The railway inherited from the Ottoman Empire to the new Republic of Turkey was only

4.138 km. Except İzmir and İstanbul, there were no suitable harbors for foreign marine trade, either. In addition, Lozan Contract was another negative issue against the development of foreign trade. Until 1929, the same customs and tariff duties, determined by the Lozan Contract, had been implemented, preventing the constitution of a national economy. Due to both the end of the contract and the effects of the Great Depression on Turkey, Turkey, like other countries, began to exercise protectionist policies in its political economy against the foreign and private attempts.

Boratav thought that, nation states from their beginning on, used to experience two periods following each other, first the flexibility and second the protectionist periods. According to Türkay (2009), the open and protectionist periods for Turkey had intervened with each other. But none of them in general had been independent from each other or from the government itself. First years after the independency war, the government had decided upon flexibility due to Treaty of Lausanne rules which were still functioning. Generally Turkey's first open period was known as the years between 1923 and 1931, meaning that the Treaty of Lausanne did not exist after 1930. However all the protectionist and open periods had been designed for being the "promoter of the capitalist national accumulation" (Türkay, 2009). Great Depression had been the primary factor which directed the economies to be overruled and statism to be considered as compulsory. Therefore, Great Depression had been the milestone where the liberal mode of economy lost its trustworthy impression and pushed the government to intervene the economy involuntarily (Boratav, 1962, p.70).

Kadro journal emerged in 1931 as a continuation of system pursuits of Turkish Republic. It had a short term publication period between 1931 and 1934, however the impact of the depression and conjuncture of the period carried the journal to an important position in terms of ideologic history of the Turkish Republic and the journal

turned into a movement in short time; after a certain period of time Kadro journal was called Kadro movement. As key elements of this movement, Kadro authors had attempts to direct ideological infrastructure of Turkey into a third way which they called statism, a non-capitalist way: Kadro had been published between the years 1931- 1934, monthly, by a group of intellectuals including Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, İsmail Hüsrev Tökin, Vedat Nedim Tör, Burhan Asaf Belge and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu in order to provide an ideological framework to the existing regime, arguing that the revolution had not ended up yet. Kadro had been a short lasted journal which concentrated upon the ideological debate during the independency war and the constitution time of Turkey, and which gave way to the so-called Kadro Movement started by the authors of the journal (Aydemir, 1932-b, pp.11-12).

According Başkaya, Kadro's insistent argument for statism was not an original thesis since it was already realized by the whole world that liberalism was not the real solution at the world's current conjuncture after the Great Depression. The statism argument of Kadro was not a voluntary choice but had been created automatically as an unavoidable conclusion of the world economic situation. End of Lausanne Agreement and Great Depression had been the factors obliging the practice (Başkaya, 2004, pp. 14-17).

In October 1934, Kadro declared that they would have a break for a while because Yakup Kadri was to abroad. But the real reason was the new law made by the government for preventing Kadro from being published. According to this law, the government officials could not be the owners of any public journals. Conditions leading to closing of Kadro in short time show conflicting nature of the period. One of the two ideas discussing the relation between the sanction of the possibility that Kadro's arguments against private enterprises provoked İş Bank's anger (Yanardağ, 2008).

1930's is a period in Turkey where significant efforts were made in order to establish new strategies in economy and society. With the impact of decisions taken in Economy Congress of Turkey between 1923 and 1931, Turkey where an economy policy based on private sector was followed and substantial changes were made on superstructure headed for state interventionism starting from 1931 and gave priority to development movement with a new economic policy. "1930s in Turkey can be approached as a period where efforts were placed in order to generate a revolutionary idea giving priority to economic development" (Ertan, 2010, p.12). While defining the period between 1920s and Second World War, Baskaya (1986) stated that developed countries used less developed or developing countries as a market and created a market for themselves by buying unprocessed raw materials and agricultural products from them, he also added that 1930's were a period both in the world and Turkey where protectionist policies were enforced in order to break this exploitation circle (Başkaya, 1986, pp.70-71).

With the end of the Treaty of Lausanne, protectionism in Turkey began to be implemented. Protectionism was the most appropriate system for those years in Turkey due to both the worldwide&inside conjuncture and the great deficit caused by the depression years. The end of the Treaty of Lausanne was the other main factor leading Turkey to protectionism in these years.

2.1. Conditions That Prepared the Emergence of Kadro

End of open economy policies adopted after 1923 was closely related with Great Depression which emerged in 1929; liberalism crisis experienced in 1929 showed for the first time and in such a clear way that this system may not always be valid under all conditions. Requirement for new economic options led cadres of Turkish Republic to be in search for new options. The main reason why statism and Third Way emphasis took shape in Kadro was the nature/conjuncture of the period: Türkeş (1999) stated that Kadro could not form an ideology if it was not the time of Great Depression (p.201).

Demirci (2006) wrote that Kadro was based on the Aydemir's theories more than the other authors. Aydemir was born in Edirne which has been a border town in 1897. The cathastrophic events that occurred during the Balkan wars in Edirne led Aydemir tend to the Turan ideas of the Balcan nationalist view. (Demirci, 2006, p. 35- 53) After Balkan wars Aydemir moved to Azerbaijan in order to be a teacher. In these years right after the Balkan wars, another ideological movement that had effected Aydemir's thoughts was Bolshevism. Bolshevism for those years meant defence for the late comers. After the industrial revolution, the Bolshevic movement ascended and had filled the ideological blanks after the industrial revolution. This defense also had given hope to the developing periphery. Nevertheless, after 1920, Aydemir could have been defined as a communist. "In 1922, Aydemir thought of himself as an automat which saw everything as "class legislation" (Ertan, 1994, p-36).

The milestone for Aydemir and the other Kadro writers was the constitution of Turkish Communist Party (1925- 27) which was built up by the Marxists on 10th September, 1920. The political groups, Aydınlık and Kurtulus had been some of these Marxist groups that led the TKP to be built up. In 1919, Şevket Hüsnü became a member of the

party while Vedat Nedim Tör took part in the representing group of the fourth Comintern. After the Şeyh Sait Movement, although TKP was against this movement, Aydemir and other Marxists from TKP were arrested and were blamed for supporting the movement (1925). Aydemir was condemned to 10 years. However, according to the forgiveness law after two years he was released (Yanardağ, 1988, p-103).

Kadro had been concentrated upon the victory of the Turkish War of Independency and the following transformation period. 1930s' Turkey had been celebrating the tenth year of the Republic during the single- party regime. According to the founders of the modern Turkey, the effects of the imperialist countries had to be stopped by being an independent nation state through an independent national economy and a unique cultural identity. Achieving these steps could only be possible with constitution of an ideological infra-structure for the Republic provided by a responsible "*cadre*" of intellectuals which they defined as themselves (Özgür, 2006).

2.2. Kadro's Comments About the Effects of the Great Depression on Turkey

“Great Depression of 1930s started with the decline of Wall Street stock exchange as a result of spread of the speculation pushing financial assets beyond realistic limits. Decline, leading to bankruptcy of banks which had ignited the rise of 1920’s with easy loans and the ‘crashing of loans’ caused bankruptcy of many companies was concluded by millions of unemployed. Crisis was global because of high rate integration of global economy of 1920s and it spread rapidly from North America to Europe and rest of the World” (Jackson, Andrew, 1999, pp.33-99).

Küçükömer (2007) defines Great Depression between 1929 and 1933: “Last four years (1929-33) of this stagnation which lasted for a decade and which was spent without having any remarkable economic improvement coincides with the greatest economic crisis of the capitalist world. In each capitalist country in crisis, there was great decline in national revenue and unemployment exceeding millions. These didn’t bring only economic instability but also lead to deep social and political instabilities. In this case, the Western World chose government intervention to economic life in order to overcome the crisis” (Küçükömer, 2007).

“As a result of World Crisis, money which had been unstable in 1920s lost value, foreign trade deficits reached high levels, national revenues decreased, state revenues and purchasing power of the public decreased and unemployment emerged” (Coşar, 1995, p.12). Coşar (1995) argues that impacts of the world depression was seen in Turkey after the second half of the depression and major part of it was overcome in 1933 with the adoption of budget policies put into practice in 1931. During this period of two years, balance budget was achieved, foreign trade deficits were met, financial order was balanced by promoting the use of equities through saving measures; and all

improvements made Turkey gain prestige in international conjuncture (Coşar, 1995, p.262). During this period, Aydemir (1932) criticised the balanced budget policies. He stated that mobilization of national labor is more constructive than having a narrow budget and money stability since the main factor is not income but expenditures, and the important thing is making work budget rather than financial budget” (Coşar, 1995, p.263). After İnönü’s critiques in parallel, an industrial policy was adopted through the lead of state; ‘statism’. Cosar argues that statism is a product of politic, economic and social factors of Turkey (Coşar, 1995, p.263).

“When the depression in 1929 started, there were two ways ahead of Turkey’s political regime: Either making the regime more moderate by returning democratic rights and freedom of middle class or making it entirely harsh (Timur, 1994).

In their comments about this depression and solution of this depression, general attitude of Aydemir and Kadro journal had differences from the general approach of the regime. Here, the only common point was the fact that both thought that depression was not an ordinary depression and it was not one of the periodical crisis of capitalism: Vehbi Sarıdal, General Secretary of Istanbul Chamber of Industry and Commerce stated that the world depression was a psychological and moral depression in terms of phylosophy, a mental depression in terms of science, a technical depression in terms of social and financial platform. According to Sarıdal, the required approach to understand the real dynamics of the technical and financial crisis should be dealing with reasons instead of outcomes. Sarıdal states that this depression was not one of the depressions emerging periodically in an ordinary way and mentions that this depression was the direct outcome of liberal economic order which had been present since 1789. According to him, this depression was a sign showing that this liberal order must come to an end (Sarıdal, 1931, pp. 17-18-19). With a similar

comment in 1932, Aydemir stated that the financial depression, the world went through, was not an ordinary depression and it should be understood very well. It was the start of a dramatic change; however Aydemir did not see this depression as a sign of negative things different than the approach of the regime. “This depression should not be seen as the cause of unendurable negative outcomes; in contrary, it should be seen as an opportunity bringing new potentials to Turkey” (Aydemir, 1932, p.24). Depression provides Turkey after National Independency War “a chance to become leader and best representative of independency in the world” (Aydemir, 1933, p.5). Despite the diversity of views, having common views with Kadro, Basar, founder of Kooperatif journal stated his opinion in the same parallel (1933); “...depression that capitalism goes through emerged as a result of unequal functioning of free exchange as a requirement of its nature. According to Basar, this crisis of the Western World could be turned into a chance for development of Turkey” (Türkay, 1997, p.12).

Keyder argues that crisis that emerged in 1929 in Turkey and subsequently gave direction to economic policies of the process was connected with internal dynamics of Turkey more than being connected with world crisis: “The year 1929 had been a milestone in many aspects, Turkey’s foreign trade had deficits in each of the first five years of the Republic. The conclusions of the long delayed depression were penalties to be paid....agricultural activities having an impact on Turkey’s export revenues already had started decreasing in 1926, and commercial loans providing essential foreign currency had stopped”. Keyder states that various methods had been tried and applied such as customs tariff, imposing restrictions to imports in order to control the economy from the center. Exchange of foreign currencies had also been restricted and as a result of this, central bank had been established. Finally, first and second industrial plans had been prepared for five year periods; however, second one had not

been put into practise since the Second World War erupted. Keyder argued that the reason for this depression to have such a great impact on Turkey was flexible practises adopted until 1929 because according to him, continous growth of an inadequate economy had always great risks (Keyder, 1990, pp.30-35).

“Due to economic depressions, societies may become conservative; for example, the depression in 1930s pushed centralization in bureucratic control of the republic”. According to Keyder, the Turkish economy had been subject to the political control of the central authority, once again (Keyder, 1990, pp.30-35).

Kadro defined that after the Great Depression, none of the countries could employ a free trade policy, due to the great deficit. The radical transformation was realized after 1929. In 1933 Turkey began to exercise the clearing system, obliged the law of the exchange to be implemented and organized one exported good for one imported one. Due to both the Great Depression and the customs duty which had been propagated, protectionist policies began to be employed especially in foreign trade economic policy. In this period, countries tended to evaluate their already existing raw materials available within their borders instead of importing processed products. Kadro declared that protectionist foreign trade policies would be the point which all the nation states were on, after 1929. Until the depression, protectionist policies were applied only in small-scale countries; but after the depression nearly the whole world economies had been closing their doors against foreign enterprise and investments (Boratav, 2004).

It was aimed to overcome economic problems by increasing production under Şakir Kesebir plan which had started before the depression and been completed during this period. Regulations made had aimed to achieve balance of payments of a planned economy without reducing the total trade volume. For this period, this plan enabled a

deeper development management by the private sector and suggested not a structural but a superficial transition. According to Ilkin and Tekeli, this situation can be explained with close relationship between Şakir Kesebir and İş Bank group but it is also possible that it was thought for not making structural change in economy a shocking situation. Within the scope of this plan, a state model to strengthen intelligence power, the organization and to encourage and motivate the private sector, was designed to contribute to the development of the private sector. Ilkin and Tekeli state that the plan consisted of rearranged policies in favor of the private sector rather than including continuity of the 1923-29 policies (İlkin, Tekeli, 1983, p.103).

In his article where he addressed 1929 crisis and assigned the title of “World Order in Decline”, Belge (2004) agreed with opinions of Aydemir. According to him, “present depression came into existence during capitalist development unique to the system itself. It is not a rhythmical and periodic stagnation; in other words, it is not an ordinary and temporary depression. For capitalist structure, it is a clear and reactionary course of structure transformation, taking power from resolution of capitalist structure, while it is advanced and revolutionary for us” (Belge, p.59). Burhan Asaf Belge defined crisis in 1929 as an opportunity for Turkey that had not been capitalized but been exceedingly influenced by crisis in terms of exports and imports. He tells about impacts of depression years on Turkish thoughts best in a feature article in Kadro journal (Kerwin, 1954): According to us, Turkey is not a part of the World Crisis and it stays out of it. It is of course, impossible to disregard the impacts of worldwide depression on Turkey. It is impossible not to see the impact of particularly great drop in prices of raw materials such as cotton, wool and goat hair on rural population. This is reality due to our passive attitude towards centralized world industry. It is clear that Turkey shall stay out of all kind of world wide depressions by virtue of particularly these three products when it

uses own raw materials... Turkey and similar countries can stay out of crisis through activities related with their National Independency movements” (Kadro, 1932-a).

To sum up, Kadro differs from negative views of other intellectuals with their comments on Economic Depression of the World in 1929. According to Kadro, industrial products after crisis shall not be under monopoly of the West any longer, but new industrial and commercial centers shall emerge; European countries shall lose their colonies; expanding countries shall be dominant; countries shall be classified as socialist, imperialist and countries in National Independence Movement and Europeans shall lose their industrial production tools. According to Kadro, all of these will create significant opportunities for developing countries. Since the depression shall continue for a long time, wide scope plans should be made rather than taking measures in an attempt to eliminate the negative impacts (Türkeş, 2001, pp.175-177).

In this historical period, where socio-economic and political infrastructures of Turkish Republic were established, development strategy proposed by Kadro included import oriented industrialization plan, protectionist foreign trade policy, radical land reform and financial/monetary policies. Kadro had proposed these methods in order to concentrate economic and political power at state's control and improving state's power to intervene in economic and political life through this method. By this way, the state could be dominant in resource and income allocation process and influence on decision making mechanisms of interest groups could be minimized. Kadro group attributed an autonomous status to the state, independent from other groups and the society (Türkeş, 1999, p.201).

“These proposals are more radical than the development strategy applied by the Kemalist government and more importantly, it is more at the forefront when compared with ideological level of the government (Türkeş, 1999, p. 2001).

Short time after establishment of National Economy and Savings Association, National Industry Model Exhibition was opened. Giving a speech in the opening of the exhibition, İnönü revealed the nature of the period’s political atmosphere by saying “We start a new life in our national economy”. (Tekeli, İlkin, 1983, p. 119)

The idea that political victory gained after Independence War could be protected with assignment of a national economy had been dealt by the regime in itself and it was a view where media organs of the period contributed strategically. Establishing a national economy was the primary subject to be dealt just after political victory of the Independence. The matter of how to achieve allocation of wealth/ capital accumulation was one of the most important elements contained within national economy and intellectuals of the period and different segments approached to this matter by using different methods. The most important point where these differing opinions of the regime and intellectual supporters of the regime intersected was creating a non-class non-privileged nation. National economy policy should be established accordingly and capital accumulation should never allow social segments to be formed in the process of industrialization. Otherwise, economic policies would be established in accordance with the benefits of the dominant group just like the countries where there are class conflicts: In our country, there are not any social classes yet and we can avoid being divided into classes if we can follow a moderate economic policy. Particularly in countries where there are conflicts between classes, methods regulating the allocation of wealth is run in accordance with the intent of the one in power... In effect, after the Ottoman empire now Istanbul government now is following a policy increasing these differences.

However, if it is requested that national structures of ours collect these minorities, it is also required to follow a policy to ensure them that they are equal to the nation in terms of economic welfare.” (Önay, 1931, p.69); as it is possible to make an inference from Önay’s speech, politics of this era is about ensuring accumulation of national capital via a national economic policy and eliminate in the meanwhile the elements creating social classes, establishing a non-class nation and a national economy.

According to Önay, if gaps between classes increase, assigned economic policy would have been established in accordance with the benefits of the dominant class and in this case it would have been impossible to have a democratic authority that will serve for overall benefit of the nation. Mentioning about great significance of imports and exports, Onay thinks that prices here should be followed by a national commission (Önay, 1931, p.69).

Boratav states that first real protectionist practice was the railway policy implemented after 1923 but argues that industrialization- aimed statism as a model started in 1930 (Boratav, 1982, pp.51-55).

In his statement defining first years of the Republic, Küçükömer argues that Turkey is a market for capitalism and it is exploited by being put into debt and being burdened into debt. Presence of a capital enough for continuing the industrial revolution inherited by the Ottomans is out of discussion in a period where first official ideology of Turkey was about to be established. There was not any efficiency in economy and unemployment was gradually increasing: “When the republic was proclaimed in Anatolia in 1923, the new government took over an economic system which was not suitable for development in a capitalist way”. Statism allowed capital accumulation (Küçükömer, 2001, pp.148-149).

According to Karpas, statism policy implemented in Turkey was approached as an economic measure by the official ideology. “CHP stated that Turkish economy based on statism was an economic development measure, and these measures were taken in order to improve national economy as a whole in a short time and for carrying Turkish society to a modern and prosperous level....” (Karpas, 2008, p.257) During statism policies, industrialization was taken above manufacturing levels for the first time and capital accumulation started improving in real terms for the first time (Gevgilili, 1989, p.49).

Küçükömer states in contrary to Kadro oriented comments, that capitalist crisis had an extensive impacts on Turkey, which was an uncaptalized primitive agricultural country then, to create negative outcomes. Principle of state intervention in economic life in Turkey was accepted and this principle showed itself as factories established by the state. Boratav (2004) mentions that this type of statism showing the course of state enterprise can be called ‘mixed economy’ and statism is an extension of capitalism. When dynamism of statism is compared with long lasting stagnation under liberalism, stagnation of capitalism in favor of Turkey’s development is not created by liberalism but statism (Boratav, 1988, pp.49-50-51); all objective conditions established in favor of industry, for example price relations in favor of industry, were valid for private industry as well, even though it was of secondary importance... Thus, most of the investment groups that would come into prominence in further periods have a background of revenues earned from state tenders in 1930s” (Boratav, 1988, p.51).

Considering statism as a mixed economy model as Boratav argues, Karpas states that it is an economic measure. In any case, discussions on statism practise turned into discussions on the character of Turkey in 1930s. While Küçükömer who thinks that crisis lead to negative outcomes defines statism as economic shield of 1930s, Boratav states that statism is a system that emerged as a result of mixed economy.

Turkey developed from an open economy to a closed economy with the crises in 1929. In parallel with developments in the World, protectionism, statism became prominent in 1930s (Coşar, 1995, p.12). In the course of the process in 1930s, Turkey made its economic movement towards statism and directed its economy in accordance with the domestic resources. In addition to impact of the Great Depression and changes in the world's conjuncture, political and economic developments in Turkey between 1930 and 1932 positioned Turkey in economic life in line with statism policies. Within the scope of these policies and state interventions, savings were encouraged, state focused on investments and numerous measures were taken in order to encourage foreign investment in the country by gaining strength as a result of termination of Lausanne Agreement. New taxes imposed supported tendency to domestic resources and import of foreign goods became more difficult. All these developments accelerated only with Great Depression and the conjuncture it created. After a short period of time, role of the state in economic life was accepted out of the discussion with the impact of the statism policies (Coşar, 1995, p.13).

We see that a negative attitude was dominant against foreign investments which had decreased with the impact of depression conditions. In 1933, Celal Bayar said, "We will not lose benefits of industry to foreigners while children of this country are enduring with difficulties for us so to have industry in this country" "Majority of foreign investments that were remains of the Ottoman order and were performing in Turkey had been nationalized in 1930" (Boratav, 1988, p. 52).

Tör stated that Turkish Revolution is the tool for creating a nation without social classes and industrialization should be achieved without creating classes. According to Tör, Turkish Revolution is the tool for creating a society without classes and privileges (Tör, 1933, pp. 14-15-16): "Turkish Revolution is a revolution of becoming a non-class and a

non-privileged union of nation. Turkish state, contrary to the American and European states, is far from working for the interest of an industrial capital; there is neither a category of workers, nor a financial oligarchy or a big land ownership” (Tör, 1978, pp.15-19). Tör (1933) argued that state was an outcome of nationalization of society instead of being an outcome of class society. According to him, Turkey’s original position had specific necessities which could only be compensated with the national unification of the Turkish society under the roof of a central state (Tör, 1933, pp. 14-15-16)

Aydemir wrote in 1932 that social classes had not yet emerged in Turkey, showing that the independency movement of Turkey had not included any class conflict (Aydemir, 1932, p.173): “Turkish Revolution was free from all kinds of imperialist provision and control towards foreign countries and at home, it was first successful messenger of New World Order preventing all kinds of class conflicts” (Aydemir, 1986, p.85).

Boratav defined Aydemir’s view about the national revolutions with the help of his four points: First, the industrialization of the late comers; second, preventing the national sources from the exploitation; third, collecting the old imperialist value in the hand of the government; lastly, eliminating and discharging the class conflict preserving the national cooperation from these types of conflicts (Boratav, 2004).

Tör (1932) defended also that there had been no prevention yet for discharging the class conflict. As it is essential for all the nation states, government attempts for business venture should have been placed regularly (Tör, 1932, no:14). However the regulation should not be based on a socialist principle.

According to Kadro, there were two kinds of conflicts: One of them was the class conflict intrinsic to industrialized countries and not to Turkey. The second was the 'metropol-periphery conflict and it was intrinsic to where the national liberation movements were existing, such as in Turkey (İlkin, Tekeli, 1982, pp. 82-83).

According to Kadro, the second kind of conflicts would generate intrinsic National Independency Movements and changes in property relations would not be able to resolve all conflicts. Therefore colonies, semi-colonies and non-industrial countries were not going to be predestined by class conflicts but by National Independence Movements (Aydemir, 1932, p.36).

Kadro defended that industrialization should be achieved only with an anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist point of view to be able to prevent the development of social classes which would be a potential threat against the unity of the nation. Because if the industrialization era could not be regulated correctly, this would lead the classes to emerge. However, Kadro declared that Turkey had not been industrialized yet and there were no classes yet established (Tekeli, İlkin, 1982, pp.82-83).

As a conclusion of the world industrial revolution, the production and circulation of industrial goods were accelerated hundreds of times and specialization had emerged (Hutson, 2010). Kadro pointed out that competition among countries was the main point which was intrinsic to the late capitalist era. At this point, Kadro asserted that the achieved political independency should have been followed by the economic independency of Turkey. "Regardless of the scale of political and military victories, victories gained can not be everlasting unless they are crowned with economic victories. All power and means required for protecting country and independence can be possible with intimacy (insibat) and development of economy (Tör, 1933, pp.15).

Although Kadro was interested in the necessity of an industrial revolution in Turkey, its main focus of interest was the possible actors of this future attempt. According to Kadro, industrial investments should be handled by the government itself and not by the private enterprise. The commercial bourgeoisie was the induction power of the native industrial bourgeoisie class (Yanardağ, 2008, pp.34-38).

A comprehensive industry program had been designed in the Congress of Industry in 1930. In 1931, at the First Congress for Agricultural Self-sufficiency, the agricultural internal market-orientation and the establishment of industries had been proposed. These industries would be responsible for the agricultural product processing and the agricultural tax adjustment in favor of regional productivity. In 1930, Central Bank and in 1932 State Industry Office and Turkish Industry Credit Bank were established. In 1933, Sümerbank was assigned with duties such as project development and management besides its banking and cotton- production functions; this institution later was commissioned also with preparation and exercise of industrialization plans. (Keskinok, 2010, p.174-175)

Two industrial five year development plans had been declared by the government, following each other. Both plans had been designed for providing an independent national economy.

The first five year Industrial Plan (1933) was the first step designed according to the needs of Turkey for developing itself as an independent nation. Twenty new factories had been declared for new efficient investment; foreign trade and other arrangements had also been issued. Harbours, highways and railroads were suggested according to the needs of an industrial country.

Second five year Industrial Plan had been designed with more details. Although the First Plan had been designed for the construction of new 20 factories, the second had proposed hundred new factories and agricultural development with new technical equipment also emphasized. However, this second plan was drafted but had never been totally implemented, due to the 2nd World War (Şağan, 2005).

As a startpoint for protectionist policies; the First and the Second 5-year Plans were based on the question of how the economic progress should be provided. The problem of regulation and arrangement for the growth and the development at regional scale in the 1920s and 1930s was not that of ‘forecasting the future’ but rather a consciously and voluntarily organized planning activity (Keskinok, 2010, p.178).

Within the context of the First 5-year Industrial Plan (1933-1937) Şeker İşletmeleri A.Ş., İşbankası, Halkbankası, Denizbank, Maden Tetkik Arama Enstitüsü, Toprak Mahsülleri Ofisi ve Eytam Bankası had been established (Kepenek ve Yentürk, 2001: 71).

On the other hand, Land Reform, one of the important suggestions of statism, had never been considered because of the foreseen conflicts especially with landlords acting at the suggested reform area.

In summary, 1933- 1938 had been full of industrialised attempts with several governmental interventions and investments included in the First 5-year Plan.

From the beginning on, Kadro had adopted the Marxist dialectical materialism. Aydemir had been the great follower of the historical dialectical materialism while providing principle ideas for the socio-economic development of Turkey: “In such countries like Turkey which do not keep up with this revolution (industrial revolution),

economic controls, debting ways, emphasis of capitalization records and at the end, taking the political liberty under the records are cocluded by the collapse of the industry. Using historical materialism for the explanation of this technical developement will be the most appropriate understanding.” (Aydemir, 1968, p.37). Aydemir (1968) asserted that historical materialism was the only method enabling people to keep up with the historical rapid transformations and changes. Aydemir, furthermore, declared that Marx pointed out that capitalism had been based upon the relationship between capital and labour and declared that the peripheral countries could not be industrialised with an ongoing capitalist exploitation order. Although socialism wanted to constitute an equal system for all countries’ worker classes, the capitalist system would be able to reproduce its inequality due to the differences among workers of different countries (Aydemir, 1931, pp.9-13).

2.3. Kadro's Ideal, Suggestions on Turkey's Development and Sources of Kadro

Kadro authors declared themselves as responsible for constitution of an ideology for the Republic of Turkey during the single party regime. Their ideological startpoint had been defined as contrary to the Liberal Republican Party, (SCF).

Aydemir and Tökin had studied in KUTV “Communist University of Eastern Workers in Moskow (Komunistitcheski Universitat Trojenika Vastoka)” which was under the command of the Public Commissary of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. KUTV has followed the Sverdlov University programs. In the following years KUTV had been renamed and got a prefix, “Dedicated to Stalin”.

Aydemir and Tökin declared that they had learned much about Lenin and Marxism while they had been studying in KUTV Institute in Moskow. This is why Kadro had many times referred to Lenin’s anti-imperialist views. However, Kadro had not been the strict follower of Lenin’s ideas. Lenin argued that collapse of the imperialist world could not have been enabled by the national movements, but that the national movements could only be the first step of the battle against the imperialist world order. In addition to it, Lenin asserted that a socialist world order would be a unique solution to lead to the removal of national differences. Kadro, on the other hand, believed that colonial countries could completely stop the effects of this imperial order on the country, by achieving the national freedom:

While emphasizing that he attaches importance to historical materialist aspect of Marxist view, Aydemir highlights the points where Marxism is inadequate. Aydemir (1968) states that Marxist view intensely overemphasizes the class conflicts rather than National Independency of colonies and semi-colonies (p.37). Means of production should be distributed in a more rational way in the world; and this

distribution can be achieved only when non-industrial countries go into national independency wars against industrial and colonist countries (Aydemir, 1968, s.43).

Aydemir (1932) pointed out that, the great conflict was between the technically developed and underdeveloped countries; “Some countries in the world were voluntarily kept in lack of any industrial development, by the industrially advanced countries. If there was not any over-accumulation of capital or any abnormal concentration of industrial development, colonial and semi colonial countries would not have emerged since the over accumulation of technical development occurred at the cost of the others’ development.” (Aydemir, 1932, p.44)

Kadro declared that they did not want to be evaluated under the titles of the existing ideological frameworks. Kadro declared that they were not defenders of socialism but that their third way ideology was standing between the two conflicting nationalist and socialist theories which Kadro tried to melt in the same theoretical pot in accordance with statism.

Statism was defined as a government policy, by Kadro authors, of which they had defined themselves as followers. Kadro thought that the national independency had to be followed by economic independency and this had to be a part of the revolution. In his conference at Türkocağı on January 5, 1931, Aydemir declared that several doctrines had emerged and gained dominance in different parts of Europe. Revolutionary socialism (Marxism) in Russia, fascism in Italy, Nazism in Germany and reformist socialist ideologies or communist movements in democratic European countries were observed. None of these doctrines had gained dominance in the Turkish independency revolutionary act. If there was a revolution, there had to be an explanation and a strategy

of it (Demirci, 2006, p.40). Kadro wanted to be a part of this ongoing revolutionary act to integrate the “third way ideology” as the official ideology of the new Republic.

According to the Kadro authors, Turkish revolution was not only the emergence of a new state, but it was an action which carried the seeds of anti-imperialism and a nation without classes and privileges (Özgür, 2006). After the victory, the newly founded Turkish Republic was in search for an ideology. “Kadro authors in general argued that the Turkish Revolution was not based on a formerly prepared ideology. Therefore, it needed an ideological basis. As Turkish Revolution ought to create its own theoreticians and had not so far done so, they aimed to provide this ideological basis for the new Republic” (Özgür, 2006, p.93). Kadro as a journal and its authors as a group were in the ongoing debates about the ideology of the new Republic. Ankara was the point where the group had met and decided to publish Kadro. The founder writers of Kadro; Yakup Kadri, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, İsmail Hüsrev Tökin, Vedat Nedim Tör and Burhan Asaf, were on the side of the socialists, except Yakup Kadri, who were coming from different geographies and used to travel a lot. That means each of them were familiar with many different cultures. Although the other intellectuals had been concentrating upon the French culture and taking it as an example for the Turkish modernity project, Kadro had been on German and Russian cultures more. Four from the Kadro intellectuals, Vedat Nedim Tör, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, İsmail Hüsrev Tökin and Burhan Asaf had been on the leftist side all through their lives, being official members of the Turkish Communist Party (TKP), before Kadro began to be published. However after the war of Independency, they broke up with their ties to the communist party. Yakup Kadri, as an exception between Kadro writers, was the only one who had not ever been a socialist.

Although five of the Kadro authors used to be fed on the socialist teaching, each of them had a tendency to nationalist idea, so they acted as a kind of compromiser between the nationalist and leftist ideas while trying to mix them on a melting pot, very carefully. They were injected with a spirit of establishing a nation during both the Balcanic and Independency wars. However, it was the general tendency of the day's intellectuals inspite of being unique to Kadro writers. "The view of Kadro (1932-4) presented an amalgam of radical concepts, left and right, aiming at creating a national ideology, and possibly preventing the expansion of the radical left" (Karpat, 1966, p.174).

Kadro authors had summarized the agricultural problems under three headlines. First, the ownership of the land; secondly, the eco-political problems caused by the problem of the ownership of the land; thirdly, the need for a land reform. According to Kadro the feudalism in the eastern side of Turkey created prevention for the development of the region. "The land used, for the peasants own consumption during centuries, would be the basic element of the new national economy" (Türkeş, 1998, pp.474-475). Kadro asserted that the income created by the feudal management of the land had been transformed into neither of the agricultural nor the industrial investments.

Kadro declared that land reform was needed in order to prevent the growing political power of the landlords. Otherwise, the landlords could emerge as a class. Kadro thought, land reform would break up the local power of landlords so that the peasants could be free (Yanardağ, 2008). At the end of the reform, government would be able to make its own regulations about land, agriculture and agricultural management. As an important conclusion, because landlords had to be vanished, peasants began to support the government.

Kadro previously, tried to cope with the economic problems due to the war and due to the deficit of the Great Depression time. Kadro took the effects of the Industrial Revolution and the Great Depression into consideration. Its comments could be categorized in two parts, a general overview and a more detailed recognition about its effects in Turkey.

First of all, Kadro had made various conclusions about the outcomes of the crisis which, according to Kadro, had positive effects specific to Turkey, as well as some negative outcomes. Turkey was to rebuild its economy independently during the crisis era which had shaken the Western economies more than the Asian. Kadro asserted that the crisis could be used as an opportunity for awakening of Turkey for an industrial attempt. Kadro also asserted that after the 1st World War, three groups of countries had emerged: capitalist-imperial states, socialist states and the national movements mostly taking place in colonial countries. Kadro believed that Great Depression led the European countries to sell their means of production, creating significant changes throughout the world (Ertan, 1994).

Kadro asserted that the Soviet suggestion should be considered by the Turkish government, which proposed that foreign trade, the exchange of goods, should be overviewed and even regulated by the government. Kadro added that there should be governmental intervention and control over imported goods and that there should be governmental decisions on what to produce and what to import or export (Türkeş, 1999, pp. 160-164).

Kadro had declared that private enterprise was weak for the constitution of capital accumulation. Therefore, the government had to intervene the economy. Even in Europe, capital accumulation was consolidated by the surplus value provided from the

colonial countries. Kadro said, there was no possibility for Turkey to depend on that kind of capital accumulation (Türkeş, 1999, pp. 160-164).

Kadro resisted to the type of capital accumulation which will lead the historical classes to emerge. Kadro argued that the socio-economic atmosphere should be rebuilt, providing an anti-capitalist way of accumulation and consolidating a national economy. According to Kadro, the government itself should be responsible for the process of capital accumulation. Kadro asserted that government should mobilize all its facilities and feasibilities for its own attempts and investments, in order to get the surplus and the profit from the private enterprises instead of giving credits to them. The government had to make regulations to use all the assessments, duties and taxes coming from the private enterprises for financing the government's own investments. (Özgür, 2006, p.91)

Kadro, furthermore, suggested that the needed capital should have been provided by the emission of the money. If the money provided by the emission would be used for industrial investments, it would not lead the inflation to increase. If the government would transfer the profit and the surplus coming from the private sector into the government investments, there would be no need for rising taxes or duties or even there could not be any further necessity for collecting any taxes. But the point for the government's direct confiscation of the private sector's outputs could be employed as an income tax, meaning that the profit coming out of the government attempts, it should have been collected by the government. The income and the profit made by the government itself would be hundreds of times more than the surplus provided by the taxation system. Özgür, referred to Keynes' General Theory provided a theoretical framework for the necessity of government intervention rejecting Say's Law and the neutrality of money assumption: "Similar to Keynes but before him, the Kadro authors

emphasized the necessity of increasing government spending and volume of credits in order to be able to use fully the resources of the country. Without ever being the advocates of depreciation of Turkish lira, the Kadro authors argued that increasing the money supply would not affect the value of national currency as long as this increase was met by productive investments. They put forward the inefficiency of taxation as the only revenue source of the government and they suggested a planned increase in the volume of credits under the control of the central bank. They rejected the validity of the quantity theory of money which asserts that any change in the money supply results in a parallel change in the price level. The Kadro authors argued that unless there was an enormous increase in the emission, the quantity of money would not affect the level of prices” (Özgür, 2006, p.94).

Furthermore, Kadro’s suggestions on Turkey’s development had an ideological dimension. Kemalist government had a special point on the private enterprise, enabling the association and partnership between the state and the private enterprise, in various kinds of production; coal, copper, beet and glass manufacturing were some of them.

Kadro had always emphasized the importance of the economic independency and industrialization at the same degree of importance. They thought that Turkey should be an industrialized country instead of being a market place.

The meeting point of Kadro had been the transformation of their socialist point of view into the Kemalist one. İlkin and Tekeli (2003), in their work explained their way from socialism to Kemalizm. They argued that the day’s regime had taken communism as an enemy which should have been kept under control, claiming that all institutions should be on a fight with communism represented by the Turkish Communist Party (TKP). Tekeli and İlkin (2003) argued that this ongoing pressure of the single-party era was

keeping the intellectuals as well as the institutions under pressure; Kadro writers were some of them under pressure and had hard time in being consistent with their original ideologies (Tekeli and İlkin, 2003, pp. 118-120). İlkin and Tekeli (2003) explained the process of changing attitude psychologically as ‘discharging a commitment and connecting with a new object of commitment’, which they called as ‘dissonance’. “In this period, people who were discharging/disconnecting, first, and reconnecting second, to a new object of commitment were in a painful situation and a fear because of this feeling created by the “dissonance”. They used to experience three steps to overcome this feeling. 1) discarding because of the external reasons; 2) discarding because of a new object appropriate for identifying; 3) internalization of the process (discarding)” (Tekeli and İlkin, 2003, pp. 118-120).

İlkin and Tekeli argued that the third way ideology of Kadro, could be the result of their feeling of being kind of converts, which the authors called ‘dissonance’. İlkin and Tekeli argued that another reason for them to let go of the communist ideology as well as their membership of the communist party was the absence of any class formations in current Turkey. Kadro probably thought that socialist revolution could not keep up with Turkey’s concrete economic and developmental problems, since there was not any concrete worker class. Kadro defined statism, its ideology, as a concrete political model created as an alternative to other politically liberal or Marxist ideology suggestions (Ertan, 1994, p.101).

Sultan Galiev, whom Kadro was suggested to be effected by, asserted in parallel with Kadro that there were some significant differences between the developed and undeveloped regions as well as their working classes. According to Galiev, the real conflict was between advanced and developing regions instead of between capitalist and worker (Benningesen and Qualquejay, 1967, p.114). Kadro furthered his idea arguing

that the capitalist accumulation was enabled by exploitation of the underdeveloped regions and their worker classes. This idea pointed out to the importance of where the capitalist exploitation should be searched for, arguing that the workers of the industrialized countries were naturally a part of the exploiting side since they had their share from the surplus of their native industry, gained by exploiting the colonized countries; they had higher standards than colonial worker classes which they would never sacrifice (Türkeş, 1999, pp.132-135).

The idea gave the meaning that the 20th century national movements were concluded by the differences between the two sides' worker classes, the industrialized and developing countries (Sezgin, 1978).

2.4. Third Way Ideology

Kadro declared itself as defender of statism and represented itself with a “third way” synthesis, which, they saw as independent from the western countries as well as the Soviet Union.

“The importance of statism era started in 1930s was the conscious third world nationalism ideology adorned with emphasis to “non-capitalist way’ accompanying adopted policies (Keyder, 1990, p.15). Economic policy of the Turkish Republic shifted towards statism axis during this period. And in this axis, non-capitalist development strategy that shall be applied without Marxist and nationalist ideologies, referred to as the third way represents an ideological ground which is thought and built discursively under “statism” policy. However, Kadro members do not define their formation on the basis of ideological background; they define it as an alternative “third way” to all ideologies: “Turkey goes through revolution. This revolution didn’t stop. All movements we went through, the excellent attempts we witnessed till today are only a phase of this revolution...This revolution possesses all theoretical and intellectual elements that can be principles for itself and consciousness for those who will maintain it” (Kadro, 1932, p.1).

Aydemir points out that political victory experienced up till today shall not form infrastructure of a revolutionary regime unless it is supported with ideology; he argues within this framework:

“..However these theoretical and intellectual elements were not composed of contracted within a system of ideas that could form an ideology for the revolution. No doubt, the most urgent and honorable mission of today’s revolutionary intellectuals is to explain the ideas and principles underlying our revolution, which is one of the most meaningful

movements in history with both its national character and its universal scope and effects within the course of revolution. As each valuable and original ideas and intellectual elements of our revolution are explained, these principles shall become criteria for generation of revolution, new and standardized revolution type shall be created in this way. This type shall always think in accordance with the same criteria, will reach to same outcomes regardless of the place and circumstances and ‘Way of Understanding the World’ specific to the revolution shall come into existence in this way” (Kadro, 1932, p.1).

Kadro proposed the steps of its third way ideology (Türkeş, 1998 , pp.474-475).

- 1- Only the government should be responsible for the industrial progress instead of the private enterprise owners.
- 2- Foreign exchange should be handled only by the government. Government should be the only decision maker on import and export.
- 3- There should not be any exploitation to lead to the capital accumulation.
- 4- Debt for new investments should be paid back with the outcomes and the products of these investments.
- 5- Beyond the industrial plan, the agricultural development and plan should also be considered until the arrival of a concrete Land Reform.

In Kadro’s thesis referred to as third way, it was emphasized that a policy preventing formation of classes should be applied in industrialization process since classes were not present in the conjuncture of the period. This emphasis justifies the view stating that Kadro’s statism thesis was prepared with the purpose of avoiding a class focused and ideological approach similar to Ercan’s thesis. Although there are discrepancies with the

power, Kadro's view denies class theories under the headline of creating a non-class society. This situation coincides with a point where Kadro could not get out of influence of the government and generate its own arguments about actors of development of classes and capital accumulation (Ercan, 1994, pp.1-5).

3. Statism from Kadro's Point of View

Küçükömer defines implementation of statism policy with resolving insufficiency of private sector by the state. According to him, there is not any competition between the state and the private sector because they can be matched up with each other as it is in statism policy (Küçükömer, 2001, p.98). This matter was mentioned in statism views of İnönü that he wrote in Kadro journal: "Simple-minded can think of establishing industry, organization, means required by the country without the aid of the state, even without direct intervention of the state...State should only try to realize things that can not be done by individuals. I hope within the next decade, Turkish statism shall be mentioned as the most advanced knowledge and masterpiece of 'statism in economy' with its consequences and overall impacts" (İnönü, 1933, pp.4-6).

In addition, Küçükömer also emphasizes that statism practise was not only a state enterprise; it had been applied with the purpose of developing private sector within the scope of statism. Finally Kucukomer defines statism as wealth transfer from surplus products obtained by the state to the privileged individuals (Küçükömer, 2001, p.98).

Mutlu divided the statism approaches into three: first "Ahmet Agaoglu's liberal partisanship"; second "Ahmet Hamdi Başar's conciliative economic statism approach; and third, CHP's statism approach which he also divided into two, radical and liberal parts". Mutlu asserted that Kadro represents the radical part of the approaches on statism (Mutlu, 2007, pp. 31-34).

Definition of statism was dictated by Atatürk and was included in Civil Knowledge Book written by Afet İnan in 1931(Coşar, 1995, p.231). "Statism we follow is based on individual efforts and activities and it is getting the state actively involved actively in works particularly in economic platform required for public and high benefits of the

nation in order to provide wealth for nation and prosperity for the country in the shortest period of time possible” (İnan, 1973, p.59). Later, “ getting involved” at the end of this definition of Afet Inan was revised as ‘getting involved is one of our important principles’ and it was included identically in the program of ‘Halk Fırkası’ in 1931 (Coşar, 1995, p.231).

There is a general agreement on the idea that the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic both characterized themselves by a strong “state tradition”. Kadro’s construction of statism had been in the same direction with the strong state tradition (Akman, 2004). Kadro took statism as a political arrangement preventing the class differences within the rapid changes of the industrialism era.

According to Ercan (2003), in societies where poverty is distinctive, emphasis is on the fact that classes are not formed yet and since there are not any classes, particular importance is assigned to authoritative state structure. Therefore state oriented theories emerge with the important thesis predestining developing countries. Ercan argues that theory of statism is one of such arguments.

According to Kadro, statism view was based on a holistic approach. However this approach was addressed to an organic integrity pointed out by Durkheim or Ziya Gökalp. Here, nationalism was different than their nationalism. While stating that internal and external conflicts define the society, statism also refers to external conflicts as source of national integrity of Turkey. (Tökin,1933, p.30).

Kadro’s theory of statism is not a reconciler between classes but is an eliminator of conflicts between classes (Tökin, 1933, p. 30).

According to Gevgilili, giving its first intensive practise during constructions of railways in Anatolia, statism was established to accelerate capital accumulation and to allow state contribution to this process (Gevgili, 1989, p.47).

“Opponents of our railway policy keep saying that railways are not built with state budget in any country, putting the load on todays generations of a work of which benefits shall be collected by next generations is in contrary with all practices. They never thought that railway business could be handled in this way as well” (Tör,1933).

Radical statism of Kadro shows itself closer with İnönü side of the regime (Hale, 1980, pp. 100- 117). While stating that statism is definately required, Ismet Inonu pointed out that even art and trade which should be performed most freely need state protection.: “Art and trade thought to be the most free always require state aid and intervention for prosperity. Since we are at service, I see this requirement everyday” (Avcıoğlu, 1968, p.212). Hale (1981-a) defined statism of Kadro as ‘ideological statism’ and statism of liberals as ‘pragmatic statism’. While making this definition Hale (1981-a) positioned Kadro on the same side with İnönü. According to Türkay, it is impossible to position Kadro exactly on the side of Inonu (Türkay, 2009, p.63).

Boratav (1962) pointed out that before 1928, there had not been any debate on statism. Statism began to be a debate after 1930 considering it with its social and political parts, in addition to its economic suggestions. (Boratav, 1962, p.15) The timing of the statism could be taken as a proof that statism had been implied due to the necessities emerged after the Great Depression. Statism was known to emerge after the Great Depression but the startpoint of the statism debate was spelled many times as 1928 due to the pre-depression period (İlkin and Tekeli, 2010). According to them, statism had covered a twenty year period beginning in 1928 and lasting till 1948. İlkin and Tekeli (2010)

separated the period into four parts. The first period, 1928-1932, was defined as the period of search for a new economic policy. The second period, 1933-1939, was defined as the period when statism was concretely exercised; the third period, 1940-1945, was the years of the 2nd World War; and the fourth period, 1946-1948, was the transition period. The last point had been defined as 1948 because the Marshall Plan began to be exercised (İlkin, Tekeli, 2010). However, this periodization did not mean that these could be counted as distinct from each other.

1929 was an important date which would change the economic as well as the political atmosphere in Turkey because in this year the capital owner and their shareholders began to drop out of the foreign trade field due to the lowering of profits. These changes had been induced by the end of the Lozan Contract which caused the tariffs and taxes in trade to increase. After the trade had become unattractive, costs for import of manufactured products from abroad had become unavailable. As a result, government had become aware that fabricating the products inside the country would be more profitable and even necessary for providing the economic balance. The government had to prevent the capital to escape abroad. Therefore, the regulation over the foreign assets had begun (Boratav, 1990).

Statism was generally used to refer to a state capitalism or a regulated market economy. Statism had been one of the ideological concepts used during the constitution debate of Turkey and defined as a government policy by the founders of Kadro, instead of an economic strategy plan. Kadro wanted to choose an anti-capitalist way to lead Turkey to keep up with the developing standards of the western advanced economies while beware of any tendency to develop classes within the society.

Statism had never been an anticapitalist way of industrialization. Nevertheless, it was on the contrary served for Turkey's development as a capitalist nation state (Gevgilili, 1989, p.48)

"In 1933-1939 period where labor rights were restricted and capital accumulation was accelerated, half billion lira worth funds which is nearly 5 % of the national revenue could be transferred to investments directly; together with private sector, the level of investment became almost 10 % of national revenue. In the end of manufacturing stage of the Turkish industrialization, the most significant milestone is statism practice." (Gevgilili, 1989, p.49)

Alpar (1978) quoted from Tör that statism is the only way to achieve an advanced economy of Turkey. "There is not any feasibility for being a non class society while feeding on the private enterprise, economically. To be able or not to be able to achieve an economic order, designed with advanced technical equipment, is the issue for Turkey's survival. An advanced economy of Turkey without any conflict is possible only with a statist economic approach." (Alpar, 1978, pp.11-19)

Statism had been used as a supporter by Kadro's third way suggestion and was in parallel with the world after-war politics due to the great deficit concluded by Great Depression. Nearly all the countries had been suffering from economic problems at the same time created by the 1st World War, followed by the crisis and the stagnation periods.

Protectionism policies had emerged with the development of the national tendency due to the fear created by the recent crisis following eachother and wars. According to Kadro, statism was not built up as an economic development strategy, contrarily it was constructed as a total government policy provided the ideological infra-structure for the

official regime. Kadro was critical to the view considering statism just as an “economic policy”. Kadro thought that statism should be considered as a political arrangement including socio-political and cultural frames beyond its economic suggestions. Kadro thought that considering statism just as an economic policy was born from the idea that statism is a transition policy, which someday had to be vanished out of the countries’ history. According to them, statism had to be taken as an intrinsic value of a national order providing welfare and peace within the borders of a nation state. (Aydemir, 1934-a, p.10) “The Turkish modern Republic was not simply an administrative replacement for the failed Ottoman empire, but also an explicit new national identity which sought to define a new vision of ‘Turkishness’ through the nation of the state. The explicit rejection of the Ottoman model found formal expression in the six basic principles; nationalism, populism, republicanism, revolutionism, secularism and statism” (Zürcher, 1993, pp. 189-90). “Statism is such an order being provided within the national accordance with the help of an organized nation evaluating best the national benefits.” (Aydemir, 1934-a:10)

Başkaya argued that statism couldn’t have been accepted as realistic. Başkaya thought that the “statism” in Turkey should have been counted as a natural outcome of the day’s conditions. He argued that the statism should not have been accepted as the foundation of the Turkish government itself because it had been needed all through the world due to the pressure of the worldwide national movements which spread after the Great Depression. The worldwide economic policies had implemented the same strategy as Turkey, trying to provide its own capital accumulation strategy. In this framework, we should see that statism had been the conclusions of the day’s historical necessities. On the other hand, Başkaya also asserted that anti-imperialist way of statism which Kadro was on, could only be an utopia, because none of the socio-economic strategies could be

independent from the capitalist historical framework. He argued that state itself was an organ enabling capitalism to survive. None of them could be counted as independent from each other because without government intervention capitalism could not play its game. Without a state or a government intervention there could not be any capitalist class, or capitalist hegemony could never emerge. According to him, statism could only show its effects on how and in what point the state would intervene. There could not be any debate except these factors which were the quality and timing of the state intervention. On the other hand, Başkaya thought that considering statism as contrary to liberalism would be a great mistake. The only possible distinction could be between liberalism and socialism. Otherwise, the debate would also be unrealistic (Başkaya, 2004, pp.17-26).

Kadro did not take the class conflict into consideration arguing that considering the class was the same as giving an approval to its existence. Kadro authors avoid using the term of 'class' in their articles. For ex. Başar used the term 'difference' which he replaced with the term of 'class': "Just how the Russian Revolution is an action for discarding the two conflicts, 'class' and colony; the last Turkish Revolution is also a conclusion of action for discarding two conflicts, colony and 'difference'." (Başar, 1982, p.188).

Ercan states that avoiding classes in Turkey has a long established history and defines statism as a way to avoid classes. According to him, state focused theories were established and applied in order to promote avoiding class concept. "The more the concepts such as 'statism', 'development', 'westernization' or 'nation' or 'common benefits of the nation' were used in the analysis of opposing parties, the more 'class reality' was disregarded. In other words, these concepts as a product of state oriented epistemology replaces concept of class. In fact each of these concepts have a class

specific content” (Ercan, 2003); “...information obtained by taking state centered epistemology as a start point do not only hide the class reality but also makes it easier to put solutions towards new investment requirements into practice (Ercan, 2003).

Kadro defined the responsibility of the state as preventing class to emerge, which would be dangerous for the social unity which they were on. Kadro’s concept of statism was a system designed for determining the whole political, social and cultural atmosphere. This concept was more advanced than the classical government intervention (Kadro, 1934, p.6). Kadro defended that a non-privileged and a non-class society could only be enabled by the construction of ‘social nationalism’ (Kadro, 1934, p.6). Kadro defended that Turkey had not been evolved to a class society yet therefore the further changes could have been kept under the control of the government. Capital accumulation should be supported by an ideology in which not any class formation was taken place. The ideal of a non-class society had been their milestone while they were constituting suggestions on the ongoing debate for the construction of the Turkish Republican ideology (Başar,1932).

On the other hand, Tökin, provided a challenging argument, about social classes, which was not in the same direction with the other Kadro writers, because he defined Turkish society already as being divided into some class based formations (Tökin, 1934, p.20). Tökin, asserted that the urban population had been divided into three categories; workers in small/middle enterprises, enterprise owners and commercial buyers. Furthermore he divided the village population into six categories. “The village population is divided into six categories: workers, farmers and sharecroppers, small scale of private ownership, agricultural lords (ağa), landless peasants, agricultural slaves and entrepreneurs.” Tökin, added that these precapitalist forms could be transformed into real classes. He argued that these formations should be kept in their primitive form

in order to avoid them to develop into some real classes. Turkey should provide a unique regime for itself not giving way to develop any classes. Otherwise, they will prepare the basis of a capitalist order and Turkey will be the same as European countries and would be suffering from class conflicts (Tökin, 1934, p.20).

“The advanced benefits of the Turkish Nation oblige to prohibit an economy which would provoke the ever-growing conflicts to separate and push apart the existing classes; thereby giving way to birth of class struggles. While the current situation of the separated European nations stand in front of us, we can not adopt it as our ideal” (Tör, 1932, p.291)

Kadro argued that Marxism overlooked the dynamics of the national attempts and that it was over-focussed on the class issue. Kadro believed that nationalist statism had to be considered with these anti-imperialist characteristics. Kadro had tried to behave as a compromiser between the leftist and nationalist points of views.

Tökin had defined three types of statism. Tökin defined the current statism in Turkey as fiscal statism, based on the liberal principles. The other two types of statism were socialist and nationalist statism; “In the socialist statism, state intervenes to all details of economic planning in order to build a new association for a determined class. On the other hand, nationalist statism had never been in any class’ command” (Tökin, 1932, pp. 272-273).

According to an economic and social transformation of the industrialism era, Kadro thought that a centralized government structure was needed. Kadro thought that government should be the unique decision maker upon how to regulate the process of capital accumulation including the internal and external trade distributing and distribution of the sources, deciding how to share the capital in order to prevent the

classes to emerge. According to Kadro if however the bourgeoisie could find a way for being strengthened as a class, it would confiscate the political and economic power instead of the centralized government: “Where the industry tends to develop, classes and class conflicts would directly develop. Turkish national attempt should provide a unique way to its economic progress and industrial development. According to Aydemir (1932-b, p.8) this way would prevent the constitution of classes and class differences in developing countries.

Kadro took statism as a long run ideology to lead Turkey as an independent country. “Socialism or fascism were feeding on capitalism itself” (Tör, 1933-a, pp.18-19). Statism should have been accepted as a unique form for preserving Turkey from other ideologies while keeping it independent, not just economically but also in a political framework (Tör,1933-a, pp.18-19).

Kadro declared that statism tended to develop a new formation in the production relationships because they saw the statism as a political strategy for developing the state economically as well as politically. “The tools of statism are industrialization, government intervention and attempts, constituting a balance between labor and capital, monitoring prizes and the protectionism” (Herslag, 1995, p.212).

Kadro writers were in the opinion that the primary conflict which had to be overcome was the conflict with the imperial order. Therefore, Kadro had been many times evaluated as a part of the “dependency echole” which had emerged in Latin America, after 30 years (Gülalp, 1983).

Kadro writers were in the idea that the social classes had not been developed yet and therefore they thought that there was no bourgeoisie-proletariat conflict which had been existing in the European region. According to Kadro, the primary conflict which should

have been overcome was with imperialism. The ideology after solving the problem of imperialism would be the new official ideology of the Turkish Republic. According to the day's rising global ideology which was the "transnational division of labor", Turkey would be responsible for providing agricultural raw material to industrialized developed countries. Furthermore, in that position, Turkey would be the market place where the industrial goods would have been sold coming from western provinces. Kadro resisted the international division of labor, arguing that it enabled the worldwide exploitation. In addition to the division of labor, Kadro resisted the international specialization approach to prevent Turkey to be promoted as a country of agriculture (Türkeş, 1999). According to Kadro, Turkey had to be an industrialized country instead of being a country of agriculture and a market.

According to Kadro, the only conflict which was similar to the class conflict was that between land owners and peasants in Turkey. Government had to distribute the lands of the land-owners between the peasants, to enable a planned industrial development and to overcome this conflict (Aydemir 1932-a).

In the conjuncture developed by the end of the Second World War, CHP stated that statism is not efficient enough in providing capital accumulation and suggested adopting a free statism practice. Within the scope of this practice, state invested in less profitable areas (such as PTT) and other areas were left free (Konyar, 1999, p.136). During the same period DP (Democratic Party) stated that they were considering new statism as a more moderate and a more free way of statism (Konyar, 1999, p.136). These show that official ideology of the regime considered statism as an economic development plan. Long afterwards, CHP criticized understanding of the period with the reason that social aspects of the statism were not taken into consideration (Konyar, 1999, p.141).

3-1. Debate On Statism

Debates on statism occurred on a platform about socio-political and on socio-economic characteristics of 1930s where ideas were generated about how to establish a socio-economic system while establishing the infrastructure of the new ideology of the regime. Kadro journal provided answers for majority of these ideas taking shape in this representative arena. Answers provided by Kadro for below stated ideas are given in the parts where ideas of Kadro are explained.

The general conflict had been between the two wings of the government: the radical defender of statism and the liberal wing with the group of İşbankası, in 1930's Turkey. The official government of 1930s Turkey had embraced two ideological bodies, İsmet İnönü and Celal Bayar. First, İsmet İnönü had been the defender of governmental intervention and statism generally. On the other hand, Celal Bayar had been the defender of the private enterprise.

“Second decade of the Republic was spent under the sway of statism principle. Real revolutioners and so called revolutioners would take sides around this principle and then all nation would enjoy the victory of Dumlupınar under the flag of an exciting economic mobilization” (Tör, 1933, p.14).

Türkay defines state-intellectual relationship of the period within the framework of a form of control mechanism and dependency accompanying this control mechanism. Accordingly, intellectuals of this period act under the shadow of the dominant ideology with the impact of pragmatic tendencies: “This control based relationship between intellectuals and administrative cadre allowed use of all potential resources that will contribute to formation of the ideology during the course of the process (Türkay, 2009, p.212). On the other hand, it is impossible that intellectuals opposing to the regime not

to be eliminated by the dominant ideology. “The opposing intellectuals, who could not be tamed by the administrative cadre, posed a potential threat against establishment of the social project and were eliminated” (Yanardağ, 1988). Developments such as proponent intellectuals coming more to the prominence and eliminating the opponent intellectuals were proves of exclusion-inclusion mechanism aimed at new social model established starting from 1920s: “In 1920s a new social system which is a Western type capitalism had been tried to be established and for cadre holding the political power it also meant the approval of their own legitimacy in putting the social system into the practice” (Türkay, 1997, p.3). As a significant characteristic, Turkey sees commitment to state in intellectuals of the period and chooses to explain this tendency only with controlling structure of the period. According to him, this tendency is an outcome of the state tradition adopted from the Ottomans and it became a stronger authoritative tendency emerged during depression years. According to Turkey, this commitment did not only influence thesis on establishment of social and economic order but also defined the limits of separation between statists and liberals: “Within this framework, Kadro journal directed Ş.S.Aydemir defended and represented statism and A.Agaoglu defended liberalism; while A H. Başar, whose formation was mostly between these two poles, defended economic statism” (Türkay, 2009, p.213).

3.1.1. Ahmet Ağaoğlu

Thesis and proposals of Ağaoğlu about structural situation of Turkey are about changing the system originating from Eastern culture and putting pressure on individuals in a democratic and liberal way and getting it closer to cultural aspects of the Europe and the West (Türkay, 1997). Stepping out of general intellectual portray of the period, Ağaoğlu sees state as an obstacle on the way of development of the nation and the economy: “He is injurious because his conflict created an obstacle before individual activities on the way to development. Therefore here we repeat a word of Engels. Great scholar says: ‘Intervention of political power which is not aimed at economic development shakes the foundation of economy as well’ (Ağaoğlu,1933, p.62).

Although he defined himself as a liberal, he did not take side with traditional liberalism with the concerns of adapting the conditions of the period and in this process he proposed a state control with predetermined limits (Türkay, 2009, p.222). Ağaoğlu had been the follower of the individualist perception as a method of emphasizing the freedom at work and working conditions, thinking that creativity could only be possible with individualist system, otherwise state control would kill the creativity of work. Although standing at the liberal side, he thought that the government could intervene economy only if there were serious conflicts. Otherwise, if the government was acting on regulations systematically even without any conflicts, it would be dangerous for the society. Ağaoğlu was in the opinion that individuals could not work effectively if their talents had been suppressed by the government’s strict regulations. These restrictions would lead the competition to be dropped off, which Ağaoğlu thought was necessary for motivating people for working creatively. In the atmosphere of competition, the working conditions need not be restricted due to the high motivation and its positive

outcomes in the economy. Working positions should be kept free from any intervention, pressure and any regulation.

“The objective of the Kemalist state is to protect, encourage and ensure individual initiatives’ progress. In addition to this, I accept the fact as far as Kadro does. The state should undertake the task of establishing infrastructure and in some industries, individual entrepreneurs are unable to do it” (Ağaoğlu, 1933).

Türkeş (1999) argued that Ağaoğlu and Kadro agreed that the private sector was too weak to undertake the task of industrialization and both advocated that the state should intervene the economy. Nevertheless, Ağaoğlu had stood at the side of the individual freedom instead of society and work (Karpas, 1996, p.76–77), while Ağaoğlu was standing at side of the state intervention which, according to Ağaoğlu, should be kept to a minimum. Ağaoğlu asserted that the authoritarian state tradition in eastern countries was the reason why these provinces could not be industrialized and reached the standards of the western countries yet.

Ağaoğlu stated that state tradition should be replaced with that of the private sector. According to Ağaoğlu, investments to be made on private sector are more profitable and more efficient when compared with the profits obtained through state managed industry. Industrialization can not be achieved without establishing the private sector (Türkeş, 1999, p.7).

In 1932 and 1933, Kadro had responded to Ağaoğlu in the newspaper “Cumhuriyet” (13th October, 12th, 13th, 17th and 20th December 1932; 21th, 22th, 23th, 26th and 27th January 1933) arguing that the Asian countries development had been prevented by the exploitation by the Western industrialized countries.

Ağaoğlu was known to be a liberal and thought that individuals working on their own interest would naturally behave in favor of the society. Kadro had been very critical upon these liberal suggestions that was made by Ağaoğlu who was one of the first liberals in Turkey and who defended the liberal framework emphasizing the individual's freedom (Türkeş, 1999, p. 163).

Ağaoğlu's critiques had taken place in his work "Individual and State" in which he explained his ideas about Kadro and Kadro's point of statism.

Ağaoğlu asserted that Kadro was playing on a new type of state where the high status groups in the society would make plans while working up in the favor of the society (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 13–15). He thought that Kadro's theories were unnatural and useless which bounded statism with the totalitarian Marxist point of view (Ağaoğlu, 1933, pp. 13–15).

Ağaoğlu pointed out that the high motivation was brought by liberal atmosphere and free working conditions which should be enabled by the separation of political and economic spheres. In that way, parliamentary democracy could be achieved (Yanardağ, 2008). The experience of SCF had brought the liberal suggestion out of Ağaoğlu's framework. However it had been closed up by the government.

Turkey (2009) argues that liberalism of Ağaoğlu doesn't have a directing aspect for liberals of today. Ağaoğlu's liberalism approaches to individual and state (see: Devlet ve Fert, 1933) in accordance with their mutual responsibilities. For today's liberals, rights and responsibilities considered within the framework of this mutual responsibility create a threat against liberal spirit and it is perceived as the cause of today's capitalist crisis. In this sense, when Ağaoğlu's liberalism is considered within the scope of rights and responsibilities, it sheds light on a social state project (see: Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesi,

1933). When it is considered within this scope, it is impossible for Ağaoğlu's liberalism to become a reference for today's liberal approach (Türkay, 2009, p. 219-224).

Ağaoğlu believed that achieving a social system which he defined in utopia of "Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde" (1933) and an ideal democracy in underdeveloped countries like Turkey would be possible only with a powerful government: " I never believed that masses with so many leaders could accomplish any mission and today I'm still not convinced. In contrary, I have always stood for a powerful government and today I'm even more certain about this belief of mine. Importance of powerful governments and prominent characters particularly in countries such as ours where political and social practices are primitive and inadvised is of importance" (Soyak, 1972, p.493).

This idea of him makes him get closer to intellectuals of the period and it should be considered possible that he had a concern of adapting the conditions of Turkey during the period (Türkay, 1997, p.10).

3.1.2. Ahmet Hamdi Başar

In 54th issue of the *Barış Dünyası* journal he published, Ahmet Hamdi Başar clearly stated that intervention and strength of government are required in nationalizing commerce under free competition conditions (Boratav, 1982, p.12). As structural problems of Turkey, Başar discussed the structural system inherited by Ottomans and western capitalism he criticised by giving equal importance to both. In contrary to Ağaoğlu, he argued that free trade system of the western capitalism gave direction and allowed unequal development. According to him, underdevelopment is a dynamic of unequal development derived by the nature of capitalism. On Turkish axis, these unequal development conditions were added to the fragmental system inherited from the Ottomans and it became one of the factors preventing development. “ According to Başar, as Aydemir argues, this crisis of the West may become an opportunity for the development of Turkey when it is benefited in the right way” (Türkay, 1997, p.12). Başar’s definition of this great depression provided a very similar comment with Kadro’s view; “This advanced version of trade mechanism made fundamental changes in the world. Imperialism and capitalism created wide spread ‘conflicts’ both between people and countries by collaborating with each other and increasing strength with the liberalist movements” (Başar, 1982, p.184).

Türkay (1997) states that Başar classified these conflicts into three groups; “class conflicts; occurred in advanced countries in the west and this conflict caused class based transitions. Colony conflicts; revealed differences between ‘industrial-agricultural’ or ‘metropol-colony’ countries. And third conflict is the discrepancy conflict which is valid both in the country and between other countries” (Başar, 1982, p.186).

Başar asserted that statism was divided into two parts, which he defined, economic statism and administrative statism. Although Kadro took economic statism as a basic element of the ultimate future society, Başar thought that economic statism would be vanished, after a while. (Tekeli, İlkin, 1982, pp. 89-102)

“Economic mechanisms of the state have different organs other than those of today’s and one of its responsibilities is to impede the progress of administrative statism while minimizing its functionality” (Başar, 1932, p.53).

Ahmet Hamdi Başar (1933), in his work “Economic Statism”, declared that European countries due to their advanced technological equipment had the opportunity to find open markets in developing countries. The new imperialism was defined as the opportunity of the industrialized countries to use the developing countries as open markets was defined as individualism by Başar. He used the individualism, which he was critical with, instead of using the term imperialism. According to him, statism was the strongest alternative to the western individualism.

From Başar’s point of view, statism was the reality of the history instead of being only a method (Başar, 1945, p.195). Başar, pointed out that the dynamics of existing statism and marxism had to be compromised instead of concentrating on one of them sharply. However, he insisted on his idea, “If Turkish socialism and statism could be able to distinguish itself from the other regions, it would have been accepted worldwide”. (Başar,1943, p.28).

Ahmet Hamdi Basar highlighted that sustainability of revolution and independency can only be achieved through a national economy and he argued that this will not be valid for a free market hence close attention should be attached by both state bureaucracy and trade associations. Keeping state out in this sense, Başar also emphasized the

importance of the cooperatives. “In Turkey Cooperative Movements take their strength from spirit of Gazi’s revolutions. Duty and responsibility of reorganizing procurement and trade classes, more precisely establishing a new country, were given to this new generation. This very important and fine work could only be achieved by united forces. In Turkey everybody is weak when alone, but when they unite a massive force emerges” (Başar, 1932a, pp.17-18). Above, Başar speaks highly of cooperatives which is a type of organization based on occupational specialization and mentions that this organization is a very suitable organization to the ideology of the new revolution: “Cooperatives are the main tools that will make use of this excellent massive power which has never been used in Turkey up till today. The main principle of our revolution is to use this great power consciously and faithfully on the way of economic development... Spreading cooperative ideas everywhere in the country and uniting individual forces and ideas of those who places an effort on this way are the duties of each revolutionary Turkish person. The greatest award expected is to be successful in approaching our goals step by step, by accomplishing our share of the duty through our articles as much as our power allows” (Başar, 1932a, pp.17-18).

Başar (1933) defined statism in contrary to individual approach of the West. “In terms of how to achieve the development, Başar showed certain similarities in his view of capitalism, crisis of capitalism and democracy and he had a similar approach to Ağaoğlu (Türkay, 1997, p.11): First, he pointed out that a concrete bourgeoisie class had to be built up for keeping this progress existing. Second, he declared that he thought, merchants and producers should take place on the scene together providing some support to the battle of the ongoing Turkish Revolution. Third, he pointed out that cooperatism which offered that people should be distinguished with their occupational specializations instead of classes, will lead people to come together as parts of a real

society (Başar, 1932-a, p.3). However he thought that private enterprise should be replaced with the state enterprise as soon as the state was able to function efficiently.

While talking of the capital accumulation, Başar argues that surplus created should be owned by those who produce more by taking risks and the major part of it should be owned by ‘the society and the state representing them’ (Türkay, 1997, p.13).

The difference between Kadro and Başar was their ideas upon where and how statism will be used. According to Başar, statism was nothing else than being an ‘economic’ policy which supported the economic progress, while Kadro was taking it as a political arrangement.

In summary, Başar was against a strict statism perspective. He tried to find a way to compromise the two distinct arguments, strict statism and individualism. Başar got close to Kadro in line with opposition to international cooperation. He saw the reason of deficiency in democracy as the inequality in the trade system. (Türkay, 1997). By departing from the logic of Ağaoğlu in rights and responsibilities, he considered establishing an organized and a balanced system where state and individual were not sacrificed for each other as a prerequisite for democracy. According to Başar, solution of all these problems was ‘economic statism’ which he saw as a prerequisite for capital accumulation. According to Başar, discussion on liberalism vs capitalism was entirely wrong due to these reasons (Türkay, 2009) because practice of statism was accepted politically in many places although the degrees of practices were different. The main concern was how to put statism into practice.

3.1.3. Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın

Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın developed his ideas around his admiration for the Republican regime and opposition to Western type modernism. He defined foundation of Turkish Republic as an uprising against the West. In his argument with Aydemir, with a nationalist attitude different from Başar and Ağaoğlu, he blamed Aydemir with being an admirer of the West. Criticisms of Yalçın were the harshest received by Kadro, related with the regime and the ideology of the period. Analysing the argument between Yalçın and Aydemir is important in understanding the prominent discussions of the period.

“It’s such a natural and suitable self control mechanism for spiritual and financial needs of an individual with personality bearing attributes of the Republican regime; it is impossible for a nation which once experienced this regime to adopt another political system. (Yalçın, 1933, pp.18-19).

Yalçın argues that foundation process of the Republic is a response to the colonial policy of the West and he adds that republic is the most modern regime possible.

“...Young Turkish Republic is also one of those new democracies coming into existence after war. However, there is an aspect separating us from others. Majority of the new governments are political outcomes of the victorious states. We deserved our right to live under the command and control of a great leader, as a product of effort placed with ambition and conciousness by fighting against the cruel and immoral policy of Europe, by spilling blood together with our women and kids” (Yalçın, 1933, pp.18-19).

As it was understood from articles in the magazine, Yalçın asserted his thesis justifying the regime. Accordingly, it should be thought that his own edition of Fikir Hareketleri

journal is one of the projects he completed in order to justify himself in the intellectual world. In his arguments under this project, it is seen that he gives references to Kooperatif Journal of Başar as well as Aydemir and Kadro movement and he enters into argument with both views. However, his argument with Aydemir provides closer interest for us in terms of determining two antipodal views.

Yalçın had written his liberal theories in his weekly published journal “Fikir Hareketleri” which took part in the ideological search of 1930’s Turkey. Yalçın emerged during the time of Edebiyat-ı Cedide as a defender of the western culture against the east, contrary to Kadro. From that point on, Yalçın’s Fikir Hareketleri had a strict conflict with Aydemir’s Kadro.

The interesting part of the argument between Yalcin and Aydemir is their antipodal views and the fact that they appear on the axis of statism-liberalism. Moreover, in the argument between Yalçın and Aydemir, Yalçın took side with the European culture. According to him, a fundamental mistake of Kadro was that they could not expel European culture and civilization by arguing that they apply colonist policies and they want to follow Europe only in technology. In his article which he wrote for Fikir Hareketleri journal, published by Yalcin, he criticizes Aydemir and Kadro in this sense:

“Europe is dead and replaced by its inheritors. They took the technique and methods of Europe. They formed a contrary and hostile civilization to European civilization, or they are about to form it. Who are these inheritors? Those who publish Kadro journal and Mr. Şevket Süreyya who speaks on their behalf”(Yalçın, 1934, 138-139).

In contrary, when Aydemir’s thesis on National Independency War is observed, anti-colonist approach of national independence movements is emphasized. Since Europe

adopted a colonist policy, fight against Europe and contrary attitude should be the most important characteristic of National Independence Movements (Ertan, 2010).

Yalçın was critical with Aydemir's conflicting declarations about Turkish Revolutionary act, because he believed that they did not complete each other, Aydemir was defining the revolution as a unique and a peculiar movement which never was imitated; "Our revolution is the outcome of a historical course.... all of its principles are unique" but will be followed or imitated completely by other nations which were in the same conjuncture with Turkey. In contrary to Aydemir's argument that Turkish revolution is unique, Yalçın declared that he wondered how a revolutionary movement could be completely original while being imitated by the others (Ertan, 2010).

According to Yalçın, none of the revolutionary movements in the world could be completely original. Yalçın asserted that this rule was also valid for the Turkish Revolution as well. Yalçın had been very critical upon Aydemir's point of view and thought that he commented falsely on the nature of the Turkish Revolutionary Movement. On the other hand, Yalçın agreed on the idea that all revolutionary movements should have original and intrinsic parts to its culture. He was still wondering how the revolution in France, in England or in USA could be similar to the revolution in Balkan. He thought that originality of a movement should not mean that it was unique and independent from any effects (Yalçın, 1934, pp.56-60).

Against Yalçın's article where he wrote his critical ideas, Aydemir published an article named "Kronikler" in Kadro, nearly after six months, where he was explaining about two journals' contents "Fikir Hareketleri" and "Yeni Adam". However, after six months, he published a new article concentrating more upon Yalçın's critiques. This article was named "We Are Inheritors Of Europe Instead Of Admirers Of Europe". In

his article, Aydemir pointed out that Yalçın's ideas which were declared in "Fikir Hareketleri" clearly, was the simulation of the pre-war era and the pre-war Europe-admirer position. According to Aydemir, the colonial and semi- colonial areas were preparing to fight against European hegemony which was reducing day by day. Aydemir wrote that even the French Revolution was traumatized after the war. Europe was defined in Aydemir's article as loosening its power and hegemony (Aydemir, 1986, p.223).

Aydemir underlines the "death" of revolution that occurred long time ago, by stating that equalitarian and liberal ideas that were influencing 1789-1793, the most efficient intellectual period of French Revolution, were left step by step and none of the values in question could be maintained after 1900s. According to Aydemir, French Revolution was convicted to this end since it could not overcome the main problem of colonialism (p. 79).

The French Revolution was nothing else than the class hegemony bringing an economic system controlled by the bourgeoisie instead of the feudal class. (Özgür, 2006, p. 93) Even the Russian revolution, as a reaction against the French Revolution, replaced the hegemony of the bourgeoisie with the proletariat only. This unequal hegemonial system could not be the way of the Turkish Revolution. On the contrary, Turkish Revolution was a reaction to both of the Russian and French Revolutions (Tör, 1932, p.17). The historical mission of Turkey was to create a national economy out of the remnants of a colonial economy. There was no such example before Turkey, and so the nation should create all what is necessary for itself (Tör, 1932, p.10).

Aydemir wrote that Turkey needed the technical equipment and scientific view to transform from the western region, but there was nothing from the ideological field of

Europe which is needed for Turkey. Although Turkey needed the thechnical part of the European development, other ideological products of Europe should be distinct from Turkish Revolutionary Act. Aydemir added that Turkey could be even an “inheritor” of the European science and method but not an admirer of it (Ertan, 2010).

Yalçın thought that Aydemir followed a wrong way in his views about Europe. According to Yalçın, Europe is more investor and capitalist than being a colonist; therefore these two concepts should be separated from each other. Yalçın wrote that Aydemir interpreted Marxism in a false way and he wanted to defend Marxism in an indirect way. Yalçın stated that Marx is a philosopher seeing the world consisting of only economy and Aydemir fell into the same mistake by judging entire Europe with colonialism. (Ertan, 2010, p.100- 102): “If seeing the world in such a simple way is natural for an admirer of Marx seeing all elements and motives of history consisting of economic reasons, there will be so less people who would agree with a partial and superficial judgement stating that Europe means colonialism...To begin with, it is required to keep capitalism and imperialism separate.” Yalçın continues his argument by providing examples. “Even though Turkey, Switzerland, Denmark, Czech Republic, Yugoslavia and Scandinavian countries are capitalist, they do not follow colonialist policies.

Main conflict between Aydemir and Yalçın (Kadro and Fikir Movements) reveal itself about Westernization. Yalçın defends his attitude taking side with westernization by asserting that European civilizations should be followed in terms of technique and culture, and Aydemir argues that Europe should be taken as an example only in terms of technique. Essentially, Kadro argues that development of capitalism in Europe had occurred with the expense of underdevelopment of colonies and semi-colonial countries (Belge, 1933, pp.31-38; Aydemir, 1933, p.10; Tökin, 1934, p.17). Belge (1934) defines

imperialism as “machine civilization” (p.38). Social order (liberal capitalism) required for using it together with the machines caused all elements of imperialist regime to come into existence within a very short period of time” (Belge, 1924, p. 38).

Yalçın discusses revolution on conceptual basis and he wants revolution to be lead towards a national and democratic direction. On the other hand, he criticizes the statements on continuity of the revolution. According to him, a continuous revolution is impossible. He states that the idea of a continuous revolution is a part of Bolshevik ideology. He defines Fikir Hareketleri where he asserted his own ideas as republican, revolutionary, liberal and follower of national sovereignty. His comments on statism vary periodically. He approves statism practice in accordance with the economic structure of the period: “Policies to be adopted in economy should be outcomes of the place and the time. Therefore, while establishing economic policy, a nation is obliged to take its intrinsic requirements into consideration while keeping an eye on social and essential principles of economic facts” (Yalçın, 1933-b, p.3). Yalçın doesn’t see economic statism as a regime and an alternative to other policies. However, he wants that policies applied in the world shouldn’t be disregarded and the healthiest way for Turkey in 1930s is to apply economic statism temporarily: “The most reliable occupation that could be applied in order to save Turkish economy and to lay strong foundations is economic statism (Yalçın, 1933-b, p.4). Yalçın states that statism principle was applied in Turkey in 1930s due to a requirement and it may be considered as a temporary practice (Mutlu, 2007).

In brief, Yalçın argues that not all countries are established on a colonist regime and states that; “Kadro accepts that positive value produced by the labor class contributes to capital accumulation since labor class in Europe is exploited; and emphasizes that in

fact industrialized Europe obtains positive value through colonies and thus Europe has power in other regions (Türkeş, 1999, p. 135).

CONCLUSION

Kadro does not believe that social process can be changed by sustainability, therefore they take side with 'Discontinuity' instead of 'Continuity' in discussion of 'Continuity vs Discontinuity'. However, 'Continuity' and 'Discontinuity' should not be defines as separate thesis, instead they should be defined as processes including each other.

The main element leading the argument in disussion of 'Continuity vs Discontinuity' is capital accumulation. Kadro, taking side with 'Discontinuity' thesis, defines capital accumulation and related social relations independent from the previous regime. Here socio-political formation is independent from the past and it was established by collapsing and rebuilding the capital relations rather than changing them with the process. It is possible to justify discontinuity argument about leaving previous capital relations, because there had been a discontinuity both in the regime of investment and capital relations during the establishment of the Republic. However neither discontinuity nor continuity arguments could define nationalizing of the social capital in Turkey. In order to evaluate the establishment period of the Turkish Republic, continuity and discontinuity thesis should be taken into consideration together. During the establishment period of Turkish Republic, both continuity and discontinuity occurred when capital funds passed into other hands and new actors took part in the process through exclusion and inclusion mechanisms.

In continuity thesis, capital accumulation turns into national capitals and actors directing the process are social classes. Social classes protect continuous capital accumulation and establish a nation state. Social classes emerge in parallel with the development of nation state and national capital. Here, structure of capital accumulation is transferred into national capital within a course of continuity together with the

transition of social classes. Kadro journal opposes to the continuity thesis. The fact that there are social classes in continuity thesis and that they are defined within the process is one of the causes that led Kadro to take side with the discontinuity thesis. Kadro argued that social classes are not yet present and opposed to the continuity thesis.

Kadro defines the changes in capital accumulation based on ‘non-class’ principle stating that the formation in Turkey is a unique and leading formation. It asserted this definition based on the ‘Third Way’ argument. Third Way is one of the attempts made for seeking a way to allow capital accumulation in the regime without holding an ideological position and it is a middle way design they created in order to avoid an ideological position. This design provides that classes had not emerged in industrializing and developing Turkey and therefore an approach based on classes would not lead to an outcome. Although social classes do not mean a capitalist class representation, they started to develop with the emergence of capital accumulation in the last period of the Ottomans. According to Kadro, classes were not present yet and it was possible to establish a non-class society mechanism. And Kadro’s non-class society could be established by statism and the third way view.

Kadro blamed ideological approaches excluding statism with being class-based and authoritative and created, and defended its unique design. “Third Way” system of Kadro emerged on the assumption that social classes and capitalist accumulation do not exist. Kadro wanted to create a ‘statism’ ideology in order to adopt non-capitalist Western type of development specific for Turkey. Kadro created ‘statism’ and ‘third way’ as an alternative to other ideologies. Kadro denies Marxism despite believing in historical ‘dialectic materialism’ and denied authoritative view essentially despite believing in the ‘nation’ idea.

Kadro falsified thesis of class perspectives. According to Aydemir, Marxist approach was important since it dealt with historical materialism. Aydemir disregarded the fact that philosophical foundation of historical materialism laid on 'class' apprehension. To the extent they avoided the class focused view, Kadro had proven that they did not consider historical materialism on the basis of a world view or an ideology. Kadro also stated that there are capitalism derivatives of both nationalism and Marxism. This shows that they define ideologies as a vicious cycle, the fact that they tried an alternative between nationalism and Marxism by using concept of nation instead of a class focused thesis shall be a right way to describe Kadro. Third way emphasis which is more prominent than the statism view makes it easier to define Kadro.

Statism view defines the way followed by world conjuncture after crisis of 1929. Turkish Republic was in industrialization period since it was a newly formed republic. It had been affected by the crisis as deep as other Western countries. However, this crisis, defined as the first crisis of capitalism lead to questioning of the capitalist fund formation and seeking new alternatives. Statism in Turkey was proposed as a social system by the intellectuals of the period, rather than an economic development plan. Therefore, statism defined as an alternative by intellectuals of the period represents an economic and social outcome emerged by necessity rather than an elective practice. When it is considered in this regard, the only original aspect of Kadro's thesis is the fact that they proposed a 3rd world nationalism, for the first time.

According to Kadro, there has been an ideological gap during the establishment of the Republic. Establishing ideology of the new Republic politically and economically is as important as being victorious in Independency War. Economic and political independency can be obtained through a system they defined under statism within the framework of a certain ideology. In this system, the idea is to achieve a non-capitalist

development uniting with a new social policy that will be established on the platform specific to Turkey. In Kadro's view, statism is a unique design which had been chosen as the ideology of Turkish Republic with a unique decision instead of a compulsory decision.

However, although statism view is an outcome of a new pursuit for Turkey, it reflects prominent ideologies of the period, world wide. Countries stopped applying free economic policies and tried protectionist practices when Great Depression in 1929 started. Statism practice in Turkey also emerged during the same period under the same conditions.

According to Kadro, the primary conflict which should have been overcome was imperialism. The ideology, which Turkey decided upon after solving the conflict of imperialism, would be the new concrete official ideology of Turkey. According to the day's rising global ideology which was the "transnational division of labor", Turkey would be responsible for providing agricultural raw material to industrialized developed countries. Furthermore, in that position, Turkey would only be a transition and a market place where the industrial goods can be sold which came from western provinces. Kadro resisted the international division of labor, arguing that it enabled the worldwide exploitation. In addition to the division of labor, Kadro resisted "worldwide specialization" in general, which offered that Turkey should be specialized in the agricultural field to develop new methods. According to Kadro, Turkey had to be an industrialized country instead of being a market.

Kadro's arguments were many times defined as the "early" dependency school because of their similar considerations of the world market economy. Main features of Kadro's third way ideology was concluded by their consideration of the world market as well as

the industrial development including Turkey, as a new Republic. Dependency school had risen around 1970 which was known to be founded by Immanuel Wallerstein and followed by Gunder Frank and Samir Amin. This theory asserted that the economic growth in advanced industrial countries did not provide any benefit to the poorer ones, meaning that there was a negative correlation between the economic growth of the core and the peripheral countries. In parallel, Kadro believed that the idea, developing countries were primitive forms of the developed countries, was wrong because capitalist system did not offer any way to primitive countries for developing themselves.

Sweezy stated that the main conflict within the capitalist system was not among the developed sectors but it was between the non-developed or underdeveloped sectors. According to Güralp, neo-marxist dependency theory almost regenerated Kadro view. Therefore while asserting their theories, Kadro estimated important elements of up-to-date underdevelopment theories of Baran, Frank, Amin and others including terms such as World System and Metropolis/ Colony.

According to Kadro, western industrialized countries used to feed on the developing ones and benefited at the cost of the others' development because they used the developing countries as their market places where their industrial goods were commercialized. Without exploitation, the western world could never have been that much economically strong.

Kadro, had always been the defender of the governmental investments and interventions arguing that they had to be risen against the private enterprise while keeping the private attempts as minor. The enlargement of statism as an argument could disturb some private enterprise owners, such as the group of İş Bankası.

REFERENCES

Acun, Fatma, (2007), “Osmanlı’nın Torunları Cumhuriyet’in Çocukları: Osmanlıdan Cumhuriyet’e Değişme ve Süreklilik” (SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi; Mayıs 2007, Sayı: 15, ss. 39-64).

Ağaoğlu, Ahmet; (1927): “Üç Medeniyet”, (Türk Ocakları Hars Neşriyatı, Sayı.8).

Ağaoğlu, Ahmet, (1933), “Devlet ve Fert”, İstanbul. (Sanayii Nefise matbaası, İstanbul).

Ağaoğlu, Ahmet; (1933): “Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde”, (Sanayii Nefise matbaası, İstanbul).

Ahmad, Feroz, (1999), ”Modern Türkiye’nin Oluşumu” (İstanbul Kaynak Yayınları, 2.baskı)

Akman, Ayhan, (2004) "Ambiguities Of Modernist Nationalism: Architectural Culture And Nation-building In Early Republican Turkey", (Turkish Studies, Vol.5, No.3, July 2004, 103-111 (SSCI).

Akman, Ayhan, "Modernist Nationalism: Statism And National Identity In Turkey", Nationalities Papers, Vol.32, No.1, January 2004, 23-51 (SSCI).

Alemdar, K. (1978), “Basında Kadro Dergisi ve Kadro Hareketi İle İlgili Bazı Görüşler”

Alpar, Cem, (1978), “Kadro Dergileri Tıpkı Basım”, (3 Cilt, AİİTA, Ankara).

Avcıoğlu, Doğan, (1968), “Türkiye’nin Düzeni” (Ankara, Bilgi)

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya (1932-b), “Plan Mefhumu Hakkında”, (Kadro Dergisi Volume: 1; Number: 5; Ankara)

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, (1932), “İnkılap ve Kadro” (Ahmet Halit Kitabevi).

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, (1933), “Türk Nasyonalizmi”, (Kadro Sayı 20/ Ağustos).

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, (1933), “Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi II Marksizm” (Kadro 2/19, Temmuz).

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya (1934), “Programlı Devletçilik”, (Kadro Dergisi, 34. Sayı Ekim, Ankara).

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, (1968), “İnkılap ve Kadro” (Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara).

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, (1986), “İnkılap ve Kadro” (İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi).

Aydemir, Ş. S. (2004), “1789 İhtilâli’nin Mezarı Başında (1)”, (Kadro Seçmeler içinde, ss.789-794, İstanbul: İleri Yayınları).

Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, (2009), “Suyu Arayan Adam”, (Remzi Kitabevi).

Başar, Ahmet Hamdi, (1932), “Fikir ve Neşriyat Alemi: Kadro Mecmuası” (Kooperatif, Sayı:1; ss. 17- 18).

Başar, Ahmet Hamdi, (1932), “Kooperatif Niçin Çıkıyor?” (Kooperatif, ss. 1-2).

Başar, A. Hamdi, (1932), “Kadro” (Kadro, Cilt1, İstanbul).

Başar, A. Hamdi, (1932-a), “Fikir ve Neşriyat Alemi: Kadro Mecmuası” (Haziran/Sayı:1).

Başar, A. Hamdi, (1933), “İktisadi Devletçilik” (İkinci Cilt, İstanbul).

Başar, Ahmet Hamdi (1943) , “Davalarımız” (İstanbul, Arkadaş Basımevi).

Başar, A.Hamdi; 1982: "İktisadi Devletçilik Hakkında Konferans", (Kooperatif, Seçme Yazılar, Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları, No-10; pp.150-177).

Başar, A.Hamdi; 1982: "Türk Devletçiliği ", (Kooperatif, Seçme Yazılar, Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları, No-10; pp.178-206).

Başkaya, Fikret; "Devletçilikten 24 Ocak Kararlarına: İki Bunalım Döneminde Türkiye Ekonomisi" (2. Baskı, Ankara 2004, Özgür Üniversite Kitaplığı, ss. 17-26).

Başkaya, Fikret, (1986), "Azgelişmişliğin Sürekliliği", (Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul).

Belge, Murat, (1983), "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma" (Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, Volum 1, İstanbul, İletişim, p.260).

Belge, Murat, (2010), "Faşizm ve Türk Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi", (Kadro no:8; pp.36-39)

Belge, B. A. (1932), "Cihan Buhranı Bitti mi? " (Kadro, Cilt 1, Sayı 1, ss. 28-39).

Belge, B. A. (1933), "Liberalizmden Emperyalizme Doğru", (Kadro 2/16, Nisan).

Belge, B. A. (1933), "Okular Nereyi Gösteriyor?", (Kadro, 3/27, Mart).

Belge, B. A. (2004), "Faşizm ve Türk Millî Kurtuluş Hareketi", Kadro Seçmeler içinde, pp. 221-224, İstanbul: İleri Yayınları).

Belge, B. A. (2004), "Çökmekte Olan Cihan Nizamı", Kadro Seçmeler içinde, pp. 54-59, İstanbul: İleri Yayınları).

Benningsen, Alexander and L.C. Qualquejay, (1967), "İslam In The Soviet Union", Translator; (E. Wheeler and Hubert Evans, Londra).

Boratav, Korkut (1962), “Türkiye’de Devletçilik (1923-1950), İktisadi Düşünceler ve İktisadi Mevzuular.” (Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, Maliye Enstitüsü Türk İktisadi Geliştirme Projesi).

Boratav, Korkut (1982), “Türkiye’de Devletçilik”, (Savaş Yayınları, Ankara).

Boratav, Korkut, (1990), “Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908-1985” (Gerçek Yayınevi).

Caretto, Giacomo , (1985), “1930’larda Kemalizm-Faşizm-Komünizm Üzerine Polemikler I-II” (Tarih ve Toplum, Sayı:17–18, Sayı: Mayıs – Haziran, ss. 56–60; 62–65).

Carretto, Giacomo, (1985), “1930’larda Kemalizm-Faşizm-Komünizm Üzerine Polemikler I ve II” (Tarih ve Toplum, Sayı:17, s. 56-60).

Coşar, Nevin, (1995), “Türkiye’de Devletçilik”, (Bağlam Yayınları).

Coşar, Nevin, (1995), “Denk Bütçe ve Sağlam Para Politikası: 1924-1938” (Türkiye’de Devletçilik, Bağlam Yayınları).

Ercan, Fuat, (2003), “Türkiye’de Kapitalizmin Analizinde Sınıf Gerçekliğinden Kaçış Üzerine, Korkut Boratav’a Armağan Küresel Düzen: Birikim, Devlet ve Sınıflar” (Der:A.H.Köse-F.Şenses ve E.Yeldan, İletişim Yayınları, ss. 611-669).

Ertan, Temuçin Faik (1994), “Kadrocular ve Kadro Hareketi” (Ankara: TC Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları).

Ertan, Temuçin Faik, (2010), “Atatürk Döneminde Devletçilik- Liberalizm Tartışmaları: Şevket Süreyya (Aydemir); Hüseyin Cahit (Yalçın) Polemiği” (Phoenix Yayınevi).

Fırat, Ali Haydar, (2005), “Bir Dönem Tartışmalarının Seyri: 1932- 1935 Yıllarında Matbuat Tartışmaları Bağlamında Kadro, Kooperatif ve Fikir Hareketleri Dergileri” (Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gazetecilik Anabilimdalı).

Fikret Başkaya, “Devletçilikten 24 Ocak Kararlarına: Türkiye Ekonomisinde İki Bunalım Dönemi” (Özgür Üniversite Kitaplığı 2. Baskı 2004. Özellikle de ss. 29-124).

Gevgilili, Ali, (1989), Türkiye’de Kapitalizmin Gelişmesi ve Sosyal Sınıflar”, (Bağlam Gevgilili, Ali, (1989), Türkiye’de Kapitalizmin Gelişmesi ve Sosyal Sınıflar”, (Bağlam Yayınları).

Gülalp, Haldun, (1983),” Gelişme Stratejileri ve Gelişme İdeolojileri”, Yurt Yayınları 5.

Güngör, Süleyman, (1995), “Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin Kurumsallaşması Sürecinde Siyasal Seçkin- Aydın İlişkisi; Ahmet Ağaoğlu Örneği” (Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, yüksek lisans tezi).

Hafızoğulları, Zeki (2000), İzmir İktisat Kongresi Görüşler, Değerlendirmeler, (Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi, Sayı 46, Cilt: XVI, Mart).

Hale, William, (1980), “Ideology and Economic Developement in Turkey in 1930-1945 (British Society for Middle Eastern Studies, Bulletin).

Hale, William, (1981-a), “The Political and Economic Developement of Modern Turkey” (Londra).

Hale William, (1981-b), “Assesments, Origins and Objectives of Etatism” (Papers/Discussions; Türkiye İşbankası International Symposium on Atatürk; 17- 22 Mayıs 1981).

Herbert, Kelman, (1958), “Compliance, Identification and Internalization Three Processes of Attitude Change” (The Journal of Conflict Revolution, cilt 2, no 1, Mart, pp. 51- 60).

Herslag, Z.Y, (1995), “Atatürk’ün Devletçiliği”, (Türkiye’de Devletçilik, İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, ss. 207-218).

Hudson, Pat (2010); “The Industrial Revolution”, (Oxford University Press US).

Tökin, İsmail Hüsrev, (1933), “Milli Kurtuluş Devletçiliği”, (Kadro, Sayı 19, Temmuz).

İlkin, Selim; Tekeli, İlhan (2010). “Cumhuriyetin Harcı; Köktenci Modernitenin Ekonomi Politikasının Gelişimi” (İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2. Baskı).

İlkin, Selim; Tekeli, İlhan (1983) “1929 Buhranında Türkiye’nin İktisadi Arayışları” (ODTU yayınları, Ankara).

İnan, Afet, (1989), İzmir İktisat Kongresi 17 Şubat- 4 Mart, Ankara TTK yayınları, 2. baskı

İnönü,İ, (1933), “Fıkramızın Devletçilik Vasfı” (Kadro, s.22, Ekim).

Jackson, Andrew, (1999), “The Global Financial Crisis” Canadian Dimension” (January-February/ Marglin)

Kadro, (1932), “Çıkış Yazısı”, (No:1, p.1).

Kadro, (1932-a), (Haziran; ss. 16-47).

Kadro, No:35-36, İlkkanun 1934-Sonkanun 1935, s. 6.

Karpat, Kemal H. (1966), “The Turkish Left”, Journal of Contemporary History, 1/2 (1966), ss. 169- 186.

- Karpat, Kemal H. (1996), “Osmanlı’nın Gemişı ve Bugünün Türkiye’si” (İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, Tarih Dizisi).
- Karpat, Kemal H. (2008), Türk Demokrasi Tarihi, (Timaş Yayınları).
- Kepenek, Yakup ve Yentürk, Nurhan. (2001), “Türkiye Ekonomisi” (12. Basım, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul).
- Kerwin, R.W, “Türkiye’de Devletçilik” (The State and Economic Growth, Atiken, New York, pp.237-257).
- Keskinok, H. Çağatay, (2010). “Urban Planning Experience of Turkey In The 1930’s.” (METU; pp. 173- 188).
- Keyder, Çağlar, (1990) “Türkiye Demokrasisinin Ekonomi Politikği”(İ.C Schick ve E.A.Tonak ed./Geçiş Sürecinde Türkiye; ss.38-76)
- Keyder, Çağlar, (1993) “Dünya Ekonomisi İçinde Türkiye (1923-1929)” (İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2.baskı).
- Keyder, Çağlar, (2001) “Türkiye’de Devlet ve Sınıflar” (İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları/7.baskı)
- Konyar, Hürriyet, (1999), “Ulus Gazetesi, CHP ve Kemalist İlkeler” (Bağlam Yayınları).
- Küçükömer, İdris, (2001), “Batılaşma: Düzenin Yabancılaşması” (Bağlam Yayınları).
- Küçük, Yalçın, (1981) “Türkiye’de Planlama Kavramının Gelişimi Üzerine; Türkiye’nin Planlı Gelişiminin Yirmi Yılı: 1960-1980”, (ODTU Gelişme Dergisi, 1981 Özel Sayısı ss. 79-115).

Mutlu, Sevda, (2007). “1930lar Türkiye’sinde Devletçilik Tartışmaları”. (İktisadi İdari Bilimler Dergisi Cilt 8, Sayı 1).

Ökçün, A. Gündüz, (1971), “Türkiye İktisat Kongresi”, (Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları, ss.390-437)

Özgür, Erdem, (2006) “Great Depression and Its Analysis Of The Great Depression.” (Zonguldak Karaelmas Üniversitesi İİBF İktisat Bölümü, Volume: 2, Number: 4, ss. 91-103).

Önay, Ahmet Şerif, “Türkiye Milli İktisadi ve Sanayi Meselesi Hakkında Bir Mütalaa” (Uygulamaya Geçerken Türkiye’de Devletçiliğin Oluşumu; İlhan Tekeli, Selim İlkin).

Sayılgan, Aclan, (1967), “Sovyetlerde Eğitim ve Türk Öğrencileri” (Ankara, ss. 8-9).

Sarıdal, Vehbi (İstanbul Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Umumi Katibi),S “Cihan İçinde İktisat Buhranı- Bu Vaziyet İçinde Türkiye’nin Hali” (Uygulamaya Geçerken Türkiye’de Devletçiliğin Oluşumu; İlhan Tekeli, Selim İlkin).

Sezgin, Ömür (1978), “Kadro Hareketi” (İleri Yayınevi Kadro- Tıpkıbasım Önsöz Cilt 1).

Soyak, H.Rıza; (1972), “Atatürk’ten Hatıralar”, (C.2. İstanbul).

Şağan, Ali, (2005), “The first industrial plan and providing development of Turkey 1933-1938.” (Marmara Üniversitesi, Türk Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Ana Bilim Dalı).

Sweezy, Paul (1972), “Modern Capitalism and Other Essays” (New York; Monthly Review Press).

Tekeli, İlhan; İlkin, Selim, (2003), “Bir Cumhuriyet öyküsü: Kadrocuları ve Kadro'yu Anlamak”, (Türkiye Ekonomik Topumsal Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul).

Tekeli, İlkin, (1982), “Uygulamaya Geçerken Türkiye’de Devletçiliğin Oluşumu”. (International Journal of Middle East Studies).

Timur, Taner (1994) “Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası” (Ankara/ İmge Yayınevi).

Timur, Taner, (2001) “Turkish Revolution and After” “Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası” (Ankara, İmge Kitabevi, 5.baskı).

Tökin, İsmail Husrev, (1932), “Türkiye’de Milli Sermaye Hareketi”, (Kadro Seçmeler, İleri Yayınları, ss.268-274).

Tökin, İ. H. (1932), “Türkiye’de Milli Sermaye Hareketi”, (Kadro, Cilt 1, Sayı 10, ss. 20-25).

Tökin, İ. H. (1933), “Milli Kurtuluş Devletçiliği II” (Kadro Dergisi, 19. Sayı, Ankara).

Tökin, İ. H, (1934), “ Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi II“, (Kadro, Tıpkıbasım, Cilt-3, Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari Bilimler Akademisi, pp. 20- 27).

Tökin, İ. H, (1934), “Garpta Sermaye Terekkümünde Müstemlekelerin Rolü” (Kadro, 3/32, Ağustos).

Tör, Vedat Nedim, (1932), “Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti.” (Kadro Dergisi/ Seçmeler, İleri Yayınları, 2004).

Tör, V. N. (1932e), “Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti”, Kadro, Volume:1, No:11, pp. 17-21).

Tör, V. N. (1932a), “Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına”(Kadro, Volume:1, No:1, Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari Bilimler Akademisi, , pp. 8-11).

Tör, Vedat Nedim (1933), “Devletin Yapıcılık ve İdarecilik Kudretine İnanmak Gereği” (Kadro Dergisi, Volume:2, No:15, Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari Bilimler Akademisi).

Tör, Vedat Nedim (1933), “Devletin Yapıcılık ve İdarecilik Kudretine İnanmak Gereği”, (Kadro Dergisi, Mart 15. Sayı, Ankara).

Tör, Vedat Nedim (1933), “İktisatta İstiklal”, Kadro Dergisi Cilt 2, No:22, Teşrinvevvel 1933, pp.14-18.

Tör, Vedat Nedim (1978), Kadro Tıpkıbasım, A.İ.T.İ.A. Yyn., Ankara, 1978 (3.Cilt, 36 Sayı).

Türkay, Mehmet, (2009), “Sermaye Birikimi, Kalkınma ve Azgelişmişlik: Türkiye ve Dünya Üzerine Notlar”, (Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı, Sınıf Çalışmaları Dizisi: 5).

Türkay, Mehmet, (1997), “Cumhuriyet Aydınları’nın Tartışmalarında Devlet Demokrasi Gelişme ve Günümüze Yansımaları” "Cumhuriyet Aydınlarının Tartışmalarında Devlet- Demokrasi-Gelişme ve Günümüze Yansıma(ma)ları" , Mübeccel Kıray İçin Yazılar, (Derleme), Bağlam yay. 2000, pp.355-370.

Türkeş, Mustafa (1998), “A Patriotic Leftist Development Strategy Proposal in Turkey in the 1930’s: The Case of The Kadro (Cadre), Movement”, (International Journal of Middle East Studies 33, pp 91-114).

Uysal, Yıldırım, (2008). “The Reflection of Kemalist Ideology in the Perception Of Metu Students. A Theoretical Practical Examination.” (M.A. Thesis from Departement Sociology).

Yalçın, H. Cahit, (1933), “Matbuat Hayatı ve Fikir Hareketleri” (Sayı 1/Ekim).

Yalçın, H. Cahit (1933-b), “Bizde İktisadi Devletçilik, Avrupa’da İktisadi Devletçilik” (Fikir Hareketleri, no.5, pp.3-4).

Yalçın, H. Cahit, (1934), “Matbuat Hayatı; Avrupa’nın Mirasçıları”, (Fikir Hareketleri, Sayı:35, 21 Haziran 1934).

Yanardağ, Merdan (2008), “Türk Siyasal Yaşamında Kadro Hareketi” (Siyah Beyaz Yayın).

Yılmaz, Mehmet, (1998) “Türkiye’de Özelleştirme Uygulamaları ve İşçi Sendikaları Üzerine Etkileri.” (Muğla Üniversitesi Yüksek Lisans Tezi).

Yıldırım, İlteriş (2007). Türk Modernleşmesi ve Türk Solu Kadro Hareketi Örneği. (Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Zürcher, E.J. (1993), “Turkey: A Modern History” (London: I.B.Tauris).