The Kadro Movement

A Search for National Socialism after the Great Depression

Ozan Ekin Derin



ÖZGÜR PRESS

The Kadro Movement

The Kadro Movement

A Search for National Socialism after the Great Depression

Ozan Ekin Derin
Middle East Technical University, Department of Political Science and Public Administration
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4938-0166

ÖZGÜR PRESS

Özgür Publications
Özgür Yayın-Dağıtım Co. Ltd. · Certificate Number 45503
15 Temmuz Mah. 148136. Sk. No: 9, Şehitkamil, Gaziantep, Türkiye
www.ozguryayinlari.com · info@ozguryayinlari.com · +90 850 260 09 97

The Kadro Movement: A Search for National Socialism after the Great Depression

Ozan Ekin Derin

COPYRIGHT AND LICENCE

CC BY-NC 4.0

© The Author(s) 2026. This book is published open access under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence (CC BY-NC 4.0), which permits use, sharing and reproduction for non-commercial purposes provided the original author(s) and source are credited. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

IDENTIFIERS

ISBN (PDF)	978-625-5019-46-2
DOI	https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub1374
First published	2026
Language	English

KEYWORDS

Kadro Movement; Development Economics; Economic Nationalism; Nationalism; Kemalism; Turkish Economy

SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION

Scopus ASJC	3320 Political Science and International Relations · 1202 History
ÜAK	Social Sciences, Humanities and Administrative Sciences (Basic Field)

SUGGESTED CITATION

Derin, O. E. (2026). *The Kadro Movement: A Search for National Socialism after the Great Depression*. Özgür Publications. https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub1374

PEER REVIEW

The full text of this book has been peer-reviewed to ensure high academic standards. For full review policies, see https://www.ozguryayinlari.com/

I would like to thank my family and Prof. Dr. N. Erdoğan again for their support in this study, respects to those we miss, and greetings to those who have recently joined us…

About the Author

Ozan Ekin Derin is a Research Assistant, PhD in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration / Graduate School of Social Sciences at METU. He holds an MS in Media and Cultural Studies and a PhD in Political Science and Public Administration, both from METU. His master's thesis examines the political practice of the Kadro journal published during the early Republican period in Turkey, while his doctoral dissertation deals with the history of political thought in the early Ottoman Empire, within their own context and the dynamics of development. He conducts postdoctoral research on folk narratives at the University of Vienna / Institut für Orientalistik, and Introduction to Politics and Turkish Political Structure courses at METU. His research focuses on the philosophy of science, contemporary political theory, and drama as well as the cultural and intellectual history, politics, and art in the pre-capitalist social formations. He is a member of GTOT and ESHPT. He has published research articles in academic journals such as the Foundations of Science, Cultural Logic, and Journal of Sociological Research.

Contents

	Foreword	xi
1	Introduction: Context and Literature	1
2	The Early Period of the Kadro Movement: Self-manifestation and Ideological Dissertation Stage Between January 1932-August 1932	13
3	The Inflection Point of the Kadro Movement: Critical Period, Oppositions and Advancements Between September 1932 - July 1933	39
4	Critical Tides of Étatism: Ramification and Embodiment of Anti-bourgeoisie Character Between August 1933 – September 1934	61
5	Conclusion and Final Comments on the Kadro Movement	89
	Bibliography	109

Foreword

This book is a revised, expanded, and clarified version of my master's thesis, completed in 2016 at the Middle East Technical University, Department of Media and Cultural Studies. In the research process for this study, issues of the Kadro journal, the independent works of its writers, the assessments of its opponents and supporters, and documents from the economic, political, and cultural history of the period were evaluated in an attempt to draw a broad structural framework.

This framework can be traced around a struggle between developmentalism, étatism, liberalism, authoritarian state building, the 1929 World Economic Depression, and the single-party rule, all of which also appear in other studies. However, the fact that the framework can be drawn in this way does not mean that all publications of the journal can be passively interpreted or methodologically reduced within this framework –and I believe the fundamental problem with studies on this subject is that, unless they offer a dull historical narrative, they oscillate between reductionism and idealism. Drawing a specific historical framework does not mean that the active and passive, constitutive and subordinate, avant-garde and reactionary elements of that framework can be evaluated in the same way. At least, if the problem is approached from the perspective of relational materialism, the shaping of the political field is a complex process that corresponds both to the direct and indirect relationships between these elements, and to the existence possibilities of these relationships.[1]

Therefore, the existence of a particular political actor is inherent both in the dynamic formation of other actors and structures, and in its own trajectory and complex political practice. In conclusion, this study, while considering the political, economic, and cultural environment in which the Kadro movement developed, has primarily focused on analyzing how this movement evolved

[1] For the premises of relational materialism, see: Derin and Baytaş (2025).

day by day, the reference points it referenced, and the political balances it maintained. In this respect, the work you are about to read claims to offer a fundamental methodological contribution to the history of political thought: without providing a thematic presentation or logical analysis of specific political thought styles, or reducing them to *Weltanschauung* of particular social groups, etc., it treats them as contradictory social constructs within a process ontology and analyzes their development dynamically. Readers will decide whether the text achieves this purpose. I would like to point out that, as a young person in my mid-twenties at the time of writing, I worked quite diligently in this context, writing over a thousand pages of manuscript and achieving this much within the constraints of time and context. I believe I reached more concrete results in this area with my doctoral thesis, and I recommend that researchers interested in the subject also read this later text. Finally, I realized that while introducing new connections, I have made as many direct quotations as possible so that readers can follow the sources of the ideas, and this is the main problem with the text you will read. The fact that I have translated significant fragments from the Kadro journal into English, making them easily accessible references for international researches, adds to the value of the work.[2] I have also tried to include as much new literature as possible that has developed since the time the text was written.

Nevertheless, I always had the feeling that the work might not be entirely complete. This was due less to the methodology and more to my inability to give a clear answer to a specific question: whether the Kadro circle could undertake official tasks related to economic planning but whether there was a need to publish a journal. After all, this movement was being carried out with state instruments. Explaining this solely by referring to the struggle between étatism and liberalism between the İsmet Pasha and Celal Bayar groups -while important- did not satisfy me sufficiently. In this context, my thoughts have matured over the long period that has passed, and I realized that the answer I was looking for might not be directly found in the sources. It could be a decision made orally and off-the-record, and at least not found in Turkish archives. In this context, my final speculative conclusion is that this move may also have been requested by the USSR in exchange for granting industrial credit. The issue of a proleft publication could have been part of these negotiations, or it could have been used as a declaration of goodwill. Proving this is impossible without accessing the USSR archives, but it should

[2] For the articles in the Kadro journal, the facsimile edition published under the editorship of Alpar (1978) was used.

at least be considered hypothetically. This thought has clarified a number of issues for me. Secondly, I must say that throughout my research I found it difficult to pinpoint the precise political position and ideological category of the Kadro movement. This ambiguity significantly delayed the writing of this book. The economic reform proposed by this movement was based on a broad program encompassing the industrial, commercial, agricultural, and financial sectors, including the regulation, limitation, transfer to state control, or outright nationalization of private property. This program, quite close to state socialism, was partly shaped by reference to Marxist class analysis, but fundamentally drew upon F. List's principles. Secondly, the Journal's nationalist emphasis was also quite pronounced. In this context, it was not easy to explicitly declare it's ideas as socialist, capitalist, or simply national liberation nationalist or developmentalist.

Over the years, I've had the opportunity to work on three issues that have minimized my mental uncertainty regarding this matter. The first point is that the USSR utilized F. List's ideas on national economics during its planning process, which reveals a certain parallel. Secondly, it was clear that the necessary working-class political mobilization for this movement to suppress rising working-class resistance and construct an anti-communist ideology was absent. In this respect, the Kadro group's proposals for a classless society, preventing the formation of class struggle, and étatism seem to have been put forward not to suppress the rising resistance of proletariat, but to curtail the power in the hands of the bourgeoisie. In this case, it is still possible and important to say that the journal had a certain socialist agenda -even if this is not very typical. If we can speak of such a hidden agenda, then it is necessary to distinguish between the Kadro movement and the Kadro journal. In this case, the Kadro movement corresponds to an organization and network similar to the early Committee of Union and Progress, while the journal becomes the ideological publication organ of this movement, taking into account the current political conditions. However, this orientation is positioned in political practice in a way that can reveal different potentials: it can transform into corporatism, developmental étatism, or a comprehensive socialist society project. It is possible that a social democracy project could emerge from this framework, but its democratic character is quite limited. However, its connection to the Kadro movement in the context of the history of social democracy in Turkey is also worth examining. Thirdly, it is clear that the national socialist movement itself may have had phases and may have carried, at least in its early stages, a certain idea of state socialism combined with paternalistic conservatism as an undercurrent.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the idea of national socialism may have had different lines of development and it is highly probable that it exhibited appearances in different parts of the world that cannot be definitively categorized, ranging from national capitalism to state capitalism and then to national socialism. This means that movements are possible that are distanced from Nazi ideology and organizational structure, cannot be reduced to it, but may share common intellectual origins.

In this respect, I ultimately find it more accurate to define the Kadro movement as national socialist; but this is not a typical ideological code, and it is far more socialist than its European counterparts, but it continues to position its nationalist and étatist tone against all democratic options.[3] Therefore, the most unclear aspect of this project is which social subject it was built upon. It is clear that, from the moment the Kadro journal was launched, it aimed to persuade Kemalist cadres and to exploit certain necessities arising from the global economic crisis of 1929. On the other hand, it is also understood that it sought to reach the working classes through the industrial enterprises it wanted to establish, agricultural reforms, and youth organizations. However, given its starting point and ideological preferences, it seems unlikely that it could garner this kind of mass support. To make more definitive statements on this subject, it is necessary to examine other examples around the world and the earliest and most disorganized instances of national socialism in the European history. I would cite these topics as the most fundamental issues that have matured over the years, and I believe that reading this book from the perspective of those question will allow for a better understanding of its contribution to the field as well as the historical significance of the Kadro movement.

[3]For an article supporting this argument, see: Carretto (1985). For examples where Kadro journal is described as left-nationalist of national-left see: Türkeş (1999) and Duman (2011). For a typical counter-argument, see: Örmeci (2011).

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Context and Literature

This study aims to find an answer to the question of what is the specific relation between the Kadro movement and dominant classes in the context of early republican era in Turkey. In the case of composing this question of inquiry, main purpose of this study determined as finding such a brief way to not recapitulate literature's contradictory arguments but state a simple level of interpretation in order to make revaluation of the Kadro movement. This study suggests that the Kadro movement should be remantioned in accordance with its struggle with dominant classes in the context which strictly tied by their political articulations and model of economic reorganization. Also this study aimed to avoid repeading main arguments of the literature on the Kadro movement that structured directly in tied with scholars political positions such as socialist critics and nationalist affirmation of the Kadro movement in terms of developmentalism, industrialism and Kemalism. Also this work is not taking any notice of democratisation literature and anti-elitist arguments; briefly it aims to reveal objective political pratice of the Kadro movement.

After start to analyze the Kadro movement and its development in a specific economic and political conjuncture, it should be remembered that here is a wide-range of literature exist about it which from one-or-two paged journals till contentfull monographies that reviewed and adjudicated about its specific importance in the Turkish political history. The multifaced and contentious studies on the topic developed in various treats of conceptualizations located in opposing positions that they may understand the Kadro movement as a civil opposition movement, a patriotic-leftist development proposal, an original interpretation of Sultan-Galief's political vision, a leftwing-Kemalist interpretation of Turkish revolution on the one hand, and a propaganda of corporatist-fascist political plan, an ideological formulation of state-led-capitalism, the first Kemalist emplacement, an opening move of étatist period in Turkey, an original and autochthon movement on the other hand, and etc.

It is important to state that, contradictions of the literature on Kadro movement stand of two main pillar. The first approach suggested to analyze the Kadro movement by assuming a clear identification with Kemalist policy of étatism and mentioning the Kadro movement as a agent –also promoter- of Kemalism. This approach can not explain why the Kadro journal forced to be closed by Kemalist leadership if the former two was identified as such. The second, critical approach on Kadro movement have a tendency to evaluate it as a ideological apparatus of a bourgeoisie that dissert an ideology to convince unrest masses after the world economical crises after 1929. However general stand points of this literature is objectively valid in general sense, and in term of Marxist analysis, it fails to notice stuggles of the Kadro movement between the representatives of bourgeoisie and their media agents such as the writers of *Milliyet*.

In general sense, these perspectives on the Kadro movement have some common –as well as differentiated- lines obviously, but these commonalities and differences are not basicly refering simple contradistinctions of interpretation styles, beyond this, I think, these commentaries on Kadro movement considerably effected by actual problems of Turkish political life, and by so, these commentaries prolifed in accordance with the pressure of actual political points of departures. However, the problem of actualite which gives specific features of commentarisation can not be ignored in the hermeneutics, these commentaries should stand on simply rigid and reliable historical datain accordance with wide contextual and syncronical interpretations.

In the scope of this study, primary and secondary sources was used to restructure the political and economical project of the Kadro movement. All issues of the Kadro journal reviewed. In this manner, early and late writtings of the members of the Kadro group was evaluated. Also literature on Turkish economical and political history reconsidered. In accordance with its base on the review of issues of Kadro journal and Turkish political history, this study rewrites a periodisation of the Kadro movement considering its political practice which determined by political and economical advances as well as its struggle with the various contemporary political actors.

1.1 General Periodization of the Kadro Movement

The general advancement of the Kadro movement and particularly development of its political position besides the forming of contention around

the journal issues can be understood by referring the history of threefold transformation of the journal.

The first phase includes the events between the publication of the first issue of Kadro (January 1932) and the period began with the appointment of Celal Bayar as the new Minister of Economy (September 1932). The characteristic feature of this phase is the its search for locating the main arguments under the term of Turkish Revolution and infusing the necessity of étatism with general and rather abstract propositions. In this phase, it can be said that, Kadro acts more like an ideological journal focusing to draw tha margins of the new movement rather than aiming to structure details of a new economic policy. Another significant point is the fact that the journal pursues the economical course of events around the world and the prediction of a global economic crisis. In this period the debut of Kadro was welcomed warmly in the media and it does not get involved in critical polemics. When the Committee of Industry from the Soviet Union started the examinations in Turkey, Kadro started simultaneously to handle the topics such as planning and nationalization within the logic of class struggles. To sum up, Kadro movement's political activity could be described as quite prudent in the first phase (Yıldız, 2011: 112).

The second phase starts with the period when Celal Bayar took office as the Minister of Economy (September 1932) and ends before the article of İsmet İnönü written to Kadro journal to explain the étatism policy (July 1933). In this phase the Kadro journal which attempted to explain temperately the importance of the étatism encountered with a media opposition in the first months -such as their polemics with Ahmet Ağaoğlu- and actively involved in the İsmet İnönü-Celal Bayar conflict. In this period, the journal treats many subjects from the reorganization of the Ministry of Economy to the problematization of the profits of the private enterprices. Besides it was involved in the current political issues of its time such as the closure of *Dârülfünûn* (the predecessor of Istanbul University) and the cultural and political organization of youth groups. In this period the focal point of Kadro journal on the international realm changed from the deepening global economic crisis to the rising of fascist regimes in Europe. This phase must be considered the first active stage of the political struggle of Kadro journal.

The last phase starts when Dr. Reşit Galip, a strong political ally of Kadro journal, was discharged (July 1933), ends in November 1934 when the decision of closure was reported to the journal writers. This phase is the period when Kadro journal mentioned its most radical opinions. It was also the time that

the global economic crisis was diminishing and the war industry was rising; thus, the Turkish bourgeoisie was also reacquiring its dominant position and overcoming the hegemony crisis. In this period Kadro was radicalizing its ideas on the nationalization and cooperatives in agricultural production, changing the focus from world economics to the Turkish proletariat and dealing with the polemics against the journal itself. The significance of this phase is the condensing of the struggle because of the shift of Kadro journal in its discourses and the discharging process of the journal.[1]

1.2 Literature Review

Kadro is one of the journals which are most studied in the recent academic history of Turkey, became within the field of interest of many academic disciplines and most commented on directly because of continious interest on its writers and various articles found significant to understand the early phase of Turkish politics as well as ideas reevaluated to construct new ideological perspectives. The monographies and articles directly written about Kadro journal constitute a notable and voluminous literature; in addition to this it is possible to find numerous comments or evaluations on Kadro journal in many academical researches in the fields of history of economics, politics and political science that concerning to analyze the history of modern Turkey. Examining all these evaluations thoroughly exceeds the focus and scope of this study. Therefore, in this section, I briefly review the essential literature in a categorical manner.

The literature on Kadro journal can be examined generally in three main categories. These can be classified as (i) the works in the history of literature, (ii) the literature analyzing the Kadro journal as the topic of political history, and (iii) the literature analyzing the Kadro journal under the discipline of history of economic. Categorization in question is segmented to various subheadings according to different point of views and focal points.

First, the history of Turkish literature and recearch in comparative literature ought to be shortly browsed. Although this field is generally excluded from this study, in this section I shortly review the discussions in the field of literature. The literature in which Kadro journal is examined that focusing on the language and culture problems in the field of history of literature is

[1] The last two volumes of the journal (November 1934, December 1934-January 1934) are excluded from this periodization model as shutdown of the journal was known that the writers started self-justification in those issues.

rather limited. Articles published by Gözaydın (1978) and Uslu (2012) about the perception of language and literature in Kadro journal and its historical significance are the main examples in this literature. Second, the studies surveyed the discussions about the "revolution literature" in 1930's of Kadro journal can be mentioned. The "canon problem" in Turkish literature which was brought forward by Murat Belge was developed by different researchers afterwards, such as Çıkla (2007), Baki (2010), Anar (2013), Sıdal and Meri (2024). In this field, the link between Yakup Karaosmanoğlu's literary works and his personality with literature canon became a subject of interest. Also, the book list named as "literature canon" and published in the fifth volume of the journal dating April 1932 was mentioned in the discussions about the literature canon in Turkey. On the other hand, the novels of Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu and the surveys on the relation of these novels with the intellectual and political circumstances of the early republic era have a certain point in literature. In this regard, the publishing course of Kadro journal was also in the field of interest of researchers. The works of Yılmaz (2008) and Karataş and Yıldız (2010) may be cited as examples to the literature analyzing comparatively Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu's novels and the understanding of Kadro movement. Additionally, the fact that Şevket Süreyya Aydemir's literary works have also constituted as a research topic in the field of literature. In this field the articles of Uğurcan (2013) and Aslan and Bilir (2014) must be stated as competent reviews on Şevket Süreyya Aydemir's novels. The significance of these articles roots in their ability to make the different episodes of Aydemir's ideas and the integrity of his works visible.

Secondly, the political history literature about the Kadro movement should be mentioned in this context. Kadro movement is examined under a few different sections in political history literature. In Turkey there is a wide literature on Kadro movement under the discipline of political intellectual history. The main literary works of this literature similarly focus on the left-wing past of Kadro and there is a persistence between the thoughts they represented in 1920's and the thoughts they expressed in Kadro journal. Ülken (1992), Harris (2002) and Tunçay (1978: 1992) might be the principle examples of these works. Although the work of Ülken (1992) handles the Kadro movement in general intellectual history and does not state the Kadroism widely, the fact that it approaches the actions of the Kadro journal's writers during *Aydınlık* Circle and its emphasis on the persistence is significant. As a result, his work is classified in this group.

It is possible to add two names who supposedly wrote supposedly using the police archives to the list; Tevetoğlu (1967) and Sayılgan (1972). Darendelioğlu (1961) must also be added to these two writers. The intellectual efforts of these two names seeming unproblematic in the terms of the access to the materials of the archives, seems rather problematic about interpreting these materials. It is also possible to encounter another literature analyzing the Kadro movement in the field of critical intellectual history which is appear under the discipline of political intellectual history. The primary works to mention in this literature are Eliçin (1970), Kayalı (1990 and 2003), Küçük (1985, 1987a, 1987b, 1988, 1989, 2004), and Özfırat (2009).[2] In Küçük's works, particular emphasis is placed on a problem of continuity regarding the critics of the communist movement of the 1920s and the early period of the Kadro movement. Besides, Kadro movement is presented as an intellectual system formed as an ideological illusion by the Kemalist government against the rising labor movement. The critics on the Kadro journal are formed in two main axis; apostasy and serving the system. In the works of Kayalı, in addition to the arguments about serving the regime or apostasy (2013: 81), the argument indicating that the étatism of Kadro journal is presented as a general system beyond the CHP (Republican People's Party) politics (1990: 16–17) brings a new light to the literature -and I also adopt this argument. On the other hand, the work of Eliçin generally summarizes the dissertations of Kadroists and criticizes these dissertations with regard to voluntarism (1970: 53) and ignoring the bourgeois characteristic of the regime (1970: 59) in an attempt to mention the YÖN movement.

Finally, when we take a glance at the recent literature, the works of Yıldız (2011) and Gürpınar (2013) are also worth mentioning. The work of Yıldız (2011), even though it is not specific to Kadro journal, adds a great deal of new information to the literature about the intellectual history of Burhan Asaf Belge who is an prominent Kadroist. None the less, it can be seen that he couldn't overcome the prejudices which state that Kadro journal produced the ideology of Kemalism and Kadroists ruptured from the communist movement as a result of the pressures of Socialist International. On other respects, the work of Gürpınar (2013) is incapable of comprehending the historical specificity of Kadroism as it separates Kadroism and Kemalism because he grounds his critics on Kemalism and elitism concept as well as it generally consists of the understanding of the significance and efficacy of the Kadro journal in the political conjuncture (Gürpınar, 2013: 96).

[2] In this context, it is also necessary to mention the following articles: Sadiq (1986), Demirci (2006), Kaya and Yücer (2018), Esen and Akbal (2024).

Another important title of the literature that I reviewed under political history discipline constitutes the researches about the Kadro journal in media history of Turkey. Firstly, the pioneering article of Alemdar (1978) in this field is to be mentioned. Although limited, there are recent studies on the subject that the works of Fırat (2007), Atılgan (2008) and Ertan (2010) are also worth referring. While data from comparative media history are of great importance to our study, the general lack of a fundamental political-economy perspective in these studies makes interpreting the data difficult. Finally, it is necessary to mention the findings on the condition of media after the Alphabet Reform and its position in the political sphere stated by Ayhan (2009) who examines the general media history of that period. In order to better comprehend the significance of Kadro journal in the media history early republic, the studies of Gümüşoğlu (2005), Oral (2006) and Çınar (2013) taken from the journals published in the same period are also taken into consideration.

It is important to note a series of works written in the disciple of political history and constitute the reference sources of Kadro literature. These works written in monography genre generally mention the publishing course of Kadro journal and summaries of the ideas from a non-critical point of view. To begin with, the works of Tekeli and İlkin (1984) and Ertan (1994) are to be mentioned in terms of their extent and importance. In the article of Tekeli and İlkin (1984: 454) Kadro journal is examined with content analysis method and the focus is the founding point of their highbrow identities within the context of the elites of the society. The writers support this position with a wider data in their works entitled as *Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadroculari ve Kadro'yu Anlamak* (Tekeli and İlkin, 2003).

Generally, the point considered inadequate in this work is classifying the articles in the journal chronologically and attempting a wide summary instead of classifying them according to their political meanings and conjunctural developments. This situation diminishes the work to a descriptive search level with the lack of the theoretical arguments. It is necessary to reorganize the wide historical data so that its political context would be revealed. The other two early dated works in the literature is the article of Sezgin (1978) and the monograpy of Bostancı (1990) about Kadro journal. In this context, it would be necessary to mention the works of Uyar (2012: 306) who examines the Kadro journal in the CHF fractions in 1931–1935 and Beriş (2014: 122) who analyzes it as highbrow radicalism. It is also possible to view the importance of the article of Uyar (1997) in literature as he classifies Kadro movement in terms of differing definitions of Kemalism.

One of the subtitles of the works that constitute the literature on Kadro movement takes part in the intellectual system which is called third-worldism or national-left. In these sources Kadro movement is analyzed under the concepts of anti-imperialism and the ideal of development. The articles that the Kadro writers composed to firstly assess themselves are considered the earliest examples of this literature. Şevket Süreyya Aydemir's monographies *Tek Adam* (1966) and *İkinci Adam* (2000) in which he examines the thoughts of the Kadro journal and his articles *Lider ve Demagog* (1997) which were published in Yön journal and *Cumhuriyet* newspaper in 1960's and 1970's set an example to this approach. Additionally, Vedat Nedim Tör's *Yıllar Böyle Geçti* (1976: 125–137), *Kemalizmin Dramı* (1980) which compiles his articles published in various newspapers and journals shows retrospective characteristics in which Kadroists assess themselves. Moreover, Kadro writers mentioned the Kadro Movement in their other works such as *Suyu Arayan Adam* (1959: 493), *Zoraki Diplomat* (Karaosmanoğlu, 1955: 22–23) and *Politikada 45 Yıl* (Karaosmanoğlu, 1968: 108–109). Along with these efforts, the fact that Doğan Avcıoğlu who takes place in the literature as an analogue of Kadro movement in 1960's, wrote Kadro simultaneously with is also a significant detail. Avcıoğlu (1996: 450) accuses the Kadroists with accepting the superiority of the state over the people in his critics on Kadro journal.

One of the focal points of the debates on Kemalism and neo-Kemalism in the 1980s was the redefinition of Kemalism through its reinterpretation. While some of the attempts of interpretations adopt a critical attitude in regards to democratisation, the others struggle to place Kemalism in the new political context. The journal Kadro is frequently cited in studies on this subject, and a number of monographs have been written about it. One of the early examples of the literature is Kongar's (1998) study on Turkish revolution. In this work Kongar examines Kadro journal under the category of center-periphery relation. This remark actually just associates the assessments conducted in the terms of development economy and literature of dependency theory of 1970's. The second most important work in this field is the monography written by Merdan Yanardağ (1988) about Kadro journal. This work (the first in its field) analyzed the Kadro movement on the base of a wide economic and political conjuncture and attempted to express the ideological background of the journal. While this work has a very significant place in literature, it associates the ideas in Kadro journal with Sultan Galiyef. There is a fallacy that Şevket Süreyya and Galiyef met in person (Yanardağ, 1988: 179). Ertan (1994: 297) asked about this matter to İsmail Hüsrev in an interview dating

16 November 1991 and took a negative answer. Besides the predictions of Yanardağ (1988: 86) that Mehmet Şevki Yazman was an old TKP member lack historical evidence. The last work written in this concept and qualified as a source work is the monography of Mustafa Türkeş (1999) on Kadro journal. Although the work of Türkeş generally manages to summarize correctly the ideological and political position of Kadro journal; it is incapable of expressing the specific impetus of Kadro journal which he described as "patriotic-leftist development-strategy proposal."[3] The articles by Atılgan (2009) and Kazancı (2009) are continuations of older discussions that take personal histories into account and are included in the literature. Finally, we should also mention two important critical articles by Sunar (2004) and Akar (2016), which criticize the Kadro movement in terms of its organizational aspects, its weakness in the face of class issues, and its elitism.

The last subhead of the literature written on Kadro journal which can be examined under the political history discipline is the critics of the socialist writers on Kadro journal. In this literature the articles and assessments of Dr. Hikmet Kıvılcımlı certainly have the greatest importance. Firstly, Kıvılcımlı sees the Kadroists as renegades. He defends the idea that Kadro journal was organized to support the bourgeoisie ideology (2007b: 138; 2008: 81–2) and deceive the masses in the society becoming more and more radicalized (1978: 79) and had a fascist ideology (1936: 31) garnished with local motifs. These allegations, which contain rather harsh language, should naturally be evaluated in light of the fact that the Kadroists originated from the TKP (Turkish Communist Party) and that Kıvılcımlı was actively involved in this organization as a member of the central committee. Since Kıvılcımlı's works do not contain a clear analysis of the Kadro, they can only be considered as the views of an old friend from a shared struggle. Kerim Sadi (Ahmet Nevzat Cerrahoğlu) who was also from the same left-wing ideology published a booklet (1934) about critics on Kadroist Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. Also Nesimi (1977: 148); criticized Kadro journal from the point of originality, that he asserted that Kadroist projects such as classless society is not an original idea but it is simply a socialist idea. In the famous book, *Benerci Kendini Niçin Öldürdü?* (Why Did Benerci Killed Himself?, first published in 1932), of Nazım Hikmet who was an old friend of the Kadroists, there are direct critics on Şevket Süreyya (Ran, 2015: 75), also Şevket Süreyya mentioned that the *Benerci* character was symbolizing himself (Göktürk, 1977: 152). The fact that Kadro journal is criticized by socialist writers was going to start again after a generation.

[3]Translation is mine.

Although there is not a wide literature on this field, Taner Timur's *Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası* (Turkish Revolution and After*)* published in 1971 must be stated. Timur (2013: 184) repeats the traditional argument of left-wing critics and mentions that the Kadroists are middle-class highbrows serving Mustafa Kemal. It is useful to state that Metin Çulhaoğlu who is also from the tradition of TKP, has comments on Kadro journal (2007: 433) and an article that he wrote on Şevket Süreyya Aydemir (1998: 92–107), however, it cannot be argued that he developed an entirely new critique.

The third part will discuss the literature examining the Kadro movement within the framework of economic history and political economy disciplines. Kadro journal is placed under the title of development economy in the literature of economical history and theory. It is examined as a part of current debates and some writers attribute Kadro movement a determinant role in étatism in order to comprehend the étatist politics in 1930's (Kazgan, 2002: 60). The work of Tekeli and İlkin acts according to the general left-wing perception and examines the Kadro movement under the category of petty-bourgeois movements (1982: 80), and categorizes it in the circle of İsmet İnönü in the conflict between two powerful groups in government who has adverse interpretations of étatism (1982: 81).

On the other hand, Boratav (2006: 215) claims that there are significant differences in opinion between Kadroists and the formal world-view of Kemalism. In keeping with the general trend in the literature, Boratav (2006: 217–18) evaluates the Kadroists as representatives of petty-bourgeois radicalism. Trak (1985: 94) on the other hand, expresses his findings verifying the difference between the ideas of Kadro journal and formal Kemalist arguments; Kadroist arguments are interpreted more extremely than the similar arguments in developmental literature. İnsel (1996: 180) classifies the Kadroists as a group who "attempt to present a doctrinal contribution to the formal étatism conception in line with third-world socialism."[4] İnsel (1996: 180) in a conflict with his own opinions, characterizes the discourses that Kadroists describe as radical étatist as the discourses under the influence of fascism and National Socialism. Başkaya (1986: 121) comments that Kadro movement compelled the historical laws; however, it ignored the pragmatic characteristic in the formation of étatism. Another significant work as a reference source on the Kadroism in the literature is Gülalp's *Kalkınma Stratejileri ve Kalkınma İdeolojileri* (Development Strategies and Development Ideologies). In this work Güralp compares the idea of Kadro journal with the development and

[4]Translation is mine.

dependency theories emerged in Latin America. Gülalp (1987: 88) examines the Kadro movement within the framework of a center-periphery model, far removed from formal perspectives, and interprets it as the first idea that formed the basis of anti-imperialist-based intellectual-bureaucratic government concepts in Turkish political history (1987: 89).[5]

[5]Also see: Oksaçan (2016), Kurtuluş Şimşek and Berberoğlu (2026).

CHAPTER 2

The Early Period of the Kadro Movement: Self-manifestation and Ideological Dissertation Stage Between January 1932-August 1932

2.1 Preliminary Considerations

For an examination of the political practice of Kadro Journal in its historical context, one must first define the significant phases of the mentioned practice based on the historical milestones. First of all, the course of publishing activities of Kadro Journal is divided into four periods. The first period includes the eight-month period between the publication of the first issue of Kadro Journal on January 23, 1932 till the eight issue in August, 1932.

The reason of such a classification is the historical importance of the new political phase commencing on the ninth issue in September, 1932 which coincided with Celal Bayar replacing Mustafa Şeref Bey as the Minister of Economy (Karaosmanoğlu, 1968: 120). No sooner than that mentioned date above, Esat (Sagay) Bey was replaced by Dr. Reşit Galip (Karaosmanoğlu, 1968: 132) in the Ministry of Education. Due to the impact of these two personalities and the new political phase on the political strategy of Kadro group, the second chapter will begin with the issue of September, 1932.

This period started by the most famous Kadro argument as such constituting an ideological content for the Kemalism (Şişmanov, 1990: 135; Tanör, 2010: 360) that burdened by Kadro group as an essential mission. In accordance with this mission, after the opening of People's Houses (*Halkevleri*) in 19 February 1932, Kadro group demanded to be assigned in its organization. In this manner, Kadro journal started to discuss agricultural problems in

terms of development and rural modernization, in fact this issues aimed to articulate new Minister of Education, Dr. Reşit Galip, who took an important role (Üstel, 2010: 335; Ağaoğlu, 1969: 149) in the abolishment of the Turkish Hearths (*Türk Ocakları* and constitution of People's Houses as the reframed substitute for the preceding organization. Their emphasis on rural development ornamented by *köycülük* (pro-peasant populism) emphasizes, after giving a citation from Dr. Reşit Galip's speech at the opening ceremony of People's Houses. This period mentioned above, became prolifed after the Turco-Soviet Commercial Treaty in April 1933 (Tekeli and İlkin, 1982: 222) that industrialization and development with central planning arguments get involved in issues. After the Prime Minister İsmet Pasha's USSR (Tekeli and İlkin, 1982: 138) and Italy journeys (Tekeli and İlkin, 1982: 142), Kadro journal started to discuss central planning by referring Werner Sombart's works. After the arrival of Soviet industrial specialist committee in Turkey, more avangard themes such as nationalization of the external trade and planned industrialization defended by Kadro journal become increase in number. In addition to that, Kadro journal get involved directly in the actual political struggles by publishing articles against the *Dârülfünûn* and its scholars. Before this point, it can be asserted that all political advances were developed on the behalf Kadro movement's étatist vision. Thus, Kadro group had not involved in any polemical debate in media and although their article on "Üç Yüzük Hikayesi" (the tale of the three rings) provoked the Recep Peker's anger (Karaosmanoğlu, 1968: 111–112), their objective position in political context could be mentioned as a rising trend. The inflection point of this rising trend will be mentioned as the Celal Bayar's appointment to the Ministry of Economy, that will be handled in the second chapter.

2.2 Kadro Movement and Its Self-Definitive Dissertations

The aspect of the first eight issues of Kadro Journal that will be mentioned in this chapter is that they deal with the premises that demonstrate their own tendencies and the political context on the most general level, and that they establish the basis of these through the interpretation of the political and economic advancements in the world. Based on this, sections were also developing within the journal that generally discussed the state's role in industry and agriculture, but still offered carefully formulated and sound recommendations.

The arguments on the level of general theses focus on the development of the agricultural production technique, organization of production and the role of the state in this new étatist organization, as well as the production cost of the goods in this sense and the opportunity to compete in the world markets. Furthermore, the matters such as the improvement of the exchange of rural goods, the way that the surplus value is exerted, industry-agriculture relations and agricultural organization and the qualifications of the expert staff of this organization are included on this consideration level. As for the issue on feudalism and the reformation of the feudal social structure, it is included in the journal as a result of the draft of the Settlement Law dated March, 2 of 1932 (Üngör, 2012: 150).

On the substantial level, the production of tobacco, opium and grapes and the state of these raw materials on the world economic conjuncture is examined and solution suggestions are put forward accordingly. In these first issues of the journal, in terms of quantity, agricultural issues are more prominent than the industrial issues. However, it can be observed that following İsmet Pasha's trip to the Soviet Union on April 25 – May 10, 1932, the number of the articles about industry increase and their political content become more avant-garde. In the first eight issues of Kadro Journal, a significant proportion of the content is dedicated to polemics as is the case for the following issues. As much as the intellectual criticism on the general level, individual people and works become the subject matter in quite a selective-strategic way, as well. The Journal with its tough and interesting tone on the polemic levels keeps people constantly interest and conducts political activities.

In this chapter, the self-image of the journal and the mission that it undertakes will be handled. The journal sets certain tasks to which it feels obliged, above all of which was theorising the revolution and nurturing the enthusiasm of revolution and assumes those tasks for the sake of Turkish Revolution. First, one must look at the context in which Kadro Journal situates itself. The journal deals with the phase of the Turkish Revolution based on an economic context;

(…) the elimination of notions such as capitulations –Ottoman Public Debt Administration-, exclusion from custom duties in the Turkish soils are not less important or significant than the abolishment of Sultanate, Ottoman code of civil law, fez and Arabic alphabet from the Turkish society. Without prejudice to the importance of the latter, it can even be argued that the significance and extent of the former is broader. The repeal of capitulations, the abolishment of the Ottoman Public Debt Administration and the recovering the sovereignty

on customs are the victory for the battle between foreign states concerning the new Turkish state.[1]

Thus, Kadro Journal prioritizes the economic context over the superstructure reforms that will form the factual basis of Kemalist principles. This proves that the journal has some specific characteristics lead by specific political aims which go beyond a simple ideology building and dissemination functions. In the rest of the paragraph, Vedat Nedim enlists the tasks for the Turkish Revolution as follows;

In this case, the realization of the economic principles of our revolution naturally provoked a confrontation with our foreign enemies. As for the realization of the social principles of our revolution, they caused a clash with our domestic enemies. Therefore, we need to be cautious and fierce against interior obscurantism in order to sustain and deepen the political victories, as much as we need to be armed, prepared and hyper vigilant against foreign obscurantism in order to have fruitful results from economic victories.[2]

We shall look further into the internal and external enemy concept of Vedat Nedim in the following pages. The insistence of the journal to include the Turkish Revolution in such an antagonism comes as a common space where it establishes its attempt to both connect with the administrative staff and to form a mission for itself. As it will be elaborated in the following parts, since it brings along the logic of historical obligation this perception that is based on the international conflicts are considered dangerous by the dominant classes that are aware of the specific interests. Kadro Journal identified the internal enemy based on these conflicts and set off to create polemics.

The identification of the foreign enemy can be observed in the texts where Turkey and world economy were connected. For instance, Vedat Nedim states that; "We heard the distinct tone of foreign obscurantism in the presentation of the president of the administrative assembly concerning Turkey at the general assembly session of the Ottoman Bank gathered in London!"[3] The head article of the seventh issue is dedicated to the identification of the foreign enemy and the determination of the path to fight it:

---

[1]Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 1 (January 1932): 8. All of these and subsequent direct quotes from the Kadro journal have been translated into English.

[2]Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 1 (January 1932): 8.

[3]Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 1 (January 1932): 8.

They take notice of the secret of the exploitation mechanism of the western colonialist civilizations in its liberal and individual economic order. Hence, the nation begins the narrative of its epic journey of its economic struggle and independence through accepting the control of the étatist economy which always with a single enforcement and a single opinion manages and dispatches in compliance with the advanced interests of the nation, and in their conflicts with that system, they decided to break free from their semi-colonial status and transition to a modern national economy based on raw materials, industry, and domestic capital.[4]

Şevket Süreyya, in his article which consisted of excerpts from his article in the eight issue of the journal dated August, 1932 and quotations from *İnkılap ve Kadro* (Revolution and Cadre) booklet published on the same month, summarizes the principles of the financial operation that will be conducted against the external enemy. The interesting element in this article is the focus on need for an active position for the economic endeavor simultaneously with the Soviet Industry Assembly which came to Turkey on August 12, 1932 and spent two months for research and study. Thus, it can be argued that the publishing of *İnkılap ve Kadro* booklet in the same month goes beyond a mere coincidence. As it will be discussed further in the following parts, this active positioning and the detection of the requirement of a avant-garde cadre correspond to each other.

In his aforementioned article, Şevket Süreyya deals with the issue of taking an active position as follows:

Because of their historical characteristics, national independence movements are not negative and reactionary attempts that aim to disrupt the economic union of the world and to cause regression of the elements of world economy by trapping them into their own small shells. (…) this autarchy, (…) these states' perpetual self-exclusion from the rest of the world does not mean their divergence from international economic affairs. On the contrary, the course of the national independence actions aims that the national economic devices of the colonized and semi-colonized states along with states that are economic subjects participate in the international goods exchange as new economic units that are improved as much as possible and thus, form a more rational world union.[5]

[4] Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 7 (July 1932): 3.

[5] Şevket Süreyya, "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin Ana Prensipleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 6–7.

As a result, Şevket Süreyya reflects on the general traits and mission of the national independence movement to which Kadro movement acts as a representative, as follows:

A national independence movement is not particularly political or particularly legal. This movement is an act of 'rebirth and re-foundation' which includes the financial and political independence of the nation, a state system depending on this independence and all the ideological elements of this system.[6]

The connection dimension of the foundation phenomenon, which is reformed with the outside world, will be discussed in the following parts of the study. In the quotation above, the emphasis on the phrase including all the ideological elements of the new state system can be observed. In order to politically interpret this phrase, another quotation from a different source is required. In the head article of the fourth issue of Kadro Journal there is a premise of this phrase from such an earlier date. In the article it is stated that "(…) the ideology of a society is the explanation and expression of technical and social conditions under which that society exists according to certain principles and within the developmental course thereof."[7]

In this statement the important aspect is that ideology would be conducted in a way that technical and social conditions can develop consistently. Therefore, a certain combination of ideology and practice must be underlined. Because the matter here is a vision for the future and not a simple reflection of the basic daily needs. Thus, it can be deduced that Kadro Journal costituting the ideology of revolution yet it also includes the practical suggestions for new things to be done. Hence, the ideological focal point of Kadro Journal must be determined: the analysis of the already present material followed by forming their ideology is not the case at all. The ideology in question is of the things to be done in the future and the point to which the system is hoped to reach; ultimately, the big question is about political vision, not simply legitimation of the regime. This situation obliges Kadro Journal to handle its actions as political practices on their own. Even in the head article of the first issue this opinion is clearly expressed:

The will and interest of the revolution are submitted to the few yet conscious avant-garde who feel and carry out the revolution and the will of the minority yet advanced Kadro. This group builds its awareness around the principles that

[6]Şevket Süreyya, "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin Ana Prensipleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 10.

[7]Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 4.

are deducted from the reality of revolution and are shaped and theorized as it's explained in accordance with its course. The deepening of the revolution means, above all, the transfer from advanced Kadro these principles and the revolution ethics and discipline as an expression of the former to the younger generations, urban population and peasants and their consequent adoption by the said people.[8]

In another paragraph touching upon the course of national independence movements, it can be seen that the political practice becomes such a fierce obligation since it seeks to reform the present classes. In the text pointed, concerning the colonized and semi-colonized states, it's argued as follows:

In these states as well, the remnants of the medieval classes persist as debris while in the capitalist societies they continue to exist as germs. However, as long as the national independence movements pursue a development path in accordance with their own objective qualities and course, mentined debris is bound to be rectified on its own while the germs vanish by themselves.[9]

2.3 Kadro Movement on Class Structure and Social Formation

In this context, the issue of classes must be brought up. In the second issue of Kadro Journal following the references to the class relations and the form that they will take in the future. Particularly concerning the first eight issues, it can be argued that critical evaluations which point out the exceptions and are quite mild till the USSR trip of İsmet Pasha, become a broader and more consistent opposition after the trip. The first critique in the magazine was directed at social classes engaged in small-scale trade or craftsmanship, who had become relatively vulnerable and powerless in the face of the global economic conjuncture. Vedat Nedim directs his criticism against the group of people whom he describes as follows:

(…) an artisan coterie who constantly desires more patronage and products which can barely compete against the exported goods with added customs duties and possesses all the defects of the obsolete and primitive technique both on production, and administration and sale fields. In the trade: the small

[8]Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 1 (July 1932): 3. It is important to note the double meaning of the word *Kadro* in this quote. This word refers both to a group of technically competent, visionary, and dedicated managerial cadre required for the execution of a specific task, and – to the same effect – to the circle around the Kadro journal.

[9]Şevket Süreyya, "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin Ana Prensipleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 9.

scale trader mentality which keeps regressing facing the foreign competition is against every modern trade method and supports every prohibition.[10]

He explains that these groups do not have the chance of surviving in the following words:

If we cannot conduct our own national economy in the circulation of goods because of the material of goods that cannot keep up with the competition conditions and the primitive technique, we must endure being a subordinated and underdeveloped economy forever. Especially during the circulation of goods: since during this circulation, each country would want to exchange its national goods with the best yet the cheapest goods. Only the best organized states could be involved in this exchange. And it would no longer be the individuals yet the organizations which face each other.[11]

The cautious tone of the assessments above is interrupted by a comment that eliminates exceptions with intentions of avoiding directly or entirely contradicting a group of the society. Vedat Nedim expresses this tactical retreat as follows; "I mean no offense to anyone. There might and will be exceptions. (…) There are obviously no deliberate malice causing this situation. Objective events had led to these consequences."[12]

Three months after the mentioned retreat of Vedat Nedim, after the USSR trip of İsmet Pasha, he would change tactics from retreating position to forward action position and he will begin to direct harsh criticism against the commercial bourgeoisie by openly naming names as well. This clear act of opposition occurs in the form the following words on the general level:

The last fortress of liberalism in the trade world has collapsed. (…) The creature called trader is now standing like a lion trapped in a cage; hanging behind the caution bars built around it and longs for the freedom of the past. It is certain that the lion behind iron bars shall never see the horizons of the desert. Yet the representatives of the free trade still hope for the revival of the past.[13]

Vedat Nedim continues with the same opposition in his criticism specific to Turkey and targets the fractions of bourgeoisie in charge of the foreign trade;

[10]Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 14.

[11]Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 14.

[12]Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 14.

[13]Vedat Nedim, "Değişen Cihan Münasebetleri İçinde Türkiye," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 5 (May 1932): 13.

The exporting traders in Turkey are the most irresponsible and privileged in the world! There is no one like anywhere else. They act as if they do not have to answer to any authority. Yet the reputation and honor of the export commodity and the faith of the balance of our trade is left on their hands. Isn't it a bit bizarre that in a country where even the President is bound by certain responsibilities, the exportation traders do as they wish without a care?[14]

The Journal attempts to dwell on the question of class conflicts, which it bases on the international economic and political conjuncture, within the context of its other aspect in the domestic politics and nationalism rhetoric. The individual legitimization of the class interests is questioned on a nationalist basis. In one of his articles Şevket Süreyya clearly explains the situation as follows;

(…) there can be no place for collaboration/compradors in the national struggle. This goal cannot be achieved through passive alliances, politically symbolic gestures, or street or diplomatic displays. The national independence can only be acquired through an independence war. (…) National independence movements aim for the independence of the nation as a whole nation. In order not only to gain the independence but also to guard and sustain it, this cause cannot contain any principles favoring individuals, coteries or classes, which can harm the unity of the nation.[15]

Also in the Kadro Journal article of Burhan Asaf's article dated July 1932, with reference to the disputes in the assembly, the dichotomy of personal gain and public interest are attempted to overcome in favor of the latter taking the national struggle into consideration. In the article Burhan Asaf defends this position as follows;

In the national assembly of Turkey, which leads the national struggle, people raise their voices as follows: In a situation where public interests are of concern, we do not recognize such a thing as the right of personal gain! Considering what it entails for Turkey to reach the level of a truly machinated civilization with an advanced technique, one can estimate the importance paid to the right of personal gain compared to the public interests.[16]

There are three points where all these arguments focalize; first concerns the Kemalist premise that Turkish society is without class struggle; second is the

[14]Vedat Nedim, "Değişen Cihan Münasebetleri İçinde Türkiye," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 5 (May 1932): 13.

[15]Şevket Süreyya, "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin Ana Prensipleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 11.

[16]Burhan Asaf, "Makine Medeniyeti," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 7 (July 1932): 30.

role and importance of the state in this social formation; third is the inevitable faith of the opponents of this new social order. First, let's take a look at how the matter of prevention of the development of class struggle appear in this section of Kadro Journal: in the head article of the seventh issue, the following initial assessments concerning the new social formation are presented: "(…) The Turkish Nation, who rejects the class cause by preventing the creation of classes in the first place, lays the foundations of an advanced social order with these actions."[17] Secondly, one must examine the role of the state in the process of the foundation and reproduction of this social order; In the words of Burhan Asaf;

Since Turkish Nation began its revolution with a society that did not form classes, it shall decline the creation of classes and will take measures to make such a creation impossible and complicate and deepend these measures even further by the day. The assignment of more means of production to the state, which can be considered the acceptance of an advanced and devised étatism, is a result of this previous statement.[18]

Finally, we shall present a quote concerning the opponents of this new order:

There might be those who fail to see how this works. Even condemning them is a waste of breath. Those who always face the enthusiastic and joyful atmosphere of our complicated and deepened revolution as alien and useless elements will be eliminated like crumbs or foam from the will of the nation which is in the process of being created, because those are the elements belonging to the debris of the community that we abandoned and moved away from.[19]

This consideration can be often found in the polemics with the scholars of *Dârülfünûn* and various intellectuals in Kadro Journal.

2.4 Kadro Movement on Economic Planning and the Form of State

One of the most important elements of a new social formation -or it can even be argued that it is the most important without any exceptions- is the state apperatus. The method of how the state apperatus will be restructured and how it will be made functional again in the context of the Kadro project is discussed at length in numerous ways in general, concretely and in the way that it is settled through polemics. The function of the state device gains

[17] Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 7 (July 1932): 4.

[18] Burhan Asaf, "Faşizm ve Türk Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 38.

[19] Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 7 (July 1932): 4.

importance in terms of planned industrialization and planned organization of the agricultural production. First, one must find out how the new roles that the state will assume will be categorically made possible in Kadro Journal. The already existing roles of the state are enlisted as follows by Vedat Nedim in his article concerning the matter;

The task of defense of the country against enemies is on the state level. (…) Thus, during the task of defense of the country the regulating and ruling role of the state is an axiom without a discussion. The regulation of the legal matters is also on the state level. (…) no one can think of an order where individuals are left to solve their own legal disputes. Education activities are on the state level, as well. (…) One can only scoff at the thought of each individual educating themselves; opening schools at their own will and enforce the curriculum that they wish.[20]

Since the terms and ruler used in the paragraph above would be repeated later in terms of the economic role of the state, the analogy of the chain of command in the army is crucial as the terms of defense economy and general staff of finance would be connected to this perception. Another important term used here is the "on the state level." This term is pronounced as an active and actionist term that does not simply refer to the implementation of certain functions by the state, but the monopolization or the take-over by the state. By making it seem as if the individual activities conflict with this position, it reaches the Archimedes point of the transition to étatism. In an article by Vedat Nedim, it is stated that;

(…) if the plan notion does not expand through the financial life, it will take a halt. Our current financial struggle, much like a military mobilization, requires the dispatching and managing of all material and moral strength and abilities of the nation under a certain plan and preparation.[21]

This point implies that the state should take control of all large-scale businesses and have the right to make autonomous decisions regarding all economic activities. Since the realization of this idea within the daily class conjuncture seems impossible, Kadro published articles discussing this idea, as well as articles that would not disturb the petty bourgeoisie and peasants by guaranteeing the security of their small estates. For example, in Vedat Nedim's

[20]Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 10.

[21]Vedat Nedim, "Niçin ve Nasıl Sanayileşmemiz Lazım?," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 18.

review of *Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus* by Werner Sombart there is a large scale planned finance definition with the words of Sombart;

Sombart establishes the fundamental qualities of the planned finance as follows: The first quality of the planned finance is receptiveness (Umfassenheit) and integrity (Totalitaeet). Hence, the plan must receive all the segments of financial life and integrate them within itself.[22]

As a response to this article, Şevket Süreyya, puts forward a plan definition that will not distress the small property owners and, bases his definition on the work of Sombart, as well. Şevket Süreyya paraphrases the planning argument of Sombart as so;

Planned finance system can only be a finance system of the nation. Yet this system, does not integrate all the financial elements and the entirety of the financial activities. He sees no point in national finance plan to include the small industry which brought no benefits as a result of its being regulated within the national financial system, individual agriculture initiatives, disorderly tradesmen and manufacturers, and even broader trade and industry initiatives which did not contradict the course of national finance. Therefore, within a planned finance regime self-conducted countryside trade and handicraftsman can freely exist alongside the large scale production and exchange branches included in the plan.[23]

Kadro Journal repeats an opinion parallel to its own like TKP's as a paraphrase of Sombart; the emphasis is the manifestation of the class question that will be a matter of alliance in order to realize the planned community order. Not causing distress to the small scale industry, agricultural initiatives at retail, disorderly tradesman, and petty bourgeoisie, i.e., the manufacturer and their integration to the system as they are, becomes more of an important issue. In its later articles, it is observed that Kadro attributes an organizing role to the state concerning the group listed above. It is intriguing yet again that there is another reference to Sombart in this statement. Kadro Journal often makes references to foreign authors in order to legitimize the opinions defended in the journal. Sombart seems to have another important merit apart from setting a worldwide example about planning: His finance book is a part of the literature of courses of Şevket Süreyya and İsmail Hüsrev in KUVT (Communist University of the Toilers of the East) and he is an academic who is considered to be an authority even for Soviet planning (Ertan; 1994: 297). In another planning related article

[22]Vedat Nedim, "(Kadro)yu teyit eden bir eser: Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus. Werner Sombart," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 5 (May 1932): 37.

[23]Şevket Süreyya, "Plan mefhumu Hakkında," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 5 (May 1932): 9.

published three issues after the one above, Vedat Nedim repeats the arguments of Sombart and broadens the activity field of étatism;

Étatism is an integrity which tolerates no disintegration. Semi-étatism might be more hazardous than liberalism. Those who complain about the state intervention in the financial affairs, desire to incriminate the state. In which field of finance do we witness the full activity of étatism, anyway? Therefore, the endless disorder in both agriculture and industry must be ended immediately and effectively.[24]

The expansion of the scope of étatism encompasses the concrete determination of industrial and agricultural production branches which enter its field of activity and nationalization of credit and foreign trade. This will be further elaborated in the following section of this book. Vedat Nedim expresses these matters as follows;

Since the national economy is a whole, it is not possible that only the industrial part of it is integrated while the rest is left unattended. The industry issue is also a raw material issue. For instance, in our country the development of cotton industry is dependent on the development of cotton production. Textile industry based on wool and leather industry are closely related to the livestock conditions. That's why, the industrial policies have to be based on a raw material policy. The industrial plan will naturally necessitate an agricultural plan.[25]

In addition,

We are in need of a regulatory policy in the field of credits and the centralized control of them regardless of their sources. Maybe not the centralized credit but the initial centralized control must be the principle of our policy.[26]

As it can be clearly deduced from this quotation, Vedat Nedim, attempts to create a position for étatism in the field of credits as well. Thus, industrial policy becomes integrated with state control in the agricultural, livestock, and banking sectors.

[24]Vedat Nedim, "Mefhum Teşkilatı Değil Madde Teşkilatı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 16.

[25]Vedat Nedim, "Niçin ve Nasıl Sanayileşmemiz Lazım?," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 18.

[26]Vedat Nedim, "Mefhum Teşkilatı Değil Madde Teşkilatı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 16.

2.5 Kadro on Industrialization

The first important attempt of Kadro Journal related to industrialization appears on the third issue of the journal dated March, 1932 when Dr. Reşit Galip -Ağaoğlu called him as "Our Saint Juste" (1969: 141)- re-emerges as an important political figure and makes a speech in the inauguration of the People's Houses (*Halkevleri*). The important role that Dr. Reşit Galip undertook concerning the dissolution of the *Türk Ocakları* (Turkish Hearts), his political responsibility in the transition and reforming of the *Dârülfünûn* into Istanbul University and his participation in *Halka Doğru* (Towards the People) movement and peasantry-based populism, made him an ally for Kadroist group (Eliçin, 1970: 364). The collaborative work of Şevket Süreyya and İsmail Hüsrev with Dr. Reşit Galip is also worth mentioning (Aydemir, 2000b: 377–378) in this context.

There are two arguments that Kadro conjointly develops so on to rise the issue of industrialization as a headline in the political agenda. The first of those arguments is that the industry in the metropolitan capitalist countries dissolved due to the worldwide economic crisis became dysfunctional, and that it can therefore be imported and managed if done quickly. Another side argument that supports the previous is that the conjuncture is on its most convenient state. The second argument claims that the current relations of production and social classes can never manage the industrialization. This argument is followed by the criticism of the liberalism of the 1920s and the failure of class-based society at the same time period. Again, the production and capital structures of the existing classes along with their logic of entrepreneurship are associated with the second argument. The first argument can be found in Vedat Nedim's article in the third issue of the journal;

In summary, the capital and means of production in industrialized big countries seek safe and hidden markets to emigrate or take refuge in while denying their nationalities. These low-technique markets surrounded by independent customs walls, yet offer high rent for advanced technique, can only be the new states which are in the course their national independence movement.[27]

In the rest of the article, Vedat Nedim asserts his comment on the availability of the conjuncture and how to benefit from it;

Without any capitulations or privileges, dodging the national purpose and combinations, the international conditions are at their most convenient for

[27] Vedat Nedim, "Tabiata Tehakküm," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 23.

bringing as much industrial infrastructure material as we wish to our country, on the condition that its costs are reimbursed in an allocated time and the management and capital rights would be directly given to the state after the indicated time period.[28]

The second argument can be again illustrated by an article of Vedat Nedim in the fifth issue of the journal. Vedat Nedim states that;

(…) who is going to be the active carrier of politics? Entrepreneurs? Will the entrepreneurs start a structural revolution in the Turkish economy? If we leave the management of this grand affair to entrepreneurs, we will have to consent to waiting for the painstakingly slow improvement of the small-scale tradesmen who lack advanced technique and expertise or the exploitation of our domestic market by non-national actors. Of course we do not intend to wait for long years or to be exploited.[29]

Parallel to this argument, Ismail Husrev raises another debate concerning the fate of small-scale producers. It can be seen that these avant-garde theses are based on the opportunity of buying means of production in exchange of goods, which is adopted following the Turkish-Russian Trade agreement, and that their frame of economic planning is extended towards small scale production based on this opportunity. According to Hüsrev;

What can be the role of manufacture in the national independence movements which aim to establish a modern and large technology, make sure that the national economy is planned thoroughly and create non-contradictory social relations on this high and modern technology? Manufacture is the legacy of the medieval and traditional modes of production whereas the modern society replaces the traditional mode of production with the rational production technology. Two positions against manufacture can be observed based on these differences:

1-Either the manufacture along with the small scale tradesmen organizations (cooperatives etc.) is adapted to the rational rules of the modern economy order,

2-Or the existence of the middle age customs is reformed by a revolutionary movement which would establish a large-scale modern technology. This rectification would mean the end of the agancies who benefit from the assets created by manufacture and real estate industry.[30]

[28]Vedat Nedim, "Tabiata Tehakküm," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 24.

[29]Vedat Nedim, "Değişen Cihan Münasebetleri İçinde Türkiye," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 5 (May 1932): 15.

[30]İsmail Hüsrev, "Türkiye'de El Sanayii," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 5 (May 1932): 24.

Lastly, let's take a look at Kadro Journal's views on the industrialization steps taken by the government as of June, 1932. As mentioned before, the allegations that the journal is a simple ideology journal in the literature or that it's the defender of the government policies on the media are proven wrong once again in the upcoming quotation since the Journal apparently is not as content of the étatism actions as it seems and it demands that these actions are developed in compliance with the Kadro group's plan. According to Vedat Nedim; "The industry incentive, state-mandated customs and quota policy emerged as measures feeding the industrialization movement which started in our country."[31] Vedat Nedim continues to make an assessment as follows;

We must openly confess that our industry policy is completely liberal despite all of these protective and controlling measures. Because of the industrial incentive law, the customs borders and the recent importation restrictions the role of the state barely mandates the individual entrepreneurship. (…) initiatives such as the foundation of an industry office and determination of an industry plan are the forerunners of a new path. However, these lack the mentality that considers entrepreneurship as a part of the national economy. (…) Both the industry office and the industry plan are for the state budget. Private initiatives are once again excluded from the office and the plan. (…) Nevertheless, it is evident that we need a general industry plan, which also includes private initiatives, in order for our national industry to eliminate the current anarchical state and get into a steady condition.[32]

2.6 Kadro on Relations and Reorganization of the Agricultural Production

In this part, the analysis of the agricultural production in the first eight issues of Kadro Journal will be presented and discussed. Regarding the matter, two different argument series that advance parallel to each other can be observed; the first deals with the general condition of the agricultural production and ways to improve it while the second assumes a dimension oriented towards agricultural relations of production and the general state of the rural classes and their reformation in terms of their social existence. As expected, Kadro initially approaches the agricultural production quite circumspectly. The general emphasis is put on the amelioration of the deteriorating state of agricultural

[31] Vedat Nedim, "Niçin ve Nasıl Sanayileşmemiz Lazım?," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 16.

[32] Vedat Nedim, "Niçin ve Nasıl Sanayileşmemiz Lazım?," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 16–17.

products, which became international trade good in the world economy. In this sense, it is recommended to keep the increase in competition opportunities of the products. The arguments which exist in a general dimension up until this point will turn into systematic and concrete suggestions which vary in the broad range from the distribution affairs to goods of the agricultural production units, or from production technique to external sales organization.

At first, let's have a look at the arguments of the journal regarding the place of the regions of agricultural production connected to the exportation within the world economy. In the articles featured in the journal, Turkey losing its monopoly over the agricultural products in which it specialized and the constant decrease in its market share is discussed as follows;

If Turkey still had the monopoly over angora wool, it definitely would not be in this pathetic state, today. If the Aegean region were still the only name for raisins, without California, Australia, Greece or Iran to compete with, we would have nothing to worry about. We would not have so many suspicions if the farming secret of tobacco was not revealed and many countries started to produce it.[33]

As a result, we see a picture of the agriculture where it loses its monopoly over certain products and whose position in the international market deteriorates. According to Vedat Nedim;

The production problem of the Turkish agricultural goods appears due to the natural monopolies losing their importance and traditional agriculture being replaced by the rational and scientific agriculture. Claiming that the problem of the day was a mere result of the crisis would mean that the main issue is completely ignored. If the crisis did not happen, we would still witness our regression in the world markets. Indeed, if one studies the course of the competition struggle to which our agricultural products were exposed in the world markets before the crisis; they can clearly see the tendency against us.[34]

Secondly, we should mention how the journal evaluates the condition of the agricultural production on the international level;

When even Germany rejects a gradual evolution and stresses the need of a vigorous implementation in order to be able to keep up with countries that are better organized in agricultural production such as the USA, Denmark and the Netherlands, we are appalled by day-dreaming and delusion skills of those who

[33]Vedat Nedim, "Mefhum Teşkilatı Değil Madde Teşkilatı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 14.

[34]Vedat Nedim, "Mefhum Teşkilatı Değil Madde Teşkilatı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 14.

believe that we can resist with medieval agriculture, artisan mentality in trade and trade mechanism with primitive and backward technology.[35]

He states that an economy left to its own devices might be able to maintain its current state without developing, but in the case of agriculture, it will be condemned to high-cost, low-profit, and low-competitive products.[36] İsmail Hüsrev focuses on the organization aspect of the same issue. He argues that agricultural production cannot be expected to develop on its own, and that, similar to the modern factory organization in industrial production, agriculture must also be modernized as soon as possible, requiring a modern form both technically and organizationally.[37]

After dealing with the condition of agricultural production and world agricultural goods market in this manner, Kadro Journal adopts a position for the solution of these problems in Turkish scale and tries to include the organization necessity into the political agenda with all of its aspects. It attempts to move its ostensibly abstract suggestions and discussions on a directly objective basis. The following quotation clearly demonstrates their serious attitude about the matter;

Debasement is an abstract concept. Credit is an abstract concept. Releasing a product is an abstract concept. All of these abstract concepts must be made concrete, characterized and materialized. We cannot deal with these matters separately from the material since there are different production conditions, debasement possibilities, separate credit conditions, different standard and packaging methods and different release courses for each material. We usually tend to make the organization concept abstract and to separate it from the material. However, production is conducted for the material. Organization is not done for the concept. Organization for the material is a field of specialization.[38]

The matter of organization of production is discussed again by Vedat Nedim in a few issues later;

Capital accumulation can be made possible through the decrease in the costs on one hand and on the other hand the increase in the sale prices, that is, the

[35] Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932):13.

[36] Vedat Nedim, "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 13.

[37] İsmail Hüsrev, "Köy İktisadiyatında Teknik İnkılap," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 21.

[38] Vedat Nedim, "Mefhum Teşkilatı Değil Madde Teşkilatı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 15.

augmentation of the amount that the producer earns. The decrease in the costs means that, above all, the backward production technique is replaced by a new one. In Turkish agriculture the advanced technique will not be established on its own but it will be brought from top to bottom.[39]

Secondly, we must mention the arguments regarding the condition of the rural regions and the possible routes that they can take in the future. These series of arguments have two main purposes; the first is the policies with the aim of the reformation/deformation of pre-capitalist classes in the rural regions while the second concerns the policies about the rectification/dissolution of classes composed of trading agents in the regions producing for the market. The uniting point of these two policies is the construct of a production organization based on a modern technique, which includes state involvement as well, and enabling this by keeping this financing in the region where the added value is produced. İsmail Hüsrev makes serious analyses regarding the matter since the second issue of the journal. The matter becomes crucial in quality and is seen more in the journal after the draft law proposed to the assembly titled "Draft of Settlement Law and the Protocol of Transitory Committee of Settlement" dated May 2, 1932 no. I/335 (Üngör, 2012: 150). According to İsmail Hüsrev;

(…) The territory issue must be solved in compliance with the interests of the national revolution by means of first establishing a social basis for a technical revolution in the rural economy, that is to say, dissolution of the feudal system and the backward forms that constitute its variations.[40]

These ideas that İsmail Hürev puts forward as early as the second issue of the journal are regularly handled in the journal in suite of the month of May, as mentioned before. In the June issue of the journal, the article of Şevket Süreyya titled *Derebeyi ve Dersim* (Feudal Lord and Dersim) is followed by I. and II. volumes of *Türkiye'de Derebeylik Rejimi* (Feudalism in Turkey) articles of İsmail Hüsrev in the July and August issues. While the articles of İsmail Hüsrev focus prominently on the historical background of the feudal regime, the articles of Şevket Süreyya passionately asserts the idea of dissolve the feudal system. In his article, Şevket Süreyya states that;

The dissolution of the feudal system is a part of the natural course of Turkish revolution. That is why; Turkish Republic contrary to the Ottoman Empire holds an opposing position against the feudal regime from the very start. (…) The battle of the revolution against the feudal system is a material

[39] Vedat Nedim, "Donan Ziraat Kredilerine Karşı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 7 (July 1932): 12–13.

[40] İsmail Hüsrev, "Köy İktisadiyatında Teknik İnkılap," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 20.

and moral struggle against a medieval and uncivilized institution that threatens the sovereignty and safety of the entire nation.[41]

The obligation of the dissolution of feudalism assigned to the young republic is established in various ways in the journal's pages (for example assuring the revolution, reinforcing the national character of the state, adopting the modern technique, increasing the tax income of the state, putting an end to the bandit activities) in addition to arguments that are the most legitimately voiced in the context of forming market for the industrial production. For instance, in the following quotation this can be observed;

In order for rural areas and industry to become markets for each other, the goods exchange affairs must embrace the entire rural population. However, it must be added that if the relationship of the Turkish producer with the industry is limited to buying export goods, then it is not possible for rural areas to be markets to national industry or vice versa.[42]

This statement is evidently a reference to the tasks of the bourgeoisie revolution against the feudal system. In order for the rural production to develop, the only valid way for Kadro group is that the surplus value in the countryside is systematically returned to the rural areas again by means of investment. This issue is discussed to a large extent in the journal as can be seen in the following excerpt;

In brief, in order to reestablish the villages, the devalued products of the producers must be revalued for them. In order for the Turkish villages to be prosperous, the income and value of the production must be kept in the villages. This can be the only way of establishing a solid basis of the Turkish national economy and of realization of our economic balance and the safety of state finance. Before anything else, the most important task is making a fundamental change, which is based on a framework of planned intervention policy of the state, of the way and habit of the rural regions becoming indebted and the conditions feeding into this situation resulting from the obsolete structure.[43]

At this point, the arguments of Kadro Journal regarding the classes making earnings from usury, which constitutes one of the most fundamental criticisms

[41] Şevket Süreyya, "Derebeyi ve Dersim," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 45.

[42] İsmail Hüsrev, "Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatında Borçlanma Şekilleri," *Kadro*, Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 31.

[43] İsmail Hüsrev, "Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatında Borçlanma Şekilleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 34.

developed by the journal concerning the rural classes, should be mentioned. According to İsmail Hüsrev;

(…) the national capital that must be accumulated in the villages is kept in towns. (…) While the national capital in other countries which are accumulated in cities and towns are invested on industry, trade and other business sectors, in our country it is used in the usury which yields high profit. The surplus values produced in the rural regions come to the towns and cities and are returned to the villages via usury. This cycle which adds up like an avalanche has turned into an economic problem which gradually diminishes the spending capacity and taxpaying potential of the rural producer.[44]

The concrete suggestions put forward by Kadro Journal must also be discussed as a relatively important aspect of Kadro's views on agricultural production. As mentioned above, parallel to its approach to the technical problems of the interlinking with the world economy and the distribution and investment issues caused by class relations, it invents concrete solution suggestions for concrete problems facing the agricultural production.

For example, following the Tobacco Congress gathered in Ankara, the Journal deals with the tobacco topic and comes up with solid solution suggestions in suite of its analysis about the matter. In an article found in the chronicles section of the journal's second issue, at first the ranking of Turkey within the world scale tobacco production is discussed and the following analysis is made;

The price of the Greek tobacco soared to 103 cents in 1929! (…) The Greek tobacco exported to Germany from Greece has risen by 60% in quantity and %160 price-wise in 1930 compared to 1929! We recommend looking at these documents to those who still try to explain the dreary disorderly state of the Turkish tobacco producers with the 'There is a worldwide crisis' cliché![45]

After the analysis quoted above, Şevket Süreyya takes an opposing position against the commercial bourgeoisie whose state is expected to deteriorate further and generally recommends the étatist solution. In his own words;

It is apparent that we would never leave a remarkably important finance branch such as Turkish tobacco to the leisure and whims of this and that. Those who wish to scavenge on the daily aid from the state, who hinder that the task is managed as a whole, or who adopt a favorable position for actions such

[44]İsmail Hüsrev, "Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatında Toprak Rantı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 14.

[45]Şevket Süreyya, "Türk Tütüncülüğü ve İktisadi Devletçilik," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 44.

as production restriction, and the shrinking and fragmentation of production affairs must be warned and illuminated.[46]

For the rest of the article, Şevket Süreyya returns to the duality of individualism and state, and concludes his argument with the criticism towards the individual initiatives and state organization. It should be recalled that the earlier issues of the Journal aim to legitimize the state involvement and intervention even though the concrete characteristics of this role are not still absent in the explanation. Şevket Süreyya continues his argument as asserting that the tobacco industry cannot be improved by the actions of individuals alone; on the contrary, those working in this sector need a general initiative. They need guidance to improve and innovate. Therefore, tobacco production, like other national economic issues, is a matter of state intervention, namely economic étatism.[47]

Another example concerning the discussion of agricultural production and circulation affairs based on concrete examples is the opium. The desire for the control of the League of Nations concerning the opium trade is considered as an important opportunity by Kadroists. The journal translates this argument into establishing the state organization against the freelance opium traders and starts a discussion on this basis. According to Vedat Nedim;

The measures taken by the state which comprehends the seriousness [of the situation] as necessary lead to a fright of those who seek to guard their interests by supporting the disorderly state of opium trade which harms our national economy. (…) When the forward interests of the nation are of concern, in spite of the blurry atmosphere created by those who aim for individual gain, the state which takes the most appropriate measures naturally pursues the path in which it believes without hesitation.[48]

After drawing the framework of the matter on the principle level, Vedat Nedim moves onto his concrete suggestions;

Ending the retail system in exportation by means of supplying Turkish opium from a single source against buyers who form a single opposing group. 2- Keeping the amount of opium to be released to markets restricted through agreements with countries selling goods to European markets. 3- Finding new

[46] Şevket Süreyya, "Türk Tütüncülüğü ve İktisadi Devletçilik," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 45.

[47] Şevket Süreyya, "Türk Tütüncülüğü ve İktisadi Devletçilik," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 2 (February 1932): 45.

[48] Vedat Nedim, "Afyon Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 18.

markets apart from the market in which we have been involved so far and in addition to these.[49]

Another example which illustrates the analysis of agricultural products and market opportunities is the grape. In the eight issue of the Journal the topic is discussed as follows;

The issue that waits to besolved in Turkey is the grape production along with the tobacco and opium production. Similar to our most important export products, grapes encounter sale impossibilities as well. Nevertheless, these entire impossibilities stem from the lack of organization as it is the case for our other products. For instance, while Turkey dominated the market in terms of grapes before the war, today it has lost its dominant position completely. This loss is in terms of both production volume and sale opportunities.[50]

Finally, the 'Village Camps' project put forward by Kadro Journal on the time period studied in this section must be briefly assessed. This idea of Vedat Nedim resembles the Village Institutes idea invented by Ethem Nejat (Erkek, 2012: 164). Interestingly, Vedat Nedim continues to argue this idea of his in the following years under the title of Regional Farm Institutes and similar suggestions will appear in the Turkish politics such as Village Institutes or Village-city Project. It is possible to find the Şevket Süreyya – Vedat Nedim correspondence concerning this issue in Gökberk's book. This issue is discussed in the letter of Şevket Süreyya dated 1.03.1974 to Vedat Nedim (Gökberk, 1977: 201) and Vedat Nedim's letter dated 5.04.1974 to Şevket Süreyya (Gökberk, 1977: 206–7). In his first article Vedat Nedim explains the purpose of the Village Camps as follows;

We must find more radical and larger scale ways to combat illiteracy. For example, can we not mobilize city schools and send them to the villages since they just set camp to the corners of cities in the holiday months; get bored of idleness and piddle around in coffeehouses all day long? They can set the camps in villages and oblige each literate person to teach literacy to an illiterate person. (…) this way, the city kids will get to know our villages and peasants; and the peasants will warm up to the urban youth. This will create a channel between the village and the city. (…) a program that can organize and provide cultural devices with which the villagers are unfamiliar such as stage plays, conferences, plays, training festivals, gramophone, radio, photography and even the cinema will activate the static and backward atmosphere of the villages like a gigantic

[49]Vedat Vedat Nedim, "Afyon Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 22.

[50]Anonymous, "Kronikler: Üzüm meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 44.

engine. (…) In summary the village camps will be the revolution camps.[51]

2.7 Concluding Remarks

This chapter mentiones the first phrase of Kadro journal as it was periodized as between January 1932 – August 1932. In this period, it is summarized that Kadro group composed its self-assertive slogans and burdened their mission in the context of early republican era. The most well-known Kadro agument be proposed in this period as to constitue an ideology for Turkish revolution. Kadro was welcomed warmly in the other media organs that also it can be stated that Kadro journal did not get involved in critical polemics. On the other hand, it is possible to think that the magazine's publications laid the groundwork for such polemics. In particular, it is inconceivable that there would be no opposition to the idea of the entire economic structure being regulated by the state, both as a national duty aimed at industrialization and extended to various branches of agriculture, manufacturing, trade, and finance. Considering all its sub-branches, it is clear that the Kadro group was working on a broad reformation plan encompassing all branches of the economy, which may also include nationalizations. In terms of its abstract principles, this plan can ultimately be considered a form of national socialism.

Firstly, all major sectors are regulated under state authority, certain social groups are eliminated or marginalized, thus preventing the development of social classes, and this plan has been established on a national scale. Developmental ties are established between the proposed economic units, and the ideology of the new structure is defined as nationalism, developed with reference to the war of liberation. This ideology becomes particularly prominent and takes on military connotations when it comes to the dismantling of the social structure in Kurdish regions. However, it would be wrong to assume that this national socialist plan was a direct echo of a Nazi ideology. The themes of fighting against the possibility of socialist revolution and anti-communism, which were influential in the development of the Nazi party, are not applicable in this case. In this respect, the socialist reformation of the economy emerges as a more dominant element, but it is not strongly emphasized in this phase of the journal. While nationalism in the journal is developed within romantic forms, it is based not on opposition to socialism but on an idea of an egalitarian national unity – on the other hand, common

[51] Vedat Nedim, "Ümmilikle Mücadele İçin Köy Kampları," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 1 (January 1932): 43–44.

themes develop in areas such as the Turkification of the economy, the fear of democracy and hate of liberalism, and grassroots youth organization plans that deepen authoritarianism.

CHAPTER 3

The Inflection Point of the Kadro Movement: Critical Period, Oppositions and Advancements Between September 1932 - July 1933

3.1 Preliminary Considerations

This period can be brielfly argued as the start of the original political practice of Kadro Movement. After Celal Bayar was appointed Minister of Economy, Kadro writers, instead of directly engaging in polemics with him, initially chose to address him indirectly using more cautious language. Journal's general tone in language use became unexpectedly moderate, and point of stress shifted to explain the objective state of World Economic Crises of 1929. Their main argument in the early set of this periode, become shaped as to validate there was no positive objective shift in the current state crisis in order to make a revision in the economic policy. One step further, Kadro Journal mentined some specific problems which did not involve in direct conflict with the Ministry of Economy, such as unification of the domestic market and increase in state incomes. It should be also indicated that, in the first mounts which Celal Bayar took office, there was a widespread opinion arised that the authority of İsmet Pahsa diminished critically in political area (Karaosmanoğlu, 1968: 134).

This moderate atmosphere in the first mounts after the take office of Celal Bayar, especially between September and October 1932, dramatically broken down after the İsmet Pasha and Celal Bey's indirect disgussion on the press, on the issue of foreign specialists. This issue breaks out with the Celal Bey's declaration to the press that, he would get Americal specialist in economy and employed them in the officer cadre of ministry as such in

an authorized position. There was a direct challance to the Prime Minister İsmet Pasha's authority, and so, he started an argumentation against Celal Bey and his proposal, that Kadro Journal directly articulated this conflict by the side of İsmet Pasha's political position, and developed their arguments till nationalization of the sugar industry which the *Türkiye İş Bankası* involved in. Furthermore, Kadro Journal get into a serious series of a polemical debate which started at 27 October 1932 against it on the pages of *Milliyet* newspaper which can be stated as the representative of bourgeoisie and *Türkiye İş Bankası* in Turkish press. This polemic famously known as Şevket Süreyya – Ağaoğlu debate.

Kadro Journal started it's the first struggle against private sector and the structure of Ministry of Economy between November 1932 and Mach 1933. In this period, precisely can be defined as a breakthrough term of Kadro Movement, the journal published antagonistic essays on such topics on illegitimate profits of private sector, constitution of cooperatives in agricultural production and reorganization of Ministy of Economy and Supreme Council of Economy (*Âli İktisat Meclisi*). In accordance with this argumentative position, Kadro Journal fully engaged with the project about making a radical reformation in *Dârülfünûn*. If it is mentioned that the champion of these project was Dr. Reşit Galip (Tekin, 1992: 184–85), and opponent of the *Dârülfünûn* reform was generally liberal scholars, it would be considered more substantial the meaning of this engagement for Kadro group. These critical writings about Darülfünûn continued until its abolition in July 1933.

The period mentioned in this chapter, also characterized by Kadro group's involvement trials to youth problem in accordance with the development of first youth protest meetings in 1930's which were organized by *Türk Talebe Birliği* (Turkish Student Association) which formed as an opposition group to İsmet İnönü (Nesimi, 1977: 74). Parallel with the development of this movement, Kadro Journal rised their proposal on more disciplined official youth organizations. Furthermore, in this period Kadro Journal started to give more references on antique Turkish myths and antique Turkish history after I. Turkish History Congress. After that the journal constituted a special column for lingual researches by following Turkish Langue Congress as an open support for Kemalist nationalist program.

3.2 Political Articulations: The Concrete Context of Strategy in the Kadro Movement's Political Practice

In many issues of Kadro Journal, particularly in the articles which set the premises for the intended topics, are often reiterated the messages of loyalty or some form of praise to the leaders of the revolution, namely Kemalist cadres. They are designed to legitimize opinions asserted in the journal and they provide a degree of protection from the criticism raised against it. In its first issue, Kadro Journal featured annotation about the Savings and Domestic Goods Week event which was organized by the leadership of *Milli İktisat ve Tasarruf Cemiyeti* (National Economy and Savings Society) and, Şevket Süreyya actively participated (Tekeli and İlkin, 2009:98). It was considered politically important that this annotation contained a such pathetic message to the army and İsmet Pasha. This short text was as follows;

The speech of His Excellency, Mr. Prime Minister, İsmet Pasha possesses the quality of a historical document for our politics as well as of a live program. (…) The protector of our national sovereignty, our army, has undertaken its tasks in terms of economic mobilization.[1]

In the later issues similar remarks were often observed as the following quote from; "In his speech of His Excellency, Mr. Prime Minister in İzmir regarding the inauguration of the Ghazi statue, issue exemplifies the loyalty and affinity which is described with a unique eloquence, as well as the best expression and comprehension formulas of our national economy."[2] For instance its fourth issue, when discussing about to need to transfer the responsibility for continuing of the revolution to the younger generations, the journal made references to İsmet Pasha and argued that there must be an organization in line with Kadro's opinions in order to avoid the hardships that the Pasha endured during the SCF (Liberal Republican Party or Free Republican Party) period. In this article the following is asserted;

Those who still recall the Sivas speech, understand the reason for this indignation: while the Turkish Prime Minister who came to Sivas via Lausanne and who wants to go further, was trying to explain the railway policy of the state, a party leader in İzmir was speaking in with the attitude of Monsieur Müller and a crowd in İzmir was religiously following this voice and a journal in İstanbul described those who brought the first railway to Sivas as if they were a drunken gang which could swim in champagne. We should ask the youth of

[1] Anonymous, "Tasarruf ve Yerli Malı Haftası," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 1 (January 1932): 48.

[2] Vedat Nedim, "Mefhum Teşkilatı Değil Madde Teşkilatı," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 8 (August 1932): 13.

the days: Have you asked what the railway policy of the Prime Minister was? Even if you have, the response you would get would vary in İzmir and Sivas.[3]

Another example is to the Journal directly supporting and defending İsmet Pasha can be found after his trip to USSR and Italy. In the sixth issue of the journal an article included the following statements;

That's why, the head of government of the new Turkey built the courage to see and personally get familiarized with the contemporary civilization movement in its own natural course which is declared to be plagued by those who still live by the Atıf Efendi traditions. This great man, this courageous man is a man who distinctively sees all conditions and element of the current time period and diligently takes them into consideration. Based on this, we deem his actions right and courageous and appreciate that our head of government and certain party actors who have responsibilities in the Turkey's administration had took the initiative to observe two neighbor countries which lead two grand social movements.[4]

The journal which expresses its commitment to the revolution leaders in between the lines, rarely articulates direct support messages for anyone except Atatürk and İsmet Pasha. The most prominent of the mentioned people is Dr. Reşit Galip. In his article featured in the third issue of the Journal, Şevket Süreyya starts with an important reference and supports Reşit Galip as follows; "Ankara Radio seldom speaks. Yet it speaks remarkably well when it does. The real voice of Ankara is the voice that can be heard when Ankara Radio speaks well." [5] These praises are granted in pursuit of Reşit Galip's speech in Ankara radio stating that the revolution was not over and if need be, it should be moved forward with radical methods. This speech was made in a ceremony organized due to the inauguration of the People's Houses on February 19, 1932. In the said speech Reşit Galip, quite similarly to Kadro group, argues as follows;

From time to time we come across those who suggest that the revolution is over and all affairs must be left to their natural course. This opinion can only belong to lazy, tired and coward souls. (…) We are under the obligation to conduct our evolution with the speed and rigor of a revolution and add new laws to the social legislation by grounding the evolution principle step by step on our path.[6]

[3] Şevket Süreyya, "Genç Nesil Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 6.

[4] Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 6 (June 1932): 4.

[5] Şevket Süreyya, "İnkılap Bitti mi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 5. This refers to the state radio branch broadcasting from Ankara. But it also represents the voice, authority, and preferences of the capital, and therefore of the political power.

[6] Şevket Süreyya, "İnkılap Bitti mi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 5

In the third issue of Kadro Journal, Şevket Süreyya fills in for the section titled Economy of the Nation of Vedat Nedim who was absent due to his trip to Germany. This article was prepared by devising it with the emphasis which can be considered slogans for agricultural development following the inauguration of Public Houses and re-emergence of Reşit Galip in the political arena (Turan, 2006: 12). This article concerns rural production activities such as wheat production, husbandry, and forestry, and provides development ideals for each and every one of them with an epic rhetoric. The romantic rhetoric can be observed in these articles thanks to Reşit Galip's interest in peasant-populism. For example, the following excerpt can demonstrate the point;

If the sound of electrical sawmill does not resonate from desolate Köroğlu Mountains; or if the sound of villages with smoke always coming out of chimneys and people's joy has turned electric is not heard from wolfs' nest rivers, these green mountains can merely be a kitsch ornament surrounding the country or sparse hair that tangle from a balding head.[7]

Apart from their general point, the connection attempts have a specific meaning as well. It concerns assuming an active role in Community Centers and spreading the Kadro group thought via that channel. The Ankara radio analogy, quoted above, is repeated in the same issue of the journal regarding the Community Centers. Şevket Süreyya argues as follows in his article;

(…) radio plays and speaks. In other countries of the world, the radio can freely play and speak. But in the new Turkey, the voice coming out of the radio needs to be put in order. For instance, when they say 'Hello, Ankara speaking…' it should be really Ankara which expresses itself! In brief, it is a systematic infusion task which has a principled, disciplined and controlled cultural infusion and whose basis is premeditated with all of its details.[8]

In the rest of the article, the concrete issue of organization which is also discussed in other contexts is handled. According to Şevket Süreyya;

In order to save maybe not initially all of the citizens, but at least the young generations from the solipsism and idleness, Community Centers are a step taken in the most appropriate time. According to the regulations of Community Centers the significance of this step can be summarized as uniting the culture infusions and movements within the society around a center. There could be no safer and experienced means other than the culture weapon to unite and satisfy the youth. This style of activity which the Community Centers

[7] Şevket Süreyya, "Tabiata Tehakküm," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 22.
[8] Şevket Süreyya, "Halk Evleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 36.

precisely include in their framework offers us an opportunity to show case out comments on this solid basis.[9]

Kadro Journal points to undertaking assignments in People's Houses and shaping them. In the same article, an excerpt from the General Secretary of CHF, Recep Peker's speech is quoted. This excerpt deals with the need for a leader staff that can educate and develop the People's Houses organization. Kadro group answer this call by putting themselves forward. Thus, it is clear that they offer their candidature to assuming a political role. The excerpt from the speech of Recep Peker is as follows;

(…) there is a need for a guidance element constituted from the sage people who can raise awareness, educate and lead the organization of Community Centers for the greater good of the people. We can always see those who complain because of the absence and ineffectiveness of such a guidance element. (…) In our opinion, the most inaccurate mentality is the case that there are no qualified individuals in Turkey. (…) we believe and think that there is an element of educated people in Turkey that can manage the People's Houses.[10]

It can be seen from another youth organization related articles published a month later that Kadro Journal's interest in People's Houses isn't just a recent development and that it wants to be systematically involved. In Şevket Süreyya's article published in the fourth issue of the journal, there are suggestions on general and specific levels concerning the youth organization. On the general level, it develops the aforementioned suggestions further related to the mass communication devices. In the words of Şevket Süreyya;

The moral principle on which there is the most consensus regarding the topic of youth education is the connection of the abstract concepts that are to be infused to a concrete action. While all of the films, newspaper photographs, radio programs and the worldviews that we read function as a system to a moral deterioration, an abstract morals infusion conducted behind closed doors is bound to fail.[11]

Following this general analysis, Şevket Süreyya suggests a large scale organization encompassing the formal education institutions in order to discipline the youth. It is put forward once again that in the said organization the People's Houses have to undertake a serious role and hence they need to be developed to fulfill that role. According to Şevket Süreyya;

[9] Şevket Süreyya, "Halk Evleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 36.
[10] Şevket Süreyya, "Halk Evleri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 3 (March 1932): 37.
[11] Şevket Süreyya, "Genç Nesil Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 7.

(…) younger generations require a large social life outside the school which includes even the school life itself (…), that is, a space for organization [*teşkilat muhiti*]. As a result, it's today's mission to prepare a youth within the revolution principles and as both a helper and follower of the revolutionary avant-garde. (…) It is high time that the youth in Turkey, especially the youth mass outside the educational system, was included in a youth movement about which there is a consensus and the implementation of its principles are expressed in a detailed manner. The conference organized on Friday, April 4 in the Ankara People's House can be the start of this movement.[12]

After this analysis we should move on to the fragments making references to the suggestions related to the position of Kadro group in the new organization. Even though generally Community Centers are supported, it is argued that its ideology and program do not comply with the main target ahead. The significance of this argument is that there is a demand for resorting to the expertise of Kadro group in terms of ideology and program. According to Şevket Süreyya;

It is only natural that the Community Center program is insufficient to be able to educate the youth with such a broad spectrum. It is necessary that the task of preparing and educating the youth in accordance with revolution principles is organized as an autonomous action which withholds the highest administration and control devices of the country and that the political nurturing of the youth is demanded from such an organization. (…) The subject of this political nurturing is not the daily struggles but the fundamental principles of the national policy regarding the future and the developmental direction of these principles.[13]

As it can be deduced from the previous quotations as well, the term of developmental direction ("*inkişaf istikameti*") is an important notion that Kadro group use to express their opinions and it can be found in this context as well. In addition, Kadro Journal vehemently supports Dr. Reşit Galip's work in the ministry even two months prior to his discharge from his office. In the article of Burhan Asaf published in the eighteenth issue of the journal it is argued as follows;

Doctor Reşit Galip Bey, did not commit to the Turkish education cause as a minister with a passion for action. If he had done so, he would have somewhat succeeded. However, this success would have only been a set of attempts left behind in the ministry period. The young minister latched onto this

[12] Şevket Süreyya, "Genç Nesil Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 7–8.
[13] Şevket Süreyya, "Genç Nesil Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 4 (April 1932): 8.

fundamental cause of the nation with the energy and courage of a revolutionary. Therefore, the assets that he contributed to the Turkish education shall live long after him.[14]

In the rest of the same article, it can be observed that Kadro group who claim to from the ideology of the revolution and educate others about it, suggest the foundation of a Revolution Institute and the obligation of passing exams from this institute in order to successfully complete superior education. Burhan Asaf describes the suggestion as follows;

All social sciences will be assessed according to revolution. All students, regardless of their major, will give exams from the institute in order to obtain their diplomas. Thus, the first condition for professionals who went through Turkish education system is being a revolutionary. Those who fail the exam of revolution shall be left behind in life.[15]

This proposal bears a striking resemblance to the formalities for advancement within the party hierarchy, bureaucracy, or military in the USSR or Nazi Germany, and I guess it forms the intellectual basis for the courses on the History of the Turkish Revolution and the Institutes of the Turkish Revolution that continue to exist in higher education today.

3.3 Kadro on the Problem of Youth Education and Recruitment

The issue of adoption of revolutionary principles by the people and the administrative staff, in other words, harmonization of recruitment mechanism of the political order with mass-youth contexts, is a matter that Kadro Journal had to discuss for a long time. It is possible to see the reverberations of the different aspects of this issue in the prominent novels of Yakup Kadri such as *Yaban* (Karaosmanoğlu, 2004: 26) and *Ankara* (Karaosmanoğlu, 2001: 175–76). In the article of Yakup Kadri published in the tenth issue of the journal, he explains the atmosphere in Ankara as follows;

I often reflect on our revolution atmosphere compared to that of Russia which has become a principle, an opinion and even a consciousness. Does this atmosphere exist in Istanbul in the revolutionary Turkey? Or in Ankara? What are its characteristics? How can it be identified? How much of a hot topic is it? What is its impact and on whom it exerts this impact? Honestly, I cannot tell as clearly as I would in the Russian context. This study of atmosphere is

[14] Burhan Asaf, "'Arkada kalan Darülfünun'un başına gelenler" *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 18 (June 1933): 95.

[15] Burhan Asaf, "'Arkada kalan Darülfünun'un başına gelenler" *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 18 (June 1933): 96.

difficult to conduct even in Ankara which is supposed to be the center of our revolution because the moral atmosphere in Ankara changes depending on districts and neighborhoods. There is a heavy medieval atmosphere in Tahtakale while Yeni Şehir progressively becomes more occidental. On the other hand, the atmosphere in the chambers of the assembly and government appears to be a frozen bureaucracy.[16]

The premise of the aforementioned Revolution Institute related ideas appear in the ninth issue of the journal which can be considered early. This premise is built on the necessity that the administrative staff must go through the education of the party. A detail here that poses significance is that the journal which avoids voicing suggestions regarding *CHF* (Republican People's Party) does not repeat such a suggestion as the party-schools and avoids being involved in the party affairs all together with the exception of the mention of the publication activities of the party in the eleventh issue. The party-schools idea that is discussed by Burhan Asaf in the ninth issue of the journal is developed as follows, first let's take a look at the arguments which establish why these schools are necessary;

(…) Today, we see no measures for the training of the politics staff as there are Civil Service Schools for training the administrative staff. However, for a revolutionary party that leads a movement like the National Independence revolution which has established start and finish points, while it is important that the principles are clearly established, it is also important to train a younger staff that will devote themselves to these principles and sustain them without any harm.[17]

Secondly, we can see how this school of the party will function, according to Burhan Asaf;

(…) our national independence considers the principle of "unity" important, as a result it cannot accept this duality in the administration and the party. Based on this argument, the institution that will educate and train the staff cannot co-exist with the Civil Service School or the Law School. In our opinion, only a school of the party can train the new and younger staff. The graduates of this school of the party will share the same opinions and will have the same level of political education in fields such as administration, foreign affairs, judicial matters and even press.[18]

[16]Yakup Kadri, "Ankara, Moskova, Roma," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 10 (October 1932): 42.
[17]Burhan Asaf, "Fırka Mektebi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 9 (September 1932): 32.
[18]Burhan Asaf, "Fırka Mektebi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 9 (September 1932): 32.

Thirdly, let's discuss the foundation style and mission of this school of the party. Burhan Asaf explains these two matters as follows;

(…) in order to realize all of these tasks, Civil Service and Law schools must be jointly integrated into the Party-school. Such a school that should exist in Ankara, after providing a worldview based on our revolution, needs to train advanced and enterprising staff that can manage organization in the fields of administration, economy and finance; a hardworking element that possesses the training to work in the political and economic foreign affairs; a judicial staff which adopts the revolution principles as its first resource and guide; and finally a foresighted journalist generation which will control the revolutionary state in accordance with the revolution principles.[19]

The mission of raising journalist, which Burhan Asaf assigns to the schools of the party, appears in one of his ensuing articles in a different context. The opinion of Burhan Asaf regarding the publication and relations of the party complies with his opinions concerning the schools of the party. According to Asaf;

The party withholds all tools of publication including the press and the radio and even if it's not the case, this is how it should be. All principles of the revolution are defended via these tools with a decisive, tough and an almost jealous manner.[20]

In the later issues of the Journal, although there are no more articles concerning the party-schools, the youth issue becomes more and more vital. Particularly due to the events in Bursa on February, 1933 and Turkish Student Union ("*Türk Talebe Birliği*") protests (Vagon-Lee, Razgrad, etc.) the issue of the youth organization becomes a hot topic in the mainstream media as well. Immediately after the events in Bursa (Goloğlu, 1974: 89), the head article published in the February, 1933 issue of Kadro, discusses the youth topic in a critical manner. The following is argued in this article;

We sent the association directors and the municipal police to those who have the audacity to walk against the revolution while the same day, intellectuals of Bursa definitely were either busy with staging a play or organizing a concert. Are we all actually aware of the fact that our attempts to keep the youth away from politics raise a well-behaved and gentleman revolutionary generation?[21]

During the month of May, 1933 following the so-called Razgrad (Goloğlu, 1974: 95) events where nationalist students clashed with the police, Kadro

[19] Burhan Asaf, "Fırka Mektebi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 9 (September 1932): 33.

[20] Burhan Asaf, "İnkılabımızın Sesi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 35.

[21] Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 14 (February 1933): 3.

Journal yet again brings up the issue of youth. The head article published in the seventeenth issue of the Journal, describes the problem as follows;

Is there a youth cause in Turkey? It will be even if it's non-existent at the moment, because the security of our revolution necessitates it. Many points concerning the youth organizations abroad were discussed even in this platform. Nevertheless, it should also be mentioned that while the organized youth in Russia and Italy serve as the guardians of the revolution, the organized youth in Germany started a whole political movement. Countries such as the United Kingdom and France can doubt the necessity of such a youth organization; however, this issue has almost become a cause for Turkey.[22]

The journal which directly evaluates the events in Razgrad, reaches the following conclusion;

There have been actions that the youth organized on its own. It is claimed that these are criminal acts. What can come as natural as this? In the Razgrad event, Turkish police and Turkish youth clashed due to the discipline of the former and pure enthusiasm of the latter like two people who used the opposite entries of a tunnel and got lost in the middle resorting to clashing by mistake. All these actions of the youth show their eager struggle to take up a role and tasks. We should not delay giving them what they wish by including them in the organization.[23]

According to Goloğlu (1974: 96–97); Razgrad events mentioned above, arised another struggle between Kadro journal and Birlik Journal in terms of the form to organize youth in objective sense. In this context, it is understood that the groups and publications that emerged in the early Republican period, differing on issues such as agriculture, industry, trade, nationalism, general culture, and social norms, were also in competition regarding the formation of youth organizations, their discipline, and leadership. While this ultimately aims to consolidate the new regime, the historical direction in which the regime will develop and who the next generation of administratives will be, are also subjects of this struggle. While the Kadro is also mentioned in this context and positions itself as the ideologue of the revolution, how it differs from other groups within its ideological framework -for example, whether its youth organizations are open to any leftist content- is left completely unclear.

[22]Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 17 (May 1933): 3.
[23]Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 17 (May 1933): 4.

3.4 Thesis on Reorganization of the State

Another aspect of the political articulation strategy of Kadro Journal includes the close monitoring and supporting all the steps/policies of the government in the fields of language, culture and history. The most prominent examples of this strategy appear following the Turkish Language Council of September, 26 – October, 5 as references to Turkish language and history in the Journal. Interestingly, following the language council, articles concerning the external Turks are featured in the Journal as well, nonetheless, they are short-lived. For instance, in the tenth issue of the Journal published on October, 1933 the head article includes statements as follows;

A new language is born, we still write the old even if it's in small portions. We will not do so from now on. We will not speak of it in order not to write it. This is such a difficult decision. Those who tremble and beg for the change of decision are those who have a comprehensive idea as to the difficulty of this decision. (…) Without any census, we know that there are at least 60 million Turks in the world. Turkish is already a great language when all of this is considered. (…) New language, great language, culture language Turkish cannot bloom in the Istanbul pot or the Anatolian garden. The site where it can discover its size and dimension is the site where the immature and amateur phases are embraced. The new language is connected to the culture that needs to be formed according to 60 million.[24]

Furthermore, the title of Şevket Süreyya's article featured in the thirteenth issue of the Journal is *Ergenekon Efsanesi* (Ergenekon Legend). In this article, there are references to an old Sumerian story whose translation had been published in *Hakimiyeti Milliye Gazetesi* (National Sovereignty Newspaper).[25] The merging of the legends and epics of Ergenekon and Sumer and making them into a symbol for the revolution is a reference to Turkish History Council. In the early stages of the Republic, we can observe the change in the reference points of the ideology with the 1930s. Kadro Journal tries to connect itself to this change.

An interesting analysis about the journal can be made at this point. Even though Kadro Journal deals with language and culture related matters, they are only featured in the journal as much as the topic of organization of the youth. Thus, it is only mentioned in between the lines or used as a reference. The moment when this publication policy changed corresponds to the fifteenth

[24] Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 10 (October 1932): 3–4.

[25] Şevket Süreyya, "Ergenekon Efsanesi," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 13 (February 1933): 5.

issue of the journal. In the fifteenth issue in March, it is notified that a column titled language column will be added to the Journal.[26] The interesting aspect of this is that the journal launches a column concerning a subject that is not directly related to its area of interest even though it had been five months after the language council and the amount of the articles and references concerning the subject had been reduced to almost none in this time period. The reason for this novelty should be explained by *Ülkü* Journal's (Ideal Journal) first publication. In the new issue that the journal heralds; the aforementioned Language Column is introduced. The first article of the column is about the outline of Turkish language[27] by İbrahim Necmi. This article will be ensued by other Language Column content in the later issues.

3.5 Thesis on Class Struggle and Nationalization

Kadro Journal, in its second phase, that is, the issues between the ninth and twentieth, prioritizes its opinions regarding the new state principle and re-organized state apparatuses. The Journal takes these opinions on the general level of principles as well as directly putting forward concrete suggestions and making an effort to defend them by the means of polemics. Generally, the journal deals with the state concept in the classes context. According to İsmail Hüsrev;

The state is founded as a result of the emergence of interest differences in the society. Where the society is divided into opposing interest groups the state emerges as an authority device which protects and represents certain groups. State institutions cannot be found at the time periods where social conflicts do not exist. In summary, the state is a result of the social interest conflicts and survives thanks to these conflicts. (…) the foundation of the state begins with the separation of private property from public property. The state (…) is a device that rules the society on behalf of certain interests.[28]

Let's just say that this opinion does not differ from the Orthodox Marxist thought. In the rest of his article, İsmail Hüsrev discusses the evolution of the state in the course of 20th century. He states as follows;

The state began to interfere in the service for the working class and health and economy related matters in favor of workers. Thus, on one hand the state interfered in the economic life in the name of capital interests; on the

[26] Anonymous, "Slogan" in *Kadro*, Vol. II, Issue: 15 (March 1933): 35.
[27] İbrahim Necmi, "Türk Dilinin Ana Çizgileri," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 16 (April 1933): 50.
[28] İsmail Hüsrev, "Milli Kurtuluş Devletçiliği: I.," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 18 (June 1933): 27.

other hand, it had to intervene in the affairs of the working class. As a result, capitalism began to become an organized regime instead of an individual and liberal regime with capital organizations on one side (cartels, trusts, syndicates etc.) and worker organizations on the other (worker syndicates). In this universe, the state stopped being the guardian of the interests of capital and became a device that is under the influence of certain interests and that interferes in financial and social life on behalf of the said interests.[29]

Again in the words of Şevket Süreyya;

The national economy before the war was just the capital-based economy. Yet, now the national economy is just the state-based economy. Therefore, the task of developing and regulating social labor division in compliance with the aims and interests of the revolution is not the product of a rambling entity but of a national labor plan. Turkish revolution requires this plan from the Turkish organizers.[30]

Compared to this new type of state, the necessity of a new state in Turkey and the necessity for this new type of state to be different from the classic class domination are clearly asserted in the Journal. According to Vedat Nedim: "Every revolution is a battle to create and found a new type of state. If the Turkish revolution has a character, it too should have a state notion of its own."[31] He continues this argument by complementing the quote above by İsmail Hüsrev; "(…) we did not make our independence movement on the account of a certain class. To us, state is not a result of the class formation but the expression of nationalization.[32]

The political practice that Kadro Journal often emphasizes in the economic context, progresses on this basis. The emphasis on the class formation in the Journal peaks especially in the eleventh issue. The significance of this issue is that it makes the decision of bringing an American Expert Board (Tekeli and İlkin, 1982: 172) against the Soviet Expert Board (Tekeli and İlkin, 1982: 158) and employing foreign experts in the ministry following Celal Bayar's taking office as the minister of economy. Following this advancement, Celal Bayar and İsmet İnönü make public statements against each other and the political environment is stirred. According to Vedat Nedim;

[29] İsmail Hüsrev, "Milli Kurtuluş Devletçiliği: I.," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 18 (June 1933): 36.

[30] Şevket Süreyya, "İçpazar ve İktisatta 'Bütün'lük," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 10 (October 1932): 12.

[31] Vedat Nedim, "Devletin Yapıcılık ve İdarecilik Kudretine İnanmak Gerekir," *Kadro*, Vol. II, Issue: 15 (March 1933): 13.

[32] Vedat Nedim, "Devletin Yapıcılık ve İdarecilik Kudretine İnanmak Gerekir," *Kadro*, Vol. II, Issue: 15 (March 1933): 14.

Our purpose is to be a nation without classes and conflicts. However, as of yet we are not a nation without classes and conflicts. But, the class conflicts in our country are not so widespread as to dominate our political life. Thus, the state of Turkey is not a class-based state. The state of Turkey contrary to European and American states is far from being an execution machine which functions for the interests of a finance oligarchy, industrial capital, large territorial property or a worker group.[33]

Vedat Nedim does not reject the existence of classes in his said article. Notwithstanding, he associates the existence and development of classes with the development of private capital. In this sense, the emphasis of the absence of classes, in a way, aims to prevent further development of classes and in other ways to rectify the already existing classes. In his own words;

Division into classes is an obligation which urge upon our hysteria in a structure built through private capital accumulation. In an technically advanced economy, classes appear along more distinct lines. As for a financial structure with a backward technique, its classes are blurry and vague. (…) the existence of classes in a society with backward technical abilities cannot be denied. That is why; the choice of private capital accumulation will not only drive us to an economy with backward technical abilities, but also will deter us from our ideal to be a nation without classes and conflict.[34]

Again according to Vedat Nedim, the tool to be used for the organization of the economy will be able to build this desired structure;

(…) this tool does not represent the national economy in Germany. This tool tries to gain benefit by exploiting the majority of the nation on behalf of a small group. Naturally, our understanding of a rational national economy is not such an exploitation tool. Therefore, it means that the tool of Turkish economy would be rational not only in the technical sense but also in the social sense, in other words, it would not waste the energy of the nation by risks such as splitting the nation into classes or engaging in party conflicts, salary disputes, strikes and unemployment.[35]

In order to realize this ideal, the opinion of Kadro Journal focuses on étatism. It defines étatism as a social system. In the article of İsmail Hüsrev

[33]Vedat Nedim, "Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 19.

[34]Vedat Nedim, "Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 19.

[35]Vedat Nedim, "Türk İktisadiyatının Erkanı Harp Dairesi: Ali İktisat Meclisi," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 14 (February 1933): 13–14.

featured in the nineteenth issue of the journal, he differentiates his étatism ideas from the state socialism concept of Adolf Vagner. According to İsmail Hüsrev;

The state socialism not only deals with the regulation of worker and financiers but also with broader national finance matters. For example, it suggests the state mandate for affairs concerning the public interests such as the post and telegraph. As a result of this movement, a lot of affairs related to the public interests went under the state control. (…) Today, the concept of étatism understood by the formal scientists is the state socialism or in other words, interventionism. (…) In our opinion, such a étatism is more of a state policy rather than a social system. The real étatism must be the expression of a system that regulates a change in the structure of the society.[36]

İsmail Hüsrev, describes the aims of the mentioned étatism as follows;

Since the plan of the economy and the society can only be realized through an authoritarian and supreme organization as the state, it is necessary that the state assume an active role for the nation in the cause of re-structuring the country. (…) The criteria here is not the interests of the worker class as it is in socialism, or of the capitalist society as it is in fascism or of the individuals as it is in individualism: It is the integrity of the society facing the internal and external actors and the welfare of this integrity along with its economic and social spurt.[37]

Kadro Journal continues its publication activities by at occasion radicalizing these purposes that it assigns on étatism and at other occasions presenting them in milder ways. Especially after Celal Bayar's taking the post of the Minister of Economy, Kadro initially tries to take up a constructive and appeasing demeanor against the opposition starting in *Milliyet* newspaper. As it can be seen in various sources, the reason why is the change in the ministry majorly dampening the authority of İsmet İnönü (Bozdağ, 1972: 91). Later on, it is observed that the tone of the discussion gets progressively more aggressive. In the second issue after Celal Bayar becoming the Minister of Economy, it is remarkable how Kadro group express their expectations from étatism in the gentlest manner. In the words of İsmail Hüsrev;

The main principle of the nationalist étatism is on one hand to defend the national sovereignty against all external forces and on the other hand, increasing the income of the national economy for the entirety of the citizens, in compliance with national interests and in a wholesome manner. The state organizes the production branches that satisfy the needs of the nation and

[36] İsmail Hüsrev, "Milli Kurtuluş Devletçiliği II.," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 19 (July 1933): 25–26.
[37] İsmail Hüsrev, "Milli Kurtuluş Devletçiliği II.," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 19 (July 1933): 30.

require a large amount of capital. Along with the state property, private enterprises work as well. (…) The state establishes its control over national capital in order to prevent it from being wasted because of things such as ignorance, meaningless competition, lack of proper planning etc.[38]

Following these statements, İsmail Hüsrev gives the following message to the entourage of *Milliyet*; "(…) we find it important to point out this aspect to those who get concerned over allegedly seeing revolutionary socialism signs in even certain administrative measures of the state." [39]

As opposed to the appeasing statements quoted above, the demeanor changes 180 degrees three months after the indicated article, and a tone which directly accuses its opposing agents is adopted. The reason why is hidden in the differences between the periods of time when Kadro states its suggestions and when it fights for the implementation of the previously stated suggestions. Stating the suggestions occurs in a way that it will not inflict the anger of those to whom Kadro addresses and in a manner that it will ensure the adoption of the said suggestions by the high-ranking persons of the state. As for the fight, it is conducted by means of arguments that will radicalize the high-ranking state officials and of directly infiltrating the agenda of the addressees who are considered as the central focus (press, persons or classes). For example, Vedat Nedim, in his article featured in the thirteenth issue of the Journal, directly classifies the opponents of étatism and attacks the private entrepreneurship. The classification of Vedat Nedim can be explained in his words as follows:

We can divide the opponents of an étatist economic policy in two main groups:

1- Those who will receive harm if the state gets involved in economic affairs. Since the interests of a group or a class overpower those of the nation in this context, we can leave this group outside the discussion. For this group the national economy does not exist, only the requirements of their own affairs matter. If each and every requirement of an affair dominates the future of the national economy, it will be impossible to pursue a consistent and wholesome economic policy. Then, only a set of measures that are shaped according to the interest of a dominant group can be of concern.

2- Those, who believe in the magic of private initiation, under the influence

[38] İsmail Hüsrev, "Türkiye'de Milli Sermaye Hareketi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 10 (October 1932): 25.

[39] İsmail Hüsrev, "Türkiye'de Milli Sermaye Hareketi," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 10 (October 1932): 25.

of a liberal education.[40]

Following this analysis, Vedat Nedim, moves onto a general criticism. He argues as follows;

Similar to the way in the agricultural and industrial fields, the faith of our trade life also completely lies in the hands of private and individual entrepreneurship. Both in terms of export and import, trade is taken over by foreign elements not the national ones. That is why; the capital accumulations accomplished via the channel of trade do not stay in the country. Large-scale trade that is not national shares the characteristics of Turkey in its semi-colonial period. Thus, it is a tool for exploitive colonialism. We do not know the state of our intermediary traders who cannot infiltrate the world markets. Most of them have gone bankrupt. (…) The consequences of the large-scale trade life based on private entrepreneurship in Turkey, portrays such a negative picture that is hazardous for the national economy. How can it be possible to believe in the creative power of the private entrepreneurship after seeing its barren condition in the fields of agriculture, industry and trade? Of course it cannot be, we do not believe in such a miracle.[41]

3.6 Criticism Regarding Abnormal Profits in the Sugar Industry

Actually, if one monitors the gradual aggression in the tone the following can be observed; as it will be further discussed in section of the polemics of Kadro Journal, since October, 1932 particularly Ahmet Ağaoğlu initiates polemics against Kadro Journal and the entourage of *Milliyet* gets involved in the said polemics. As the only response to this, it is declared by a short article titled "On the occasion of a criticism" in the eleventh issue of Kadro Journal that the criticism of Ağaoğlu will not be left unreciprocated. Again in the same issue, Yakup Kadri lashes out as follows;

The external threats in the period of revolutionary Turkey can appear in all shapes and forms. They can appear in the form of a Sheik with a green flag or a revolutionary with a red flag or even a liberal with a white ensign. It is unfortunate that not only a great majority of these liberals live among us today but also they have the right to vote, work and have authority and status in the war veteran Turkey which is the love child of independence and nationality.[42]

[40] Vedat Nedim, "Bizde Hususi Teşebbüsün Zaferi," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 13 (February 1933): 10.

[41] Vedat Nedim, "Bizde Hususi Teşebbüsün Zaferi," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 13 (February 1933): 15–16.

[42] Yakup Kadri, "Ankara, Moskova, Roma," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 40.

Articles published by Ağaoğlu get discontinued on November, 13 while the last salvo of the month comes from Kadro Journal. The sugar industry of which *Türkiye İş Bankası* was a big partner (Kocabaşoğlu et al., 2001: 286), is critically discussed in detail. It is clear that the political practice of Kadro Journal was intensified in this political environment. The criticism article written by Şevket Süreyya is based on an incredibly well-conducted analysis. Statistical data and tables are often used in this analysis. Turkey is numerically compared to the world on the criteria ranging from the sugar beet agriculture to sugar consumption. Since the close involvement of *Türkiye İş Bankası* in the sugar industry is commonly known, this article means declaring war. According to Şevket Süreyya;

Turkish sugar industry needs to be regulated. The target of this regulation is to ensure the profits of this industry. The most vital phase of this task is the scientific cultivation of the soil in the field of sugar. The scientific cultivation of the soil in the field of sugar is not a task for small farms or something that can be handled through simple guidance.[43]

He continues as follows;

Even in Oceania where 75% of the population consists of blacks and savages, sugar production per capita is at least 11%. Thus, it is the leading cause and target of our economic nationalism to erase the stamp of poverty from our nation's face and the stamp of backwardness from the face our country and make our country into a producer of numerous and various goods.[44]

According to Şevket Süreyya the alarm bells start to ring for the sugar industry. It is both easy and necessary that this industry branch is subjected to state control and regulated. In his own words;

In our sugar policy, the capability of the individual guidance meaning the creation and promotion of individual capital took its last breath even before the great depression. Now the present day requires that the large-scale production and especially jobs as complicated as the sugar industry are organized in nation's control and measurements.[45]

Again we can continue with the following statement of Şevket Süreyya; "(…) it can be argued that the sugar industry is the production branch, amongst all national industry branches, whose facility must be controlled and

[43]Şevket Süreyya, "Şeker İstiklali ve 160.000 ton Türk Şekeri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 12.

[44]Şevket Süreyya, "Şeker İstiklali ve 160.000 ton Türk Şekeri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 15.

[45]Şevket Süreyya, "Şeker İstiklali ve 160.000 ton Türk Şekeri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 16.

planed from the very first step and whose planning and control is the most possible."[46]

3.7 Concluding Remarks

In epitome, in this part of the thesis that was briefly statted that Kadro movement started its political struggle with Turkish bourgeoisie in the period of September 1932 – July 1933. In this period, Kadro journal directly involved in İsmet (İnönü) Pasha and Celal (Bayar) Bey conflict, by the side of İnönü and Soviet industrial planning strategy. One step further, Kadro journal also took a part in the discussions about *Dârülfünûn* and meetings of *Türk Talebe Birliği*. In accordance with this context, journal developed a bundle of suggestions, in order to solve conflicts mentioned and open an area of authority itself to participate advances more formally. First, Kadro Journal suggested to reorganize state apparatus as such Celal (Bayar) Bey can reach and articulate his marked-based economical policies. In this manner, Kadro Journal suggested to re-define roles and reorganize functions of Ministry of Economy[47] and Supreme Council of Economy[48]. Secondly, Kadro journal developed concrete suggestions to youth problem as a response to meetings that mainly argumented to constitute party schools in CHF and develop the program of People's Houses. Lastly, Kadro journal take a side in the discussion about the *Dârülfünûn* and articulate with Dr. Reşit Galip with both formal and political spheres.

Ultimately, all these actions can be understood within two main trajectories. The first of these trajectories concerns the use of political power and the provision of security mechanisms. For example, university reform, support for İsmet İnönü, and even the establishment of youth organizations -political initiatives and ideological codification efforts in this regard- can be evaluated under this category. But the second trajectory cannot be simply reduced to this. Within the context of this second discussion, the Kadro group is conducting preliminary work for the nationalization of various sectors of the economy. The seriousness of this initiative is evident in its development, extending beyond theoretical areas such as class struggle and the nature of the state, the notion

[46] Şevket Süreyya, "Şeker İstiklali ve 160.000 ton Türk Şekeri," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 11 (November 1932): 11.

[47] Vedat Nedim, "İktisat İşlerinde Devlete Veto Hakkı ve İktisat Vekaleti," *Kadro* Vol. I, Issue: 9 (September 1932): 17.

[48] Vedat Nedim, "Türk İktisadiyatının Erkanı Harp Dairesi: Ali İktisat Meclisi," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 14 (February 1933): 15.

of the state and its restructuring, to concrete struggles for the regulation -and even nationalization- of the sugar industry. This last principle has drawn a very strong reaction from circles of capital and the representatives of financial sector, as well as their spokespeople in the press, and the problem is taking on appearances both inside and outside the state.

CHAPTER 4

Critical Tides of Étatism: Ramification and Embodiment of Anti-bourgeoisie Character Between August 1933 – September 1934

4.1 Preliminary Considerations

In this chapter, I deal with the August, 1933 – September, 1934 period of Kadro Journal. This period started by the abolishment of *Dârülfünûn* and constution of Istanbul University in August 1933. This event should be considered as inevitably important political advance for the Kadro movement (Tekin, 1992: 184–85; Hirsch, 2005: 287–88), however the Kadro journal, surprisingly, did not consider this case that, almost only one reference had given to the opening of new university.

Thus, exidently was the result of dismissal of Dr. Reşit Galip from the Ministry of Education. After this dismissal, Kadro journal chose to wait silently for almost two issue till the political positions and power distribution become more clear. It was obvious that, Dr. Reşit Galip planned to start a huge rural education and development mobilization project after the abolishment of the *Dârülfünûn* (Eliçin, 1970: 381). Journal recharged its political position and redefine its terminology on étatism after Oktober 1933 that was evaluated as another inflection point for the Kadro Journal. In parallel with publishing of the Mustafa Kemal's letter of support and İsmet Pasha's essay on étatism in journal under the favour of 10th anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic, Kadro group revitalized their political mission and started a new advancement operation in term of political and economical sphere. It is obvious that, Kadro group had shifted their terminology incidentally, and get some

new references such as İsmet Pasha's essay, which gained central position in Kadroist arguments.

One step further, in this period, Kadro group get involved in a direct struggle with the Turkish bourgeoisine in the pages of Kadro journal. The polemic with Mahmut (Soydan) Bey with Kadro group take place in this period. Moreover, advanced étatist arguments such as nationalization of sugar industry proposal get developed, anti-protectionist argumans extanded and gained more social and class-based references, and nationalization of cement industry and insurance sector, land and agricultural reform proposal had widespread in journal coverange.

Another significant point need to be adressed is Kadro movement's political articulations and their advancements in the mentioned period. Dr. Reşit Galip's uneven death had been responded in Kadro journal in a mournful way. Surprisingly, journal started to criticize Recep Peker and his lectures in the Institue of Revolution in Istanbul University (Aslanapa, 1997: 211). This critic also developed with the critic of People's Houses and of course a suggestion to take a mission in the Institue for themselves. On the other hand, Kadro journal started to discuss on municipal administrations that explained the surprising alliance with Kadro and Şükrü (Kaya) Bey (Solak, 2013: 166), The Minister of Internal Affairs. One step further, the evolution of this alliance which Tekeli and İlkin mentioned (2003: 422), can be assumed to start with the agricultural reform proposal of Kadro journal –thus Şükrü (Kaya) Bey was one of the supporter of agricultural reform (Solak, 2013: 205; Goloğlu, 1974: 223). Furthermore, after the change of the Minister of Public Affairs, journal tried to affialiate the new minister, Ali (Çetinkaya) Bey. On the other hand, Kadro journal involved in an interminable and corrosive polemical with Hüsayin Cahit (Yalçın) Bey (Ertan, 2010: 124). It is obvious that, corrosive polemical mentioned above, gave a damage to intouchable and prestigious image of the Kadro journal.

4.2 Seeking a New Solid Foundation: Moving from International Context to Domestic Reality

Kadro Journal structures its étatism proposal on two simple premises in terms of the purely economic context. First one is the fact that, as mentioned in earlier chapters, the economic progress led by private sector had not reached the desired level in the 1920s. This argument concerning the failure of private sector is supported by a series of additional arguments regarding the reasons as

to the necessity of economic development and its imminent accomplishment. At the same time, these additional arguments can be considered as the backing of the ideological axis devised by the Kadro circle. The essence of these arguments is a national independence rhetoric shaped by the references to the National Independence War period. This rhetoric connects to the success of national independence struggles on one hand, which means that the Kadro group got stronger in the daily political arena; on the other hand, it offers a chance for Kadro group to comment on the meaning of Turkish Revolution in international political and economic conjunctures.

In the realization of Kadroist Project, the significance of these main and additional arguments are as follows; there is an enormous amount of literature in Kadro Journal arguing that the national sovereignty is in danger due to the imperialist advancements in the world political conjuncture regarding the rise of Fascism and Nazism. The arguments about the fascist regimes usually highlight their expansionist aims. In addition to the tactic of spreading the perception of this danger, following the economic crisis of 1929, it is especially emphasized that the world economic system is irrevocable damaged and that it is impossible to restore it with the existing ways of liberal capitalism. These two arguments are further developed by comments that the bourgeoisie would not be able to organize the social formation in the daily situations; however, the possibility of the irrevocable resolution of the society gets more imminent by the day. As an example, the articles that put forward the danger of transition to the types of subsistence economy (*zati iktisat biçimleri*) which are often found in the journal's articles can be presented.

On the other hand, as much as the resolve of the world economy is presented as an inevitable outcome in the Journal, it is also portrayed as an opportunity from which should be benefited in the context of Turkey. As long as the state finds sufficient capital it can implement the industries that are about to be resolved in the capitalist centers and naturally connect them to the other sectors of the economy. On the condition that it is accepted as a principle that the production capacity of these enterprises are connected on rational level, agricultural production could have been organized and developed by the government as well. Thus, the income venues of the government must be increased in order to realize these changes. Considering the level of national production in early 1930s, the complexity of distribution relations, the redistribution of the highly limited resources in a way that gives more control to the state necessarily leads to the reduction in the shares of dominant classes or their dissolvation all together. The radical increase in the state's income and

the organization of the resolved social formation with the active involvement of the state forms the basis of the Kadroist thought as mentioned earlier.

The significance of this period is that the Kadro group's arguments which defend étatism, particularly following the article written by İsmet Pasha in Kadro Journal on the occasion of the tenth year commemoration of the Republic in October, 1933, acquired a new terminology and new reference points. For example, even though the arguments focusing on the rise of fascism and its expansionist nature can still be found in the journal, the *point de capiton* (Zizek, 2011: 103) which they are rationalized in the political practice turns into the term of 'defense economy'. On the other hand, taking into consideration especially the issues of the year of 1934, it is possible to see articles arguing that the economic crisis continues and even gets deeper are progressively reduced in quantity in the journal.

Two examples are quite sufficient to explain this situation. First, let's take a look at İsmail Hüsrev's article featured in the twentieth issue of the journal. In this article, which is written a month prior to the period that we are discussing, the argument suggesting the continuation of the world economic crisis is fairly prominent which can be seen as a follow-up of the press position of the journal in the period of October, 1932 – July, 1933. Nevertheless, it can also be observed that İsmail Hüsrev who can be defined as the most cautious person within the core staff of Kadro Journal detects, with a keen perception, the actions with the aim of the control of the economic situation. In his article, İsmail Hüsrev states as follows based on a report that he published following the London Finance Conference of League of Nations;

The abnormal change of the prices caused a great damage to the world economy mechanism. All markets are turned upside down. The agricultural goods and raw material stocks are constantly increasing in the world. (…) Industrial production has also regressed remarkably.[1]

Nonetheless, in the later parts of the same article, İsmail Hüsrev draws attention to how the state interventions increased to the extent to cause a reduction in the world trade volume and the rationalization of the production gained a significant importance[2] and that it dragged the prices down paradoxically.[3] These two developments can be regarded as attempts to save

[1] İsmail Hüsrev, "Dünya Buhranına Umumi Bir Bakış," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 20 (August 1933): 20.

[2] İsmail Hüsrev, "Dünya Buhranına Umumi Bir Bakış," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 20 (August 1933): 20.

[3] İsmail Hüsrev, "Dünya Buhranına Umumi Bir Bakış," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 20 (August 1933): 22.

the national capitalism by paradoxically being separated from the capitalism within the world economy. In this case, while the opinion of Kadro regarding the resolve of the world system is confirmed, its argument suggesting that the capitalism would collapse with it is refuted. As it can be deduced from the later articles as well, the analysis suggesting that the fascism emerges to save capitalism complies with this conclusion. In the twenty-seventh issue of the Journal, the article of Mehmet Şevki reaches this conclusion. In the words of Mehmet Şevki;

The world crisis damages the countries with the most advanced industries and (…) reduces their production by 30% in certain sectors yet it never causes a halt in one specific sector: war industry. While the industrial production decreases in every sector, the production of the war sector constantly increases and expands though it undergoes certain structural changes.[4]

In reality, the condition of other production related sectors linked to the war industry gets better as well and this situation has a positive effect on Turkey's foreign policy. The main mistake of Kadro Journal, when evaluating the international economic conjuncture, is that it focuses on the production, trade and stock numbers before 1929 as a reference point. However, not being able to reach these numbers says very little about the collapse of the capitalist system. As for the authors of Kadro Journal, based on the data, they assume that the system is in a structural crisis. Even though this analysis is correct to a certain extent, it does not allow creating a hypothesis about the future of the system by separating the structural effects of the measures taken to end the crisis from the conjuncture effects. Thus, although the capitalist system regresses in terms of conjuncture, it grasps the minimum threshold where it can reproduce itself structurally and make it possible to maintain this extraordinary situation by taking necessary measures.

As for the effects of this situation in Turkey, as Pamuk (2012: 177) states, the reorganization of the Turkish economy starting from 1934, world economy gaining volume even if it's in a *dirigé* way and maintaining a positive trend in the phase leading to the world war must have reinforced the structural basis of the class domination in Turkey. In this case, the basis of the Kadro group's political practice shifts to the economic and political conflicts in the country from the automatic developments in the international axis, that is, the crisis and resolve. At this point, it can be concluded that the rise of the class encounters a rhetoric that has tougher class references.

[4]Mehmet Şevki, "Buhrandan Korkmayan Sanayi: Harp Sanayi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 27 (Mach 1934): 44.

In the period that we are discussing, the journal offers new suggestions that make direct references to social struggles and possess the possibility of being connected to the concrete class conflicts and possible populist levels. The suggestions can be divided into two main groups. First group of suggestions bring up a discussion about the direct protectionism policy and assessing the state in this sense. However, the emphasis point progressively focuses on the class situation of the state and the legitimization of the satisfaction of private interests of dominant classes on the social level.

If we take a step further, Kadro Journal criticizes the conflict between private and public interests by mentioning its concrete contexts and directly pointing them out, that is, trade bourgeoisie, trading agents and private companies which conduct cartel activities –for example sugar and cement industry. It seriously brings up the proposal to dissolve these sectors. These suggestions can be found in the earlier issues as well; however, in the period of August, 1933 – September, 1934 the arguments get firmer with a rise in their quantity and their reference point changes in terms of quality. For instance, in this period, "populism" is seen for the first time in the pages of the journal, issues where the "social justice" term is used for the first time such as the increase in the purchasing power, labor rights and labor organizations.

4.3 A Critical Terminology Shift: Defense Étatism

First, let's take a look at how the term defense étatism, *müdafaa devletçiliği,* or another use as *müdafaa vasıtası olarak devletçilik,* is used. The origin of this term is based on the fact that the economic development is perceived within a war mentality. Kadro Journal authors frequently use this term following the article written by İsmet İnönü in the issue of October, 1933. Nevertheless, the origin of the term is not the article of İsmet Pasha; but, it is the speech of Mustafa Kemal dated 31.08.1924 in Dumlupınar.[5] At first, we shall look at the first usage of the term; Vedat Nedim quotes this term in the following context and form:

The independence war in economy is nothing but the internal and external continuation of the independence war at the battlefields which has just finished. Those fools who think the war is over since the sound of canons on our borders stopped should listen to the words of Ghazi: 'Regardless of the greatness of the political and military victories; unless they are crowned with an

[5]The source cited is the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper dated August 31, 1924. http://www.atam.gov.tr/ataturkun-soylev-ve-demecleri/dumlupinarda-konusma (24. 05. 2016)

economic victory, they will not be permanent. (…) All forces and tools needed for the defense of the country and the independence can be perfected with the development and advancement of the economy.[6]

In the article of İsmet Pasha which was written for the journal, the term is used more clearly. This clarity is apparent from both the explanation of the reasons for the policies that are to be implemented and pointing out the groups whose interests will potentially conflict with these policies. In his article featured in the twenty-second issue of the journal, İsmet Pasha states as follows;

Étatist policy in economy, showed me its necessity as a defense tool above everything else. Before everything else, factors that can damage the state in terms of economy must be eliminated in order to build a strong state structure that can make up for the centuries of neglect, correct the unjust destructions and resist the tough conditions of the current time. Therefore, we had to acknowledge étatism in economy as a defense tool to pursue it as a development route and hence a decision point and a basis.[7]

The significant point in İsmet Pasha's article is the emphasis of the dissolvation of 'factors' that damage the state economically.[8] Although the state is the focus of the article, Kadro authors will not be late to point out to these 'factors' in more concrete contexts and directly in the intellectual world. For example, in the same issue the journal, the article of Vedat Nedim spots these factors from the very first step and makes threats with sanctions. According to Vedat Nedim;

(…) it can be clearly deduced from these lines how our Chief who explains the national independence cause in all of its integrity, considers economic battle as a defense issue. We must once again establish that those who use the national finance formula as a mask for their private interests can never be worthy citizens for the front of Ghazi.[9]

The assertion of Vedat Nedim which is quoted above is followed by the criticism of Siirt deputy Mahmut (Soydan) in *Milliyet* and his rewrite of İsmet Pasha's essay. Naturally these two essays and their clash is not only a hermeneutic effort. Quite the contrary, it possesses political struggle significance. Mahmut Bey attacks Kadro Journal in his article dated November, 5 1933 without naming anyone as follows; "His Excellency, İsmet Pasha, blocks the claims of irresponsible people who try to make it seem as if étatism within

[6]Vedat Nedim, "İktisatta İstiklal,"*Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 22 (October 1932): 14.
[7]İsmet Paşa, "Fırkamızın Devletçilik Vasfı," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 22 (October 1932): 4.
[8]İsmet Paşa, "Fırkamızın Devletçilik Vasfı," *Kadro*, Vol. II, Issue: 22 (October 1932): 4.
[9]Vedat Nedim, "İktisatta İstiklal," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 22 (October 1932): 15.

the party program is the same as a étatism that dominates communist and Marxist parties."[10]

In the rest of the article tougher statements which make threats with sanctions are used as follows; "It is especially interesting that certain theses which are alleged to be original and national –maybe without being aware- already exist in the congress decisions of the communist party, minutes of these party meetings, the principles of Marxism and its implementation essentials."[11] Mahmut Bey evaluates étatism as a tool and supports the classical argument found in many sources that "étatism enables state to realize things that the individuals cannot" and then points out the fact that it is not possible for the Party Chiefs to use such a language as "(…) we will prevent them from establishing any beneficial enterprise." [12] One day after Mahmut Bey's article was published, Vala Nurettin commented on the article of İsmet Pasha featured in Kadro Journal in his article titled Memleketi mi Yaşatacağız Hususi Menfaatleri mi? (Which one do we want to help survive: The country or the private interests?)[13] and reaches the conclusion that "(…) seemingly what İsmet Pasha means is different from the analysis of Mahmut Bey." (Tekeli and İlkin, 2003: 344).

Again, as we learn from the works of Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 344); Mahmut Bey responds to this article by repeating his views[14], a summary of the articles by İsmet Pasha and Mahmut Bey gets published in İzmir Trade Post[15], in *Cumhuriyet* of November, 9 and Alaettin Cemil feels the necessity to summarize the article by İsmet Pasha.[16] I will not elaborate on each of these articles so as not to divert from the main topic, yet I should mention that the discussions regarding the issue had reverberations in national and general levels and these stemmed from the suspicions that the bourgeoisie being able to control the state

[10]Mahmut (Soydan), "Başvekilin Makalesi: Fırkamızın Devletçilik Vasfı," *Milliyet* 5 November 1933, cited from Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 343).

[11]Mahmut (Soydan), "Başvekilin Makalesi: Fırkamızın Devletçilik Vasfı," *Milliyet* 5 November 1933, cited from Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 343).

[12]Mahmut (Soydan), "Başvekilin Makalesi: Fırkamızın Devletçilik Vasfı," *Milliyet* 5 November 1933, cited from Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 344).

[13]Vala Nurettin, "Memleketi mi Yaşatacağız Hususi Menfaatleri mi?," *Hergün*, 6 November 1933, cited from Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 344).

[14]Mahmut (Soydan), "Nasıl Devletçiyiz?," *Milliyet*, 9 November 1933, cited from Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 344).

[15]Anonymous, "CHF Devletçiliği," *İzmir Ticaret Postası*, 9 November 1933, cited from Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 345).

[16]Alaettin Cemil, "Başvekilimizin Kıymetli Bir Yazısı," *Cumhuriyet*, 9 November 1933 cited from Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 346).

mechanism. This matter has a special significance within the political practice of Kadro Journal. On November, 8 of 1933 privilege holder and author of Kadro Journal, Yakup Kadri, sends a threateningly aggressive letter to Mahmut Bey. Yakup Kadri uses the following statements in the letter (in cited from Tekeli and İlkin, 2003: 578–79);

I cannot read *Milliyet Gazetesi* since it became an ordinary commercial institution. The other day, some young friends who share my opinions suggested that I read "National" Newspaper in order to be informed about the comments concerning the article by Pasha published by Kadro Journal. (…) Those who engage in commercial activities despite their minister status, like you, should at least know that violation in thought and press world is an incredibly powerful weapon. For example, what would you do if one of the Marxist youngsters: "Mahmut Bey is (…)" Without a doubt you would be shocked. It must be noted that the cosmopolitics (…) are as much indecent as internationalist (Marx) are harmful to the national motherland economy.

Following these statements, Yakup Kadri uses the following statements that remind everyone that Kadroists have the backing of Kemalist leadership (in cited from Tekeli and İlkin, 2003: 578); "(…) The works done by some of them have the honor of being close to and appreciated by directly our great Chief and what you are attempting to say about them is only a slander."

The end of this dispute means victory for Kadroists. As Yakup Kadri states in his memoirs, the dispute abruptly comes to an end as a result of Mustafa Kemal calling Mahmut (Soydan) Bey and ordering him to stop at once (Karaosmanoğlu, 1955: 24). We see that the issue ends in victory for Kadro as it holds an overly confident and daring attitude against the bourgeoisie in the later issues of the Journal. We know that there were no interventions towards Kadroists in this date while Mustafa Kemal calls and silences Mahmut Bey. In the November, 1933 issue of the journal, it takes an offensive position against Mahmut Bey, who has no possibility of defending himself, with an article titled an Open Letter to Siirt Deputy Mahmut Bey. In this article, Mahmut (Soydan) Bey is accused of diverting from the CHF's party discipline and even as far as of committing treason. Here, the Kadro group skillfully uses Mustafa Kemal's authority as the foundation of its own authority.It's important to take a look at certain statements in the article, for example;

(…) this issue which you bring up in your daily comments and discussions, is an issue that cannot allow such a discussion because the article of our Prime Minister titled "The Étatism Trait of Our Party" is not an ordinary article that everyone can disrespectfully mention or put in daily newspaper comments on

a whim: It is a DIRECTIVE (…). And you should also know that directives can be given or received yet they cannot be INTERPRETED![17]

In the rest of the article, Kadroists lecture Mahmut Bey regarding the party discipline as follows and they continue their victorious tone with ironic references;

You could have voiced your worries and assessments over the "Étatism Trait of Our Party (…) in person in the party. This would have been more appropriate so as for you to be in a better position now and so as not to allow the matter that you threw in midst of daily discussions to be disrespectfully misused by this and that. If that were the case, either in Hakimiyeti Milliye columns or in party chairs, the party staff that thinks and reacts like our Prime Minister would naturally tirelessly try to sooth your worries and sorrows regarding the issue of the étatist characteristic of our party.[18]

Another significant aspect of the mentioned article of İsmet Pasha for Kadroists is that it enables making a precise judgment concerning how seriously the étatism policy is handled and for how long it will be continued, meaning whether it is a temporary measure to save the day. The following statements in the article of İsmet Pasha inform everyone that the étatism policy is long term; "At the end of the upcoming decade, hopefully, Turkish étatism with its works in the country and its international effects, will be remembered as the most advanced science and the masterpiece of the étatism in economy."[19]

Kadro Journal turns these statements into a slogan immediately and presents them to the attention of all groups of the society. The long-term nature of the policy is presented as follows in the Journal; "The second decade of the Republic will pass under the rule of the étatism principle. The sides of real revolutionaries and fake revolutionaries will be decided around this principle and only then the entire nation will begin to taste the victory of Dumlupınar under a flag of an excited economic mobilization."[20] It is not difficult to see that the étatism as a long term policy is quite important for the realization of Kadroist project. After this point Kadro Journal will attempt to reveal its project with all of its dimensions and as it is expressed in the quotation above, it would try to determine the *pro et con* sides by taking étatism as a reference point.

[17] Anonymous, "Siirt Meb'usu Mahmut Beyefendiye Açık Mektup," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 41.

[18] Anonymous, "Siirt Meb'usu Mahmut Beyefendiye Açık Mektup," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 41–42.

[19] İsmet Paşa, "Fırkamızın Devletçilik Vasfı," *Kadro*,Vol. II, Issue: 22 (October 1932): 6.

[20] Anonymous, "Slogan," *Kadro*, Vol. II, Issue: 22 (October 1933): 17.

4.4 The Debate on "the New State" and "the New Society"

After establishing that the étatism is a long-term policy, a new discussion is brought up in Kadro Journal regarding the structure and mission of the state. In this discussion the terminology that the Journal uses expands to include the terms "new state" (for references of this term; Ersanlı, 2003: 134) and "new society" and the criticism done earlier using the term liberalism becomes much tougher directly under the title of capitalist development. The leading role of the state in the development strategy causes a discussion regarding "ruling the society" and its legitimate methods and a direct criticism of a social formation oriented by class interests are seen on the pages of the journal. The emergence of the issue of ruling the society and in reality its portrayal as an authority problem can be observed in the following paragraph;

High technique and big capital are the elements that determine the nature of the social rise and faith of a modern society. Whoever uses the high technique and accumulated capital in a modern society, rules the society. The state which does not actively withhold the high technique and big capital is like an unable guard that does not have the authority to actively intervene in contradicting interests in the country.[21]

The portrayal of this authority problem is not excluded from the discussion about capitalism and class issue. That is, the emphasis of classless society that shifted to the literature on the Kadro movement points not to the current situation but to the destination which is desired. Vedat Nedim explains this situation in a succinct way as follows; "In countries where the center of gravity of the economic life is private entrepreneurships, a miracle that can prevent the existence of classes and the conflicts amongst them is yet to be found."[22]

According to Vedat Nedim; "Capitalist industrialization immediately leads to class conflicts and disputes. Class conflicts and disputes are like the shadow of capitalist industrialization."[23] The protective policy adopted for industrialization, since it allows the control of state sources for the bourgeoisie, appears to be an element policy that actually improves the class domination. In his same article, Vedat Nedim deals with the situation as follows; "Individualist protective policy aims that a small group becomes necessarily industrialized thanks to the state protection. Therefore, it causes the emergence of classes."[24]

[21] Şevket Süreyya, "Yürüyen Devlet," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue:25 (January 1934): 6.

[22] Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Yolunda Aydınlık," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 15.

[23] Vedat Nedim, "Sanayileşme Davası," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 24 (December 1933): 17.

[24] Vedat Nedim, "Sanayileşme Davası," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 24 (December 1933): 18.

As a direct example to this situation it is mentioned in an unsigned article featured in the twenty seventh issue of the journal that the demands to limit the production are addressed to the state representatives who meet with the industrial bourgeoisie due to the industry program. These demands which aim to sustain the cartel profits are regarded by the journal as follows;

The profits that are considered to be low cause these ideas of limited production. (…) perhaps the industrialists are right with their demand even if they are at the expense of the country being left without an industry. Nevertheless, this demand can never be accepted for the interest of the country.[25]

Based on the article of İsmet Pasha featured in the journal, Kadroists claim that the state support and private enterprise are already interlinked and finally the private enterprise has become unable to function without the support of the state in a crisis. This situation will open the way for the possibility of the state redistributing its resources differently. If the state is involved in the economy to the extent of being able to encompass the private entrepreneurship it can also do business instead of just protective activities. These lines published in the journal reaches the conclusion that the state is involved to the extent of being able to encompass the private enterprise;

It can be clearly understood from the words of the man who stands above us all [referring to the article of İsmet Pasha] that we do not exactly have a single private enterprise like the initiatives which were born in the liberal economy period of Europe. All of ours survive with the sacrifices and protection of the state. Thus, without any hesitation it can be suggested that all of our entrepreneurships are state initiatives. These are some who believe as follows regarding the portrayal of the truth with this manner: 'Not only Turkish state but all others as well protect the private enterprise. This is the most natural task of a state.'[26]

In another part of the article, he continues his criticism of the previously established protectionism argument as follows;

We are not sure for how much longer it can be considered a policy for the greater good of the unity of state and nation that the state continues to make sacrifices in favor of the entrepreneurs and against its own budget in a time when it tries with difficulty to balance its own budget. If there needs to be a sacrifice on the part of nation and the state in order to build an industry

[25] Anonymous, "Rakkamların Anlattığı Sanayi II," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 27 (March 1934): 50.

[26] Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Yolunda Aydınlık," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 14.

in Turkey, we must make this sacrifice for the well-being of our financial integrity and sovereignty. Nonetheless, this should aim the benefit for the state and indirectly the nation. Individualism-based protectionism policy is a policy that consumes the budget resources of the state (…). The industrialization of Turkey means that the national markets are attached to the national industry that is the nationalization of the profits gone abroad due to exportation. Yet, the individualist protectionism policy makes these profits individualistic.[27]

The key point of the issue acquires a different quality with Kadroists handling the issue in a new different context concerning the lack of legitimization basis for the support of state for the private enterprices. The question about the base of legitimimacy of the protectionist policy hangs on the air in the daily conjuncture in many aspects according to Kadroists. One again in the words of Vedat Nedim the Kadroist reference point of the legitimization problem emerges as follows;

(…) the ignorance is apparent in the tendency to copy the policies of other states without taking into consideration our national conditions. What should we do regardless of what the other states are doing? What sort of policy can enable the protection of higher interests of the country and the nation?[28]

This point is principally conveyed in the opion that "Turkish state is an institution that protects the interest of the entire Turkish nation, not those of a group within the nation."[29] It is clear that this argument essentially involves severing the link between the state and the bourgeoisie in favor of a socialist understanding that refers to the national scale.

However, it would be a mistake to regard this opinion just as the ideological position of the bourgeoisie as this function that is undertaken by the state is situated in an extraordinary position on the scheme of existing social classes. An article of the *Kooperatif* Journal (Cooperative) author, Ahmet Hamdi, featured in Kadro Journal discusses the topic of the function of the state in a broader context. In this article the following statements are used;

There is currently a class that is dissolved and its missions are taken over by the state. However, this new revolution is not just about replacing a class with the state control: just as liberalism is not about replacing the feudalism with the bourgeoisie. The revolution that the world is going through is replacing

[27]Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Yolunda Aydınlık," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 15.

[28]Vedat Nedim, "Sanayileşme Davası," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 24 (December 1933): 20.

[29]Vedat Nedim, "Sanayileşme Davası," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 24 (December 1933): 18.

the conditions of old society, its views on domination and legal and economic relations and judgments with new conditions.[30]

It is fact that even though Kadro and Kooperatif Journals are allies on the common basis regarding the support for étatism policy they do not always agree with each other in terms of the functions of the policy and that Ahmet Hamdi is not inclined to Kadro radicalism. In spite of this, certain articles featured in Kadro journal are coincidental; they are published to support the theses of the journal. For example, a month prior to the publishing of Ahmet Hamdi's article, İsmail Hüsrev's article touches upon similar points. According to İsmail Hüsrev;

Establishing new socialist social relations upon rational technique will necessarily result in the changes of the economic perception and mentality. In today's national economic system an individualist and profit-based economic mentality is observed. All of the economic activities are oriented in compliance with the emergence ways of this mentality. The subjective action force of every initiative that exists or is in the progress of being established is the principle of making profit. Nonetheless, state industry, state economy and integral understanding of economy has an economic mentality that aims the well-being of the entirety of the nation not necessarily prioritizing the profit making. The motivation of economic activities is no longer the maximum profit principle; it will be the principle to ensure the maximum development of the production forces for the well-being of each and every citizen of the nation.[31]

4.5 Class Interests and State Sanctions: Efforts to Establish a Legitimate Foundation

It constitutes the backbone of Kadro group's thesis to ensure the general welfare, to increase the production and consumption and to put the role of state in the center in terms of development process and distribution functions. The reason of this thesis stems from the failure of the private sector, the issue of national independence and limited resources and the problem with gradual financing of the development. For example, the slogan in the twenty-first issue states as follows; "National industry establishments, which require protection from the state and sacrifice and patience from the nation, should only be established

[30] Ahmet Hamdi, "Ahmet Hamdi Beyin Mühim Bir Yazısı," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 28 (April 1934): 43.

[31] İsmail Hüsrev, "Beş Senelik Sanayi Programının Manası," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 27 (March 1934): 30.

under the control of the state." [32]

The actual center role of the state in the use and distribution of these resources results in decision rights regarding the areas of use as well. This brings the principle of the distribution of resources and the legitimization of this principle to the questioning of Kadro group. Even though the criticism of the private sector is not clearly put forward like the populism, the arguments which do not define the basis for the legitimization of class interests for the sake of common welfare stem from this context. We can quote a statement which is used in the twenty-second issue of the journal as a slogan to exemplify. The slogan which we assume to be the common opinion of the journal authors is as follows;

The industry establishments that are made profitable with the aid of state involvement and state budget should remain under the control of the state and their profits should be kept by the state. As every citizen has real capital shares in the creation of this profit even though they do not literally own stock certificates.[33]

Following the analysis of the limited resources, their taking over by the state for 'more legitimate' state activities, their management and similar other issues lead to the instrumentalization of that state through the conflict with dominant classes and based on these conflicts in a way that can found the 'new society'. Now, let's briefly take a look at the arguments of new state and new society found in Kadro Journal in this context.

Interestingly, the article which uses the term of new state most clearly is by Mehmet İlhan who is not a permanent author of the journal but occasionally sends articles to it. In the article of Mehmet İlhan which he sent to the twenty second issue of the journal and in the period following the article, the term is used more often in the journal. The title of the article that we will quote in the following sentences is 'What can be understood from the new state in Turkey?' According to Mehmet İlhan; "The new state originates from the nation, it searches for welfare means for the nation. It is not sycophancy for any fraction or a group; it adopts as a main target to ensure the well-functioning of the society and non-conflict among citizens."[34]

Naturally, this opinion is based on the criticism of the state structure which is described as the liberal order in the Journal. According to Şevket Süreyya,

[32]Anonymous, "Slogan," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 38.

[33]Anonymous, "Slogan," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 20 (August 1933): 36.

[34]Mehmet İlhan, "İnkılabın Anlaşılması Yolunda: Halkın Karşısında Bürokrat," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 22 (October 1933): 40.

"Since liberal individuals take opposing positions against each other actively and to the state theoretically, the cause of the law is nothing but the state not intervening so that the powerful can dominate the weak."[35] It should be noted that this opinion is categorically Marxist. In addition, the arguments concerning the historical existence of the classes, which is an issue that is at times discussed in the journal, is not outside the Marxist scheme either. For example the assessment of İsmail Hüsrev concerning the matter is as follows;

We cannot find any classless societies in the social systems from the periods following the resolve of the primitive commune based on common property and the establishment of the social differentiation up till now. The social differentiation is the principal quality of all societies. However, all of the social systems that ever existed in history have had social classes and conflicts of their own. For example, we can classify them as the slave owners in Greek and Roman societies; the feudal lords and serfs in medieval times and labor and capital today.[36]

The section of the journal that we are analyzing is quite precise and clear concerning the current existence of class struggle. For instance, Şevket Süreyya leaves the following footnote regarding the struggle of powerful and weak; "It is known that the struggle between the powerful and weak has transformed into labor and capital in the industrial state."[37]

Parallel to this opinion, the existence of classes in Turkey is discussed as follows;

(…) according to this departure point, let's see the social foundation of the Turkish society. Presumably, we cannot be considered to be a classless nation. This type of opinion goes against the nature of property as wherever we look in the country, we notice people groups that differentiated from each other depending on their ranks they assume in production and source of income.[38]

In the rest of the article, İsmail Hüsrev shares his final judgment. In his opinion; "It can be understood from the social groupings in agriculture, industry and trade fields that the nation structure of Turkey is subject to laws seen in every liberal and individualist society."[39] This means that social classes exist within the current structure and have the potential for development.

[35] Şevket Süreyya, "İnkılap Hukuku," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (February 1934): 8.
[36] İsmail Hüsrev, "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 25 (March 1934): 37.
[37] Şevket Süreyya, "İnkılap Hukuku," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (February 1934): 8.
[38] İsmail Hüsrev, "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (April 1934): 20.
[39] İsmail Hüsrev, "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (April 1934): 22.

Şevket Süreyya summarizes the form of the Turkish society if its foundation basis remains the same as follows;

(…) this development of the social labor division in our country will on one hand lead to new production units and reconciliation fields in agricultural and industrial production; on the other hand, it will divide the children of Turkey into social groups based on the quality of their relations to production and labor. In societies where labor and economic affairs are not planned in a social and étatist manner these social groups are called classes.[40]

İsmail Hüsrev evaluates the point where Turkish society will end up in case it develops without changing its present social structure in a similar manner as follows;

The nation always contains and raises elements that can shake its integrity at any time as potential forces within itself. Turkish nation will no doubt end up with being divided into conflicting parts one day as a possible result if it keeps pursuing this liberal and individualist route.[41]

The suggestion of these authors who make these warnings is state having an active position in the most serious manner. This position should not only be perceived as the embodiment of the state institutions but also controlling the position of the organization of production and division of dominant classes. Discussing the issue in this way, contrary to the image of Kadro Journal in the literature, ends its perception as an ideology journal or a defender of development and puts it in the scheme of class conflict. İsmail Hüsrev handles the issue as follows;

It is necessary that we take an active position towards the entire nation unity, nation integrity in terms of current classes and classes in formation. There is nothing else other than the state's security forces and state laws to fight against those who wish to utilize political actions for individualistic and group interests. Nevertheless, what is underneath these security forces and state laws, that is, the liberal and individualistic development of the nation continues to develop in its natural course. However, there needs to be a complimentary revolutionary action along with state forces and authority, which can unite the national body organically and will not allow any reaction from the left or right in the future.[42]

[40] Şevket Süreyya, "İş Kanunu Yeni Cemiyetin Temel Kanunlarından Biridir," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 30 (June 1934): 5.

[41] İsmail Hüsrev, "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (April 1934): 22.

[42] İsmail Hüsrev, "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (April 1934): 22.

We will discuss the appearance of the mentioned position as concrete suggestions in the following sections. Let's briefly mention the impact that this position aims to create in the context of the new society. Firstly, as it is mentioned above, the founding principle and legitimization basis of the 'active position' to be assumed must be determined. This principle based on common interests shall be the dissolve of the objective foundations of class domination. Of course, due to the political strategy of Kadro Journal the dissolve of all dominant classes in the way prescribed by socialist theory and practice is not featured in the journal. Nonetheless, the state control over sectors having central importance that are associated with many sectors of world economy or national economy and that determine the route for formation development eliminates the determining quality of the dominant classes over social development. İsmail Hüsrev deals with the basis of the dissolvation activities based on common interests and the position of Kadro Journal as follows;

In all of our publications, we took "national integrity" as an action and offence point. In our opinion, Turkish nation is integral on the inside as much as it is on the outside. We consider class and group conflicts within the society and class and group domination whether it's from top-down or bottom-up as backward actions that hinder nation integrity. The dissolvation of class domination is one of the advanced principles of national independence movement. It's the initial and final national interest. Therefore, the viewpoint of "Kadro" community it is "social integrity". [43]

As for the notion of new society that would stem from this movement, it is characterized by the state dissolving the conflicts in an authoritarian manner and replacing the class relations with its own organization. According to Şevket Süreyya;

(…) since the conflicts amongst individuals are actively and entirely pushed into the background and the conflict between individuals and the state will be virtually dissolved, the main basis of this system is the state involvement in all social affairs. Moreover, it is not only and involvement but it is the state managing and regulating all of these affairs de facto. In the new regime, the theoretical and material basis of the state authority comes from the necessity of dissolving the conflicts within the society.[44]

As it is explained before, it can be observed that the Journal establishes the necessity of state authority in terms of taking over the control of other classes and individuals and directing them towards a certain path. Let's now take a

[43] İsmail Hüsrev, "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 25 (March 1934): 34.
[44] Şevket Süreyya, "İnkılap Hukuku," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (February 1934): 8.

look at how the Journal establishes the functional basis of state authority and field of action by quoting two statements from Şevket Süreyya. According to Şevket Süreyya;

Since revolution, due to its significance in terms of previous events, means the forceful connection of will and interests of certain people to those of others, discipline, prestige and authority become obligatory and inseparable elements in this sense. From this perspective, a revolutionary state, above all, (…) has to be authoritarian organization that is the natural representative for revolutionary tendencies and builds its authority through it.[45]

The field of action where the state will actively use its authority is determined as follows;

State is an organization whose mission is principally intervene in the structure of the society and reestablish this structure without any classes and privileged groups. As a result, within this structure, it should be present as an organization that encompasses not only the administrative and political but also founding, regulative, operative of big capital and wide economic functions and activities of it. [46]

There can be no possibility to find any class conflicts among the participants of this new structure. According to Şevket Süreyya;

In societies where labor and economic affairs are controlled under a social and étatist plan and hence the largest production tools are regulated by the state, the hegemon of the society are not classes. Because, there are no conflict of interests between the labor and production branches; furthermore, the state that is basically their representative organization does not conflict any of their economic interests either.[47]

It is noted that one of the social consequence of the étatism attempt is ensuring the social justice. According to Vedat Nedim; "The state taking over the industry branches which need state protection and the sacrifice of the nation is not only a requirement for our national interest but also it is so for the social justice."[48] Even though this term is not sufficiently explained, articles, which underline the increase in purchase power through the reorganization of

[45]Şevket Süreyya, "Beynelmilel Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi III: Türk Nasyonalizmi (Devam ve Son)," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 10.

[46]Şevket Süreyya, "Yeni Devletin İktisadi Fonksiyonları," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 29 (May 1934): 11.

[47]Şevket Süreyya, "İş Kanunu Yeni Cemiyetin Temel Kanunlarından Biridir," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 30 (June 1934): 6.

[48]Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Yolunda Aydınlık," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 16.

arelations of distribution, can be qualified as the visible representation/use of the concept of social justice. The journal publishes a series of articles which highlight the increase in economic value of the labor force on the occasion of the Labor Law which circulate in the sub-commission of the National Assembly after 1932 as a draft law and reemerges in the agenda in 1934 in a way that includes the syndicate law as well. It should be reminded that the Labor Law draft enters into force in 1936 in a manner that disregards the organization right of the working class (Makal, 1999: 354). According Şevket Süreyya,

The unvalued state of the labor force is a negative economic phenomenon which is a characteristic of former semi-colonized states and now it should be one of our national principles to raise our national economy in the development course to the valued level it deserves which also includes the national technique, national capital and national economic organization.[49]

More theoretically, the perception of social justice can be associated with the changes in the context of worker and employer. In the article of İsmail Hüsrev which he wrote for the twenty seventh issue of the journal where he comments on the Five Year Industry Program, he points to the context changes mentioned above. In his words;

As a result of the foundation of state industry, the form of relations between the workers and employers will change. The state industry will be the scene of the social relations between the state which is the representative of the entire nation and the members of the nation who assume tasks; it will not be relations of the employer and the employee. (…) State industry will lead to the present system acquiring a social appearance by giving it a populist element; it will not bring a class based element to the populist ["Halkçı"] order of the national economy.[50]

4.6 Class Interests and Representation: The Problem of Intellectuals in Kadro

This part presents the details developed by the Kadro members regarding their understanding of étatism in a more advanced manner, and examines their arguments that constitute a direct threat through state sanctions. The arguments are formed both for the support of the articulation concerning the early republican reforms under the Kemalist leadership and against all potential

[49] Şevket Süreyya, "İş Kanunu, Cemiyetin Temel Kanunlarından Biridir II: Kıymetsiz "Sa'y'den Kıymetli "Sa'y'e," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 31 (July 1934): 5.

[50] İsmail Hüsrev, "Beş Senelik Sanayi Programının Manası," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 27 (March 1934): 29.

class interests which oppose the advancement route of étatism drawn by Kadro. It is evident that in the period of the Journal with which we are dealing, the class related context of the arguments opposing étatism are not in the other issues. First of all, there is the categorical analysis of those who oppose étatism. The words of Şevket Süreyya clearly put forward the position of Kadro concerning this matter. According to Şevket Süreyya;

(…) those who oppose étatism in the new regime favor conflict and dispute because the functions that they acquire and represent within the society depend solely on the conflicts of [private] interest in society. Since the rectification of these conflicts equally means the rectification of their material and moral interests and missions, all of their cause that opposes étatism includes the following:

1- State not intervening in economic affairs,

2- On the other hand, keeping the profits open to the exploitation of limited groups, which should actually belong to the society, by subjecting all state forces to the will of their own high economic interest and will. [51]

As for the article of Vedat Nedim[52], it creates the context that Kadro will precisely discuss: Étatism is a 'principle of revolution' and those who oppose it should be dispersed like those who opposed other principles. This context is strong enough to force silence upon the étatism opponents. Furthermore, it should be noted that in the later years Recep Peker makes statements regarding the possible criminal sanctions imposed on those who speak against étatism and this causes great discussions in the party group. Thus, it can be claimed that the position of Kadro complies with the radical wing in the party. It is useful to repeat a point that we mentioned related to the commentary on İsmet Pasha's article on étatism; it has not been fully clarified yet in the early 1930s with what purpose and how concretely this principle will be implemented. That's why there is a serious effort both in CHP and the media towards the interpretation of the étatism principle or more thoroughly implementing it to the class scheme without any problems. We see that the reason why is that dominant classes cannot take an unquestioningly commanding position over the economic order of any fraction.

When we observe the categorization of Vedat Nedim, discussions over the étatism principles gain sense as follows;

[51] Şevket Süreyya, "İnkılap Hukuku," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 26 (February 1934): 8.

[52] Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 15.

There are those who desire to use the étatism principle of our revolution as an object like a banana which change its taste depending on intended purposes. Because this principle:

1-Directly attacks the material interests of opposing groups,

2-Is not yet an attributed to our state policy,

3-Necessitates a mentality system that fundamentally contradicts the traditions and tendencies of a liberal and individualist worldview.[53]

These three articles are quite significant because the content of the first article means taking an opposing position against the bourgeoisie. It's taken into consideration that the étatism policy is not devised as a mere policy but as a first step of a new system and it can be foreseen that all classes and fractions that control the means of production tools -omitting the small scale production- will be on the axis of this conflict is we remember the possible branches in the reorganization of agricultural production. For example, Vedat Nedim expands the discussion to almost all sectors of the economy and attaches the group to the individual context, that is, with an indirect narrative like Aesop's fables, the class context as follows: "those whose private and group interests will be damaged due to the implementation of a étatist finance policy in the fields of industry and agriculture are no doubt against the étatism principle of our revolution."[54]

The concrete political emphasis of the Journal concerning the public interests emerges this way. The concrete context of the thesis of "what matters is the interest of the country not whether it should be state initiative or private initiative"[55] is stated as follows; "Étatism directly attacks the material interests of the various groups."[56] This attack is already clearly perceived by the dominant classes who lost no time to start a battle against Kadro Journal. The polemics that we mention on various occasions occur in this manner and this is the meaning of the 'intellectual resistance', that is, the third article quoted above. The meaning of the second article is quite clear: the importance of ending all discussions about étatism within the party and establishing it within a constitutional system in order to defeat this resistance. The protection and continuation of étatism, which would become a constitutional principle with

[53]Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 15.

[54]Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 17.

[55]Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Yolunda Aydınlık," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 14.

[56]Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 15.

the pressure forces of the state, should be legitimate and efficient. Vedat Nedim clearly states this as follows;

There are even those who go as far to dare to claim that the étatism principle is temporary. If the understanding and criticism of the étatism principle as a temporary tool today is not considered as a vile bigotry like claiming that the republicanism and secularism principles are temporary, it's because this principle is yet to be a law.[57]

Below these statements, the article of İbrahim Fazıl Bey on April 13, 1933 in *Akşam* newspaper and the article of Mehmet Saffet Bey written for the fourth issue of *Varlık* journal are, so to speak, journalized as footnotes. According to the head article featured in the twenty first issue of the journal, those who attack the étatism principle actually direct their spite to this point as they cannot do so to the other principles. When they achieve to abolish étatism, they will move on to attacking other principles. We can quote the following statements from the head article;

(…) unfortunately étatism has become a stage where those, who cannot deny our national regime completely, can freely express their spite and anger. (…) next thing the following will be voiced;

- Secularity is one of our national principles yet it is temporary!
- Nationalism is one of our national principles yet it is temporary!
- Republicanism is one of our national principles yet it is temporary!

Etc. Etc.[58]

Now let's take a look at Vedat Nedim's explanations on the first article. In his opinion;

(…) an étatist policy on economy which prioritizes the public interests above all will naturally have to clash with private interest groups in many fields. For example, today the representatives of a set of low technique industries that are built with the aid of privileges given by industrial subsidies law, the protection of our customs tariff, protection of our trade policy and customs and tax exemptions, unsurprisingly will not applaud the implementation of an étatist industrial policy. A national industry in terms of an étatist policy does not mean that a small group can be reinforced at the expense of sacrifices done with the national budget and state vaults.[59]

[57] Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 18.

[58] Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 4.

[59] Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933):15–16.

Vedat Nedim elaborates and finalizes his criticism as follows;

Even though the Turkish étatism is not a system that desired to control all economic activities, it is not a capitalist protectionism that says 'I got your back. You can work and profit however you like' either. Yet today, the principle that dominates the industrial private enterprises in Turkey is only the profit calculations of the private initiators. And the state is perceived as an institution that is obliged to take measures for the achievement of these profits. Although the group that receives the most protection and subsidies are the industrial groups, they never seem content as a result of their low and backward capital, technique and information and they always request protection. However, they do not lean towards making commitments in exchange. An étatist industrial policy will naturally end the group policy that supports the aforementioned conditions.[60]

The route that Kadro Journal chooses to sustain this struggle is to include étatism in the context of other revolution principles and supervise it the same way. This issue which is systematically discussed in the Journal initially begins as the classification of certain intellectuals as liberals – through polemics. Nevertheless, in the period that we are going to discuss, this criticism is qualified as directly opposing the regime and "obscurantism" and is stated more harshly. According to Vedat Nedim;

(…) an étatist policy cannot sacrifice even fifty cents to industrial establishments which can only survive thanks to state protection, that is, the national sacrifices –today, the most of the industrial establishments are of this kind. Such as protectionism policy that works in favor of a small minority of the nation conflicts with populism and nationalism principles of our revolution.[61]

Taking a step further, it should be noted that there is a shift from the context of the earlier issues of the journal where étatism made sense on its own to the new context where it is associated with other revolution principles. For instance, the following paragraph vehemently argues that the principle of étatism ought to be supported as the revolution principles;

The sycophancy and infidelity are natural obscurantism phenomena that every revolution and advanced movement in history have faced and always combated. Nonetheless, as much as it's faith that this obscurantism appears

[60] Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 16.

[61] Vedat Nedim, "Devletçilik Karşısında Zümre Menfaati ve Münevver Mukavemeti," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 16.

with every forward action, it is also a natural and inevitable law and obligation of the history that every time it appears it will be mercilessly rectified.[62]

This shift, along with its aspect depending on defending the revolution principles, also brings the principles known as Kemalist principles to the Kadroist interpretation. We can quote a comment that has become a slogan as an example;

The style of individualism in profit and étatism in deficit, which can be welcome in certain countries, is in a state of conflict with populism, étatism and nationalism principles all three of which are included in our national principles. As a result, we consider it the original principle of the Turkish economic nationalism to let the state have all profit and deficit of the affairs it conducts and leave all the deficit and profit of the non-state activities to those who conduct them.[63]

4.7 Concluding Remarks

In epitome, this chapter argued characteristics of Kadro movement developed and revised in the period between August 1933 and September 1934. In this period, that mentioned in the chapter above, Kadro journal stated more 'avaguard' thesis which directly struggled with the not only Turkish bourgeoisie's beneficiary articulation with the state, but also the legitimacy among the society with refered to the general interest. In this chapter, Kadro group's thesis about the legitimacy of étatism and nationalization is mentioned that, in accordance with the abstract or principal arguments, Kadro journal argued more specific and concrete proposals such as critics about[64] and nationalization of the sugar industry[65], coal industry[66], cement industry[67], treadmill industry[68] and also foreign trade[69]. One step further, Kadro journal

[62]Anonymous, "Kadro," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 4.

[63]Anonymous, "Slogan," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 20 (August 1933): 42.

[64]Şevket Süreyya, "Milli İktisat planı ve Şeker Sanayimiz," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 6.; Şevket Süreyya, "Şeker Mütehasısının Raporu Ne İçin Eksiktir?," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 30 (June 1934): 42.

[65]Anonymous, "Slogan," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 40. Anonymous, "Slogan," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 50.

[66]Vedat Nedim, "Kömürde Devletçilik," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 25 (January 1934): 18.

[67]Vedat Nedim, "Çimento Sanayiinde Devletçilik," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 27 (March 1934): 21–22.

[68]Anonymous, "Rakkamların Anlattığı Sanayi. III.," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 28 (April 1934): 39.

[69]Vedat Nedim, "Dış Ticarette Devletçilik," *Kadro*, Vol. III, Issue: 26 (February 1934): 14. Burhan Asaf, "Planlı Dış Ticaret ve Dış-Ticaret Ofisleri," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 28 (April 1934): 33.

also codify advanced arguments on agricultural organization in this period in terms of nationalization and reorganization of tobacco farming[70], production of small scale peasanty[71], and also make a agricultural reformation[72]. These samples exposes the most avanguard form of étatism which Kadro movement mentioned. At the end of this period, in paralel with the rise of bourgeoisie, while the Kadro movement started to revaluate domestic classes and producer's-labourer's rights on the national income, there is not a coincidance that the Journal forced to be closed.

Ultimately, considering the unity among the industries mentioned above, it becomes clear that the ultimate project of Kadro group is to connect almost all medium and larger scale production areas and regulate production in these areas through state control and regulation. This type of arrangement would mean at least the nationalization or state regulation of all production capable of supplying goods to the market -and making a profit- and the integration of subsistence economic units into the state sector. Furthermore, the regulation of distribution relations by the state and the increase in the share of value produced by the producing classes are also emphasized issues. Consequently, since the institutionalization of this new role of the state can be achieved by transferring resources that would otherwise go to the capitalist profit fund to the state and allocating them to consumption, this idea, if taken to its extreme, amounts to the same as the liquidation of the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the idea of creating a developmental national economy, insofar as it is combined with the idea of the nation-state and an authoritarian regime, transforms into the national socialism of the Kadro group. This project makes no democratic distinction whatsoever regarding non-Muslim communities and minority groups such as the Kurds, which suggests that the authority required by the process of social transformation is being legitimized through a harsh nationalist perspective. On the other hand, it is clear that this perspective is not very compatible with bourgeois circles and their understanding of nationalism. To the extent that the Kadro journal developed this kind of understanding of nationalism, which would precede Third Worldism, and concretely extended its proposals to different sectors, it was pushed to the margins of power –and

[70]Anonymous, "Ankara İkinci Tütün Kongresi," *Kadro* Vol. III, Issue: 28 (April 1934): 45.

[71]İsmail Hüsrev, "Türk Köylüsünü Topraklandırmalı Fakat Nasıl?," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 23 (November 1933): 38–39.

[72]İsmail Hüsrev, "Türk Köylüsü Bir Toprak Reformu Bekliyor," *Kadro* Vol. II, Issue: 21 (September 1933): 21.

this situation offers a general opinion about the fundamental characteristics of the existing regime of the time.

In the final analysis, the last issues of the Kadro journal seem to have resulted in a final and desperate push and a crash against the invisible walls of the bourgeois character of the regime. While the writers emphasized the inefficiencies of various industries, the harsh conditions after 1929 crises, and the need for a broad transformation ranging from agriculture to trade to reform the industry, they seem to have overlooked the fact that the current political power actually rests upon these very forces. One of the main reasons for this is that they don't know whether the revolutionary government has social support, or to what extent it enjoys public consent. In principle, the idea that the new republic needs to redistribute economic resources, restructure production relations, and organize this under a nationalist-authoritarian regime in order to generate consent can be considered operational in certain extent. However, whether the government possesses the initial consent and power to carry out such a transformation, and whether it can survive without maintaining contact with the existing ruling classes, does not seem to have been sufficiently considered in the Kadroist project.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion and Final Comments on the Kadro Movement

The unique nature of the 1930s must be associated with the end of the uneven and combined development format which had been pursued by Turkey since the middle of 19th century till the end of 1920s, and which had shaped the Ottoman-Turkish social formation in an aggressive manner. According to Trotsky (1978: 147);

It is false that world economy is simply a sum of national parts of one and the same type. It is false that the specific features are 'merely supplementary to the general features', like warts on a face. In reality, the national peculiarities represent an original combination of the basic features of the world process.

Until the 1930s, the combined development course of the social formation had been established based on the articulation with the world economy. Furthermore, the specific structure of the formative unity was determined based on the conflict and connection course of various social classes and fractions as well as the social groups that were organized/supported by the former two (local trade bourgeois, foreign bourgeois fractions, non-Moslems, small scale landlords and as such). Keyder (1982: 9) asserts that the economic and political position of the early republic stemmed from the reformation of the 19th-Century-Ottoman-Empire or, in the vernacular of the day, the accomplishment of the structural adjustment activities and the development of it, according to the conjuncture.

Whereas, in the 1930s combined development was cast aside by the local powers and the national economies oriented towards autarchy due to the Great Depression in the 1930s that had impacted the entire world. This new tendency of the local powers helped eliminating the "uneven" system or at least made an effort to make it manageable. Therefore, it can be argued that the form of the uneven and combined development in the 19th century or the phase, if regarded more broadly, ended and a new form came to be. It can be described as follows: The transition from a phase of combination based on connection to

an interregnum period where disintegration emanated and a search for a new combination format began.

The main characteristics of the aforementioned period can be found in the works of Gülalp (1987: 59) and Polanyi (2011: 66). In the first section of Gülalp's work, it can be deduced that the crisis of 1929 had led to a crisis in the government system and the state itself as it disturbed the relations between the social classes and the world economy in Turkey or even Latin America (1987: 23). The most significant inflection point of the said disintegration for both Turkey and the other members of the world system had been the decision of the UK to abandon the gold standard (Polanyi, 2013: 66). The fact that the UK had abandoned the system would mean that the very hegemon of the system deemed it unsustainable, which evidently would have a world scale impact. This occurrence is further explained in the Kadro Journal. If we continue with the same example, it can be seen that the USA had continued to stay in the system for a certain period after the withdrawal of the UK. This action of the USA can be interpreted as an attempt at an easy victory by the new candidate for hegemony of the system. However, the USA would fail at its attempts in the 1930s. It would have to wait till the end of the WWII to completely replace the UK as the hegemon of the system. This demonstrates that the rupture had political and economic consequences in both national and international level and, maybe most importantly, that it had a certain logical course.

Gülalp (1987: 24) points out a broader argument about the political context of the mentioned rupture by stating that before the change in governing authority, the former switches to the change that defines the new period, yet the implementation is executed by the new authority. As an example of this event, the overturn of the oligarchy in Latin America by populist regimes is presented (Gülalp, 1987: 24). Usually this process becomes evident on the world scale by the bourgeois from losing power in the governing authority and is rendered visible by the decrease in the trade volume between the center and the periphery countries. This situation can be regarded as the loss of hegemon by the ruling block and the ensuing crisis in the government, inaccordance with the terminology used by Nicos Poulantzas (2014: 158). In the context of Turkey, it can be asserted that the crisis of 1929 had the same impact on the leadership of the trade bourgeois. According to Trotsky (1978: 154); "The political superstructure (…) has its own dialectic, which intervenes imperiously in the process of world economy, but does not abolist its deep-going laws." In this case, it is to be anticipated that the regime changes into a populist party similar to the example of SCF (Liberal Republican Party or Free Republican

Party). Nevertheless, since the industrial bourgeois was still developing and the large scale landowners did not have the political advantages of an oligarchic construct, the regime was taken over by an authoritarian one instead of a populist regime.

Due to the specific creation of this state format, the capitalist state is dependent on the unity between the ruling social classes and fractions (Poulantzas, 2014: 48). This alliance, especially the political, economic and ideological policies and activities of the government, are required to specifically satisfy the current needs of the alliance between the ruling classes. In general, it is supposed to acquire the support or the consent of the classes excluded from this mentioned alliance and to ensure the overall features and interests of the capital.

In this sense, a fundamental change in the economic policies of the government exists in the same axis as the structure of the ruling bloc and a gradual fundamental change in the structure of the state itself. The interpretation of this change within the present class conflicts presents itself as a system problem, as well. Thus, an outside adaptation of a certain economic development technique (in the context of an accumulation model and accumulation regime) (Jessop, 2008: 411) becomes a reckoning with the old order and a 'system problem'; plus, induces new potentials and burdens in terms of class strategies and combinations of power relations.

This system problem is not an issue locked on the new economic role of the government as a result of the economic evaluation of étatism and Kadroism (Boratav, 2006: 161; Kuruç, 1987: 125; Başkaya, 2004: 123). The real issue concerns how this new system can organize the consensus amongst the current classes in a manner that it can support the new economic role of the government and economic development. It is a political matter that deals with the fundamental organization and structure of the state. If the political aspect of the problem is disregarded, one can easily fall into the same error as Boratav (2006: 143) and reduce the existence of the whole problem to the crisis of 1929. Nonetheless, Boratav also produces an implicit political problem; he presents arguments against the attempt to level étatism to socialism in the context of 1970s. The position of Boratav can be defined as attributing specificity merely to the economic perspective in order not to level étatism to socialism.

Neardisappearance of the conditions for the rejuvenation of the economic power of the commercial bourgeois which had been the hegemon of the ruling block before 1929 and the unlikelihood of its regaining power in the near future gave birth to a *deficient ruling bloc* in the Turkey of 1930s. This

deficiency can be occupied either the old hegemon or a fraction that has a long-term accumulation model and a politicized accumulation strategy with supportive qualities -in the case of Latin America shows that becoming populist is advantageous for this fraction (Gülalp, 1987: 12)

The fractions of the capital not included by the trade cannot fill the said deficiency, yet in general, the capital is not inclined to entrust the governing authority to social classes that can afford to cut ties with the market such as the agricultural class, in the first place. In this case, the transition of the political authority to a developmental paradigm enabled this system problem to be managed as a *prolonged lack of conflict* state. This situation is in favor of the industrial bourgeois whereas it criticizes the commercial bourgeois to a certain extent. The aforementioned state can be called a temporary 'artificial balance'. The temporary nature isn't caused by the artificiality but by the fact that the relations between the hegemonic powers would evidently be formed yet again after an instance. Under these conditions, the dominant classes choose to continue the state of none-conflict till a certain instance.

The characteristics of the indicated *prolonged lack of conflict* can be listed as follows:

a) Development of the industrial bourgeois,
b) State managing the intermediate goods and transportation investments,
c) Smaller yet more effective reconstruction of the trade bourgeois,
d) State subsidies and increase in factories in favor of the large scale landowners who produce for the market,
e) Creation of a serious political control by the state against the landowners and workers (two unique sources for the surplus value transfer).

If the state can be reconstructed through an étatist economic model, industrialization seems possible with the aid of consensus and interests of domestic classes (prolonged lack of conflict state). However, accumulation strategy, which had lost its economic strength, and, whose accumulation model suffers crisis, enables the commercial bourgeois, who lost political support, to be more active in the ideological apparatuses (especially the press) and demonstrates resistance enough to sustain its social presence even though it cannot make its own thesis known. Especially the *Türkiye İş Bankası* entourage had the advantage to turn the commecial capital into an accumulation model based on manufacture, that is, the changes in the system had been quite cautious and gradual due to reasons such as the ability to adapt to the new

system and the benefits acquired by the finance capital, as well. As the Kadroists put, it was an 'opportunity lost'.

Because the trade capital has enough influence on the political and ideological instances to prevent the full social control of the government and the interests of the feeble industrial capital, even if this power to influence does not stretch enough to become the hegemon itself. Despite the fact that it cannot dominate these instances with its influence like it used to, it still withholds sufficient power to veto the decisions or have them implemented under its own supervision. To sum up, it can be argued that the trade capital is not strong enough to impose its accumulation model yet it is still organized and efficient enough to fight the tendencies that categorically go against the capital or can remove the production conditions in practice once again. It can be pointed out that similar to the way that the étatism of the dominant classes imposed the political superstructure of the state of prolonged lack of conflict; the étatism of Kadroists envisaged such a state till an instance wherethe resolution of conflicts could no longer be postponed.

The difference is that the ruling classes suggested the prolongation of the non-conflict state till a new hegemon appeared, which was seen as the natural resolution while they naturally predicted that at the next instance the issues would be concluded in favor of the capital. It can also be claimed that they had justified political grounds to support this prediction. For instance, they were assured that Celal Bayar would be the Minister of Economy and at each stage of étatism -particularly at the Etibank-Sümerbank process (Boratav, 2006: 264, 280)- the institutions founded by the state would be transferred to the private capital.

As for Kadro movement, the resolution at the last instance is ostensibly recondite. It seems that the Kadro is open to a soft transition to socialism, but it has no arguments that can stand against a governance take-over of a strong and modern industrial bourgeois. This constitutes the recondite aspect of staffing. It can also be asserted that which of the two they would be inclined to choose cannot be inferred from their political practice because the possibilities such as the aforementioned constrictions of the practices and the "secret agenda" does not allow the chances of a clear choice.

In spite of this, the insistence to keep the economic power within the government, the emphasis on the weakness and the primitiveness of the industry, the belief and enthusiasm for the creation of a modern and progressive industry with the help of the Soviet Union through planning, gives the impression that they focused on the possibility of a soft and technocratic

transition that is not dependent on class conflict. This specific organization of economic field, outstretching even towards agricultural production, suggestion of cooperatives and state farms seem to support the mentioned argument, as well. Perhaps they do not have a secret agenda yet they do not seem to oppose to the idea of state controlling all tools of production, either. Does this passive affirmation make the Kadroists socialist?

In order to decide for certain whether the Kadroists were socialists or not, first one must have an idea of the different types of socialism. Where would the Kadroists be in the range of the classic division of the supporters of the primitive communal society, utopian socialists, scientific socialists, socialists of the university members and bureaucrats, various syndicate movements and those who actively try to eventually construct socialism, i.e., the militant socialists?

Dr. Kıvılcımlı (2007a: 284) puts forward that the fact that the Turkish society comes from an egalitarian structure and that it had social constructions that can almost be considered primitively communist did not suffice to make it into a socialist society.[1] When the overall state of the society is taken into consideration, it is highly doubtful that there would be an opposition to a soft transition to socialism as long as basic needs are satisfied and there would not be too much conflict with the constructions that have socio-ideological context (e.g. religious organizations, family etc.). Nonetheless, these masses do not easily accede to be involved in an active political practice for the construction of real socialism. This situation does not constitute a sufficient reason for them to be considered as a part of the socialist camp in terms of current politics.

When the same assessment is applied to Kadro movement, it is evident that the political practices are not included in a socialist program. Kadroism is not mainly concerned by the subordinated classes. But by proxy of étatism and nationalism, the masses come closer to the matter of its concern. The ideological call of Kadro movement is not directly oriented towards the masses, either. This call is addressed to the ranks of government and bureaucratic elite, and it encompasses the general principles and setup for the design, construction and implementation of a populism format that can reach the masses.

The role of Kadroism within the class war is clearly against the "Lumpen-bourgeoisie" (Baran, 1974: 332; Frank, 1995: 14–15) and the commercial bourgeoisie which lost its hegemonic position. Moreover, it proposes a model to the detriment of the trade bourgeoisie for the redistribution of the

[1] For a study we conducted using folklore sources on this subject, see: Derin and Bozdoğan (2023).

state resources. Thus, Kadroism movement assumes the role of the political spokesperson for the industrial bourgeoisie that already exists or will do so. On the other hand, state holding the production tools forms the objective basis of the transition to socialism. At this instance, the question acutely persists: Is there an implicit socialism ideal within the political practice of Kadro movement? If it is indeed implicit then what sort of objective impact did this ideal have on the political practice?

Kadro movement should be considered as a a process of political practice. Kadro Journal presents itself as the ideological body of the said practice. This is clearly stated by Şevket Süreyya when he defines the Kadro Journal: "Kadro is a journal of ideology" (Aydemir, 1959: 479). It may not be another *İttihatçılık* (Unionist Movement) yet it is a serious political practice that withholds the reckonings of the early republic. This can also be observed in the criticism directed towards Kadro; Kadro is not a collection of various views and suggestions like its contemporaries. It is a journal that is organized in a well-disciplined manner around a common view and that approaches the governing authority in a 'dangerous' way. On the other hand, Kadro movement demonstrates a semi-formal characteristic. The systematic articulation effort of the authority of the government and the state sovereignity with Kadro Journal and the fact that it situates itself as a party amidst the political advances on the national and international scale, makes it connected with the authority as much as possible. More importantly, this movement figures that it can rightfully use the authority and makes an effort accordingly. This situation can be observed through the polemics that it provokes since its very first issues. It's even possible to see from the press of the time that they were seriously criticized for claiming the title of the sole protector of the étatism, revolution itself and its principles against the mentioned polemics and looking down on everyone else as well as judging other intellectual groups.

Evaluating Kadro movement as a political practice, it can be concluded that instead of reciting the views of the government like a typical ideological party, it expresses its own unique aims, which shows its uniqueness, the sources of its thoughts and the horizon of its improvement. For example, in the novel titled Ankara of the author Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu (2001), a serious Kadroist utopia that distinguishes itself from the objective aims of the class domination and even goes as far as clashing with them, can be seen. This finding can be exemplified through how Kadro Movement lost a great proportion of its field of activity and eventually dissolved after the 1933–1934 when national and international political and economic conjuncture strongly established the

class domination in Turkey and the beginning of the end of the world-wide economic crisis emerged.

One of the most interesting aspects of the issue is how it was possible for Kadro Movement get its share of authority; to develop daring designs in numerous fields varying from the technical and social organization of the production to the reformation of the circulation and division relations; international exchange of goods; reorganization of the state institutions; organization of the youth and the problems of ideological formation. Plus, the fact that it even offered alternatives that can change the social subordination hierarchy and the property structure. If we take into consideration the socialist movements of the truce period and the development of the same traditions till the mid-1920s, especially in the examples of TİÇSF – Turkish Workers' Farmers' Socialist Party- (Tunçay, 1978: 323–24; Tunçay, 1978: 337; Tunçay, 1982: 91, 144; Tunçay, 1992b: 32) and TKP (Akbulut and Tunçay, 2013a: 54–55, 81, 305; Deymer, 1975: 289–291) it can be deducted that they proposed ideas on the same line as the suggestions of Kadro Journal. Also keeping in mind that a considerable number of Kadro journalists were involved in the indicated political organizations, it will not come as a shock to see the different variations of these arguments in the issues of Kadro Journal. The main intriguing point is that even though the socialist arguments that were trending for a while during the truce period were gradually cast aside from the main trend arguments and there had been proceedings against the socialist organizations, how it was possible for Kadro journalists who were identified by numerous authors contributing to the Kadro literature with similar arguments (as mentioned in the part of literature rewiev) to infiltrate and get accepted in the political governing party.

In this phenomenon, the personal traits of Kadro journalists, i.e., technical expertise; intellectual formation; tendencies and personal connections have an important role, yet the crucial matter must be sought in a more structural level. An analogy can be made with the socialist thought that emerged and got well-accepted in the constitutional monarchy period when a new formative union was trying to be built or the socialist movements that came to the fore along with the emergence of the possibility of disintegration of the social formation during the truce period. Similar to these examples, Kadro Movement obtained itself a seat in the political arena due to the gap created in the class domination organization following the crisis of 1920 and SCF Movements (Koçak, 2006: 593; Emrence, 2014: 33–34). Similarly, the socialist movements in the constitutional monarchy period were rectified along with a new model

of bourgeois dictatorship as a result of the change in the demographic quality of the Empire and ensuing new political reproduction system or formative union in suite of the Balkan Wars. Furthermore, the socialist movements of the truce period were clearly beginning to be rectified with the invitation for the Ankara Government to attend the London Conference that was expected to gather on February, 1929 and the emergence of the possibility of a legitimate connection with the world political system. As for the communist activities during the early republic days, it was mentioned earlier that it took a blow in the aftermath of the evolution of the legal authority of bourgeoisie to a dictatorship of bourgeoisie and that its field of activity had narrowed remarkably. Parallel to the aforementioned three processes, Kadro movement emerged and was well-received during the crisis of the state and the social formation, however, after 1933 its recommendations were rectified on the grounds that they were ineffective and even dangerous in prior to Turkey becoming a part of the new world order.

When the general traits of the Kadro Journal are evaluated, contrary to the literature, the Kadro Movement does not seem to aim to form an ideology and to create the Kemalist ideology. Historically, it can be observed that the figures who created and developed the Kemalism are Peker, Tengirşek and even though they are not as prominent, Bozkurt and Ertem (2013), and even people such as Safa (1995) whose relations with the regime are more evident. It can be claimed that the Kemalist remarks as a Kadro movement variation emerged at a later stage after 1960. In this sense, it would not be accurate to assume that Kadro Journal invented a main Kemalism movement for its period. This is related to what extent it adopted this mission rather than its failure. The discussions on the literature written about Kadro Movement draw the conclusion that main axis of the Kadro Journal is to form the Kemalism when they take into consideration the issue of the article in the journal, the booklet titled *İnkılap ve Kadro* by Şevket Süreyya and certain emphasis point there of. Yet again, with a hasty judgment, Kemalism is associated with its contemporary movements such as Nazism and fascism and it is criticized on that basis. These mentioned views tend to have solid points regarding authoritarianism and political arena, yet it can be argued that they misjudge the class domination and world economic conjuncture and they lead to a problematic judgment concerning ideology. In spite of everything, the fact that Kadro movement is a sort of political power orientation is briefly mentioned in the literature in the context of elitism and intellectual activities etc. -especially in Tekeli and İlkin (2003: 485–86).

According to the analysis of the author, it is quite problematic to simply qualify Kadro Journal as an journal dedicated to ideology-building. When the topics and content of the articles in the journal are compared, it can be clearly seen that there are only several parts that directly deal with Kemalist ideology. A bigger proportion of the articles mentioned are dedicated to the research for 'Turkish Revolution'. However, the interesting point is that the Kemalist reforms which were regarded as a main trend related to the Turkish Revolution, are hardly present in the journal. Their presence is often limited to the mention of their names. Therefore, concepts such as westernization or modernism are either absent or merely featured in the critique of Reformation Period. Nevertheless, journal's main content, both quality and quantity wise, comprises of the reorganization of the rural production, resolution of the developments in the world political and economic conjuncture, the parts where solid suggestions for the industry and fields of real production are offered.

Kadro journal mainly deals with solid suggestions concerning production, circulation and distribution; search for political connection and polemics. As a result, it can be deducted that Kadro Journal sets its basis on the search for a new economic system and political institutions. It seeks to create a youth organization consolidated around a certain ideology within the scope of the indicated institutions; however, it always puts the emphasis on the 'material organization' which means a real organization controlled by Kadroists. Inter alia, considering the fact that the journal makes no effort for the retrospective study, explanation and grounding of revolutions, as well as only featuring it in the context of the critique of the 1920s, it is evident that it deals with the 'third-world' or anti-imperialist ideology not because of aiding Kemalism directly but because it aims to realize its own solid suggestions through the connection with Kemalist leadership. This ideology is important apart from the class power of Kemalism and is a fundamental part of the political practice of Kadro movement.

In order to assess political and ideological phenomena in terms of society, the fundamental arguments of a Prussian military theoretician and general, Carl von Clausewitz must be elaborated and raised to a new dimension. On an argument which attracted Lenin's and Engel's attention (Clausewitz, 1975: 15), Clausewitz (1975: 67) concludes that war is a continuation of politics through different tools in order to surrend the enemy's will (1975: 44). There have been many analyses based on this argument ranging from the struggle of imperialist interests on the international platform to the tasks of the revolutionary party of the working class. Further continuing the argument, Clauswitz asserts that the

war is directed towards suppressing the will of the opposite party, and goes on to explaining the psychological and strategic elements of the said suppression. The argument of this paper will broaden the matter without prejudice to the Hegelian structure behind the definition above: Ideological and political phenomena are formed with the aim of suppressing the will of the enemy, building alliances and resisting. According to Poulantzas (1982: 41); political practice is defined as;

(…) the sense of transformation of a definite object (raw material), resulting in the production of the something new (the product) which often constitutes, or at the very least can constitute, a break with the given elements of the object. What is the specisifity of political practice in this respect? Its specific *object* is the 'present moment' (as Lenin said), i.e. the *nodal* point *where the contradictions* of the various levels of a formation *are condensed* in the complex relations governed by over-determination and by their dislocation and uneven development. This present moment is therefore a *conjuncture,* the strategic point where the various contradictions fuse in so far as they reflect the articulation specifying a structure in a dominance.

The ideology and the political practice of the Kadro movement must also be mentioned in scope of these terms. In the mentioned context, it is possible to deduce that ideological and political formations have the following characteristics:

(i) They take over the will (of the group, class, fraction, individual),

(ii) They reproduce the said will as a means of authority,

(iii) They provide guidance in the process of rupture from the authority and transition to new authority forms,

(iv) They reform the already existing authority composition and its elements.

As for the Kadro Movement, it can be observed that they seek the systematic development and reproduction of the connection with the Kemalist leadership; providing the subjection of the people to the political system within the scope of the participation and mass politics (authoritarianism, youth organization, People's Houses) and mass ideology (development, anti-imperialism, particularism) as well as reproduction. Furthermore, it can be concluded that they tended to criticize the dominant classes, primarily, the trade bourgeoisie and the landlords and pursue a policy oriented to the support of other classes for the rectification of the former.

For instance, in the earlier issues of Kadro Journal there is sympathy towards small scale production and it increasingly highlights the state which organizes

the small scale production (and the gradual damping) as opposed tothe traders and high profit national industry. Yet again, in the articles of Şevket Süreyya, the undertones vary between ideology and demagogy. It is evident that the said articles seek an economic populism such as the improvement of welfare and consumption in favor of the workers and peasants, syndical rights and increase in real salaries (revaluation of the labor). Nevertheless, one question remains to be of importance: how to associate Kadro journal's claim of classless society or society without conflict with our evaluation?

It is a given that social formations exist and get developed through class conflicts. When Kadro journal claimed that there were no classes in Turkey, it received an angry feedback from all the Marxists of the time in Turkey. In a modern world, especially in a country articulated into capitalism, claiming the absence of classes was considered to be either oximoron or due to having 'malicious' intentions (ideology-building). It is particularly unimaginable as Dr. Kıvılcımlı (2007b: 103) states that Turkey had been a society with classes since it entered the trade and mine colonies of Summerians.

The position of Kadroists and the socialists in this discussion, on its most vague aspect, focuses on the theoretical framework of support for the class concept. It's impossible for a Marxist to accept the premise of absense of classes in a private property-based society. Naturally, they would consider such arguments as items produced to feed the ideology of bourgeoisie in order to block the efforts of the working class. All in all, the position of the Marxists against Kadro is a political one (e.g. Dr. Hikmet, Ş. Hüsnü, etc.) and of course it is a position that claims the leadership of the worker class' political endeavor. Up until here, all seem to make sense. The real problem occurs when Kadroists dispute with the bourgeoisie, as well. If Kadro supports the ideology of the bourgeoisie like the Marxists claim, why would it dispute with the press of bourgeoisie?

Initially, it must be established that bourgeoisie is not a monolith and that it is comprised of many layers (Poulantzas, 2014: 93–94). Moreover, it must be noted that when these layers become fractions, it is possible that severe disputes, quantity and quality wise, amongst the layers of bourgeois break out -Poulantzas deals with this issue in almost all of his work after his doctorate dissertation. Therefore, speaking of class struggles, it must be underlined that there are class struggles amongst both the working class and the bourgeoisie, and the different fractions of the bourgeoisie and certain sections of the classes active in provide agricultural production (sharecroppers, feudal lords, ploughmen, small scale farmers, pawn brokers, mediators etc.). Thus, instead

of narrowly assessing the concept of class struggle as a mere conflict between the working class and the capital owners in the contemporary social formations, it should be considered as the foundation of the political, economic and ideological relations which influence all levels of the social formation. The reflections of this foundation become regular during the polarization of the dominant and auxiliary conflicts as Zedung (2008) argued.

From this perspective, statement of Kadro Journal that can be epitomized as 'here are no classes in Turkey' or 'they haven't been developed' must be politically examined. First, Kadroists are under the obligation to accept these statements as a pre-condition because of their relations with the Kemalist party. This pre-condition includes three conditions and a direct conclusion. The political practice of Kadroists being dependent on the state results in the obligation of non-dispute with the CHF for the use of the state power. However, this does not mean that Kadroists approve of every policy and politician of CHF without an exception. Quite the contrary, they disapprove and try to criticize while avoiding specific targeting; yet the public non-dispute state is diligently sustained.

The first condition of this was to ensure that the advantage thanks to the non-dispute with the party leader, Mustafa Kemal would be guaranteed at all events. The only way to achieve this is to unconditionally approve and accept all direct policies and executions that are attributed to Kemal Pasha himself. These include the Kemalist reforms, Kemalist historical disquisitions, various mythoi formed concerning the Turkish Independence War and the one-man regime.

The second condition is to seek alliance with the political leaders who are still active at the top of the regime. The primary name of the indicated leaders is İsmet Pasha. The adoption of the term étatism which is often used by Kadro is a reference to this power relation. Plus, an unlikely alliance with Recep Peker is observed; it is possible to see that they are always open to an alliance in *Tasarruf ve İktisat Cemiyeti* Press (Savings and Economics Society Press), in the opposition to SCF, in the support for the idea of a uniformed youthorganization, in the pres activities of the journal, in "La Turquie Kemaliste" and finally in the support for the People's Houses.

This openness to an alliance stems from the fact that Peker was one of the closest to İsmet Pasha; not because Kadroists approved Peker's opinions and actions -e.g. the course books of Peker for the revolution history largely conflict with Kadro's way of thinking. Furthermore, certain connections were made between Kadroists and Peker that can be examined in Aydemir (1959: 479), Karaosmaoğlu (1968: 112), Tör (1976: 130).

Another point to be made is that Recep Peker was for the radical interventions against the 'anti-revolutionaries' or in other words him being the lead of the radicals. The disagreement between the Kadroists and Recep Peker is a political division. As Peker occupied a sufficiently strong position, he did not wish to allow Kadroists near him lest they might be rivals for his position due to their intellectual capacity. His encouragement for the release of the *Ülkü* (İdeal) Journal, his oppositions during the initial establishment phases of Kadro Journal, his reaction to the 'tale of three rings' and his criticism against *Tasarruf ve İktisat Cemiyeti* Press under the guise of reformation according to party principles all point the direction of the aforementioned argument.

Kadroists started getting closer to Dr. Reşit Galip, who is an old SCF member (Naskali, 2015: 22), when the alliance with Recep Peker became difficult and the relations started causing trouble. The basis of this alliance actually begins with the famous conference given by Şevket Süreyya at the *Türk Ocakları* (Turkish Hearths) which was later published with the title *İnkılap ve Kadro*. Following the said conference, compliments were paid by R. Galip who is a notable member of the *Türk Ocakları*. Şevket Süreyya, (1959: 481), criticizes Hamdullah Suphi who is the chairman of *Türk Ocakları* which was later to be dissolved. It can be stated that Hamdullah Suphi also had a type of criticism and political projecy against liberalism in that manner such as corporatism, Jessop (2008: 191) argued as political and ideological critic of capitalism. During this process, Şevket Süreyya supports the forced dissolution of *Türk Ocakları* and them being transformed into People's Houses (1931) and took the side of Recep Peker and Reşit Galip.

The search for an alliance yielded its first fruit when Dr. Reşit Galip, against Zeki Velidi Togan, defended the theory of the mass migration from central Asia, which is also supported by Mustafa Kemal, at the First Turkish History Congress (2–11 July 1932). This position made an impression on Kadro journal and R. Galip received support. Z. Velidi who claimed that this theory was nonsense had to flee to Austria in 1932, anyways.

The second phase of the alliance takes place by reason of the *Dârülfünûn* reform (1933) (Ottoman University Reform) which was led by the Minister of Education, Reşit Galip. Şevket Süreyya had already been arguing in both Kadro journal and *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper with the professors of *Dârülfünûn* for a while, (e.g. A. Ahmet and İ. Fazıl, İ. Hakkı) and was of the opinion that *Dârülfünûn* could not keep up with the revolution, became obsolete and eventually expired. This issue led to an active and ideological alliance due to the reform project of Dr. Reşit Galip. Kadroists were deeply touched by the

untimely death of Dr. Reşit Galip. They dedicated a large section to him and his actions on the issue of March, 1934 and confessed their commitment to his ideals.

Secondly, Kadroists copied the argument that there were no classes in Turkey, on the condition that it was not defined under the term 'being classless' –the rejection of this term results in excommunication from the Kemalist camp- from their studies in the 1920s, communist publications and mainly from the position of the USSR and The Third International (Harris, 2002: 43; Tunçay, 1992b: 130).

The main reference in this chapter is the position taken by *Aydınlık* during and immediately after the Independence War. Actually, it is possible to find the same position in the works of Gramsci, as well. In his article titled *War in the Colonies* published in the issue of 7 June 1919 of *L'Ordine Nuovo*, Gramsci states that (Forgacs, 2010: 137):

(…) Turkey which has risen with prestige from the defeat that it suffered sets an example for the world. At the eyes of millions of people an Anatolian shepherd is more precious than a cotton manufacturer in Manchester; Sultan is a rescue flare that shines brighter than a ship-owner from Liverpool.

It is possible to talk about a continuation within the themes here, yet the change in the position of *Comitern* (Tunçay, 1992b: 41) in the second half of the 1920s took effect, the focus of the emphasishad changed, and it caused a fundamental political rupture (Tunçay, 2013a: 188–89). Moreover, there is a certain form that the international political conjuncture brought upon the perspective of USSR concerning Turkey. This form also offered a relational authonomy for the state of early republican period.

The third pre-condition is an empirical level where Kadroists set the foundations for the classless society and the issue regarding the alliance with Kemalism. As mentioned before, in his memoirs, Şevket Süreyya touches on the poverty in Anatolia and the inmates in prisons at length (Aydemir, 1959: 432). This empirical data states that it's fair and legitimate for the Kemalist camp –the modernists- to work. In this statement, there is an implicit empirical-criticism of the communist movement, as well.

There is a contradiction between this empirical level and the Comintern's decision on Bolshevization. The following quotation can be used to explain this situation (Laclau and Mouffe, 2001: 61):

Communist discourse itself became increasingly dominated by the hegemonic character which every political initiative acquired in the new historical terrain of the imperialist era. As a result, however, it tended to

oscillate in a contradictory manner between what we have called a democratic and an authoritarian practice of hegemony. In the 1920s economist stagism was everywhere in command, and as the prospect of revolution receded the class lines grew still more rigid. Since the European revolution was conceived purely in terms of working-class centrality, and since the Communist parties represented the 'historical interests2 of the working class, the sole function of these parties was to maintain the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat in opposition to the integrationist tendencies of social democracy. In periods of 'relative stabilization', therefore, it was necessary to strengthen the class barrier with even greater intransigence. Hence, the slogan launched in 1924 for the Bolshevization of the Communist parties. Zinoviev explained it as follows: "Bolshevization means a firm will to struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat, it means a passionate hatred for the bourgeoisie, for the counter-revolutionary leaders of social democracy, for centrism and the centrists, for the semi-centrists and the pacifists, for all the miscarriages of bourgeois ideology ... Bolshevization is Marxism in action; it is dedication to the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the idea of Leninism."

The confusion that this development provoked in Turkey takes a reactionary form and leads to the dissolution of the party (Tunçay, 1992b: 49):

Vedat Nedim who attends a party conference on May, 1926 in Vienna, is appointed as the director of TKP on the spot. After this congress, the fragmentation process within TKP begins. There had been disagreements concerning whether the leftist activities in Turkey should be executed in the way that Komitern desires or in a way that takes into consideration the condition of the country itself; on top of this, the personal dispute between Şefik Hüsnü and Vedat Nedim breaks out. The main reason of the dispute between the two was the fact that Şerif Hüsnü's letters from abroad to Vedat Nedim insisted as an order of Komitern that the tramway workers and as such would be made to go on strikes.

Yet, Vedat Nedim resisted this request on the grounds that the conditions of the time were not suitable (Yıldız, 2011: 79–80). According to Sayılgan (1972: 196):

TKP entourage already had a positive attitude towards the Ankara government that had amicable relations with the Soviets [...] therelatively more active strategy that Komitern wanted TKP to pursue and the way put forward by the group led by Vedat Nedim and Şevket Şüreyya, which stipulated the "realities of the country" conflicted. Şevket Süreyya explains those days as follows: "(...) Komitern grossly intervened in our actions. This was a hazardous

and unperceptive interruption that failed to understand the national movement and the historical responsibilities of the intellectuals… One of the first to oppose to this approach of Comintern was TKP.

The situation that stemmed from the said development axis as a direct consequence is Kadroists switching to the Kemalist ranks and Kemalist adopting the position of the classless society notion, whatever it entails politically and ideologically. As the Marxists of the time rightfully claimed, this position is a principle designed by the Kemalist dictatorship for eliminating the political organization of the working classes and an ideology that is founded on the nationalist aspect of the principle indicated.

As a result of the first chapter; because of their private relations with Kemalists, Kadroists wholeheartedly accept the Kemalist classless society concept including its entire political structure –the exploitation of the working class, oppression of the rural classes etc. Our political analysis regarding this matter, quite clearly comes to this conclusion.

The guarantee and sustainability of this relationship is a political practice for Kadroists. Nevertheless, the tools of this political practice may not be included in the political practice of Kadroism. It can become the auxiliary and instrumental variations. For example, defending Dr. Reşit Galip's political thesis is important for Kadro not only in terms of maintaining the theme of political perspective. This phenomenon does not need to be deducted from the adventures of Şevket Süreyya for Turan movement (Aydemir, 1959: 167–171) since Kadro is not an individual journal as such. It has a neat policy. If the text concerning the first *Türk Tarih Kongresi* is examined, it can be observed that the initiative of Dr. Reşit Galip is fervently supported yet the content is a little disregarded. Therefore, the scope of the political practice of Kadroism leaves out the historical thesis whilst it aims for closing the ranks, so to speak. As a principle, they aspire not to contradict any position supported by M. Kemal and even to be fanatics of such positions if possible. Otherwise, Kadro does not attempt to fundamentally invent a historical thesis. Personally the author does not consider that the Turkish History Thesis held any essential meaning for Kadro movement. Even if such a case is possible, it only becomes significant in terms of a rupture from a Europe-oriented historical conception to support their own thesis.

To conclude, in this study Kadro movement evaluated as an political practice which had been formed around an economical model and actual political conjuncture of the early republican era in Turkey. This political practice focuses on the state-centered program (étatism) to transform

economical structure of Turkey in exactly under titles of state owned industry, state organized and owned argricultural production, state controlled foreign trade, state control on prices and redistribution function, and economical institutions shaped in accordance with this program such as Ministry of Economy, Planning Chamber, Supreme Council of Economy and municipal administrations. Furthermore, Kadro movement aimed to constitue an ideological reference system which suopports the Kadroist project mentioned above, and an organizational basis to propogate this ideology for masses and especially youth.

In order to reach these objectives, Kadro movement struggled with the power groups and representatives of bourgeoisie and land-owners, that gives another characteristic of the Kadro movement that argumentative and polemical line which advanced on the concrete context of politics and economics as such power relations in the CHF and struggles between agricultural producers and commercial bourgeoisie, and new formed industries as such sugar, cement, mining and financial sources of state protectionism. The problem of unifying these areas, of integrating them ideologically and organizationally, is fundamental to the Kadro étatism; however, the Kadro movement has never been able to achieve the power to run such an organization. This struggle obviously end while the bourgeosie's rise before the World War II and by the discharce of Kadro group that indicated a propability and constains of the political struggle without mass support in the last analysis.

On the other hand, the possible end of the Kadro movement does not mean the end of all the political activity of the former Kadro members. With the exception of Yakup Kadri (Karaosmanoğlu), who was sent abroad on an ambassadorial post, the Kadro circle had the opportunity to play a role in the establishment of new industries, planning, state press agencies, art and culture circles, and even in the opposition against the CHF (Republican People's Party). In the sixties, the Kadroists reappeared within the Yön movement, engaging in influential editorial roles in cultural issues, publishing plays or memoirs, and even publishing a series of monographs to reintroduce Kemalism to the popular field –and their influence continued without diminishing at least until the eighties. Furthermore, this effect can also be observed in post-Soviet era Turkey, where the national-left experienced a resurgence, and it is not surprising to know that publications on the Kadro journal continued until recently, and that even higher-quality facsimile editions of it were published every twenty years. In this context, the 'passion' of Kadroism has not completely disappeared; on the contrary, the void left by left-Kadroism is being filled

in rapid succession by examples of conservative, nationalist, and even liberal Kadroist variants.

Bibliography

Ağaoğlu, A. (1969). *Serbest Fırka Hatıraları* (2nd ed,). İstanbul: Baha Matbaası.

Ağaoğlu, S. (1969). *Babamın Arkadaşları* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Baha Matbaası.

Ağcabay, C. (2009). *Türkiye Komünist Partisi ve Dr. Hikmet.* İstanbul: Sosyal İnsan Yayınları.

Akal, E. (2013). *Milli Mücadelenin Başlangıcında Mustafa Kemal, İttihat Terakki ve Bolşevizm* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2014). *Moskova-Ankara-Londra Üçgeninde İştirakiyuncular, Komünistler ve Paşa Hazretleri* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Akalın, G. (2010). *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ekonomi-Politik Tarihinin Liberal Yorumu.* Ankara: Orion Kitabevi.

Akar, M. (2016). Kadro: Bir 'Sınıftan Kaçış' Teorisi. In *Çalışma ve Toplum Dergisi,* (Issue 48). Retrieved 21.08.2016, from http://www.calismatoplum.org/sayi48/akar.pdf

Akbulut, E., and Tunçay, M. (2013a). *İstanbul Komunist Grubu'ndan (Aydınlık Çevresi) Türkiye Komünist Partisi'ne (1919 – 1926) (*Vol. 2). İstanbul: Sosyal Tarih Yayınları.

_____ (2013b). *İstanbul Komunist Grubu'ndan (Aydınlık Çevresi) Türkiye Komünist Partisi'ne (1919 – 1926) (*Vol. 3). İstanbul: Sosyal Tarih Yayınları.

Akı, N. (2001). *Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu İnsan-Eser-Fikir-Üslup.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Akşin, S. (1987). *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki.* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Alemdar, K. (1978). Basında Kadro Dergisi ve Kadro Hareketi ile İlgili Bazı Görüşler. In *Kadro Dergisi Tıpkı Basımı.* Ankara: Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi.

Altınkas, E. (2011). Cumhuriyet İlk Yıllarında Aydınlar: Kurucu Seçkinleri. In *CTAD*. (7 (14): 114–132). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü.

Altun, Ş. (2008). *Atatürk, İnönü, Bayar'ın İktisat Kavgası*. İstanbul: Hayalet Kitap.

(Ed.) Alpar, C. (1978). *Kadro* (Facsimile, 3 Vols). Ankara: Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi.

Anar, T. (2013). Türk Edebiyatında Edebiyat Kanonu: Kanon, Kanona Girmek Ve Kanona Müdahale. In *Fsm İlmî Araştırmalar İnsan Ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi* (Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp.40-78). İstanbul: Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf Üniversitesi.

Anderson, B. (2015). *Hayali Cemaatler: Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması* (8th ed.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Aralov, S. İ. (2010). *Bir Sovyet Diplomatının Türkiye Anıları 1922–1923* (2nd ed.). Trans. H. A. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Arsel, İ. (1965). *Türkiye Anayasa Hukuku'nun Umumi Esasları: Cumhuriyetin Temel Kuruluşu* (Vol. 1). Ankara: Mars Yayınları.

Aslan, C., and Bilir, O. (2014). Gerçek ile Ütopya Arasında Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. In *Humanitas* 1(3): 15–26. Tekirdağ: Namık Kemal Üniversitesi.

Aslanapa, O. (1997). *1933 Yılında İstanbul Üniversitesinde Başlayan İlk İnkılap Tarihi Ders Notları: Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, Recep Peker, Yusuf Kemal Tengirşenk.* İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı.

Atay, F. R. (1980). *Çankaya.* İstanbul: Bateş Yayınları.

Atılgan, G. (2008). *Yön-Devrim Hareketi.* İstanbul: Yordam Yay.

_____ (2009). Sosyalist Soldan Kemalizme Olumlu Bakışlar (1920–1971): Nedenler, İmkânlar, Dönemler ve Bazı Sonuçlar. In *Praksis, 21*(3), 47–76.

Autheman, A. (2002). *Bank-ı Osmani-i Şahane: Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete Osmanlı Bankası* Trans. A. Berktay. İstanbul: Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları.

Avcıoğlu, D. (1996). *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: (Dün-Bugün-Yarın)* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.

Ayaşlı, Y. (2014). *Türkiye'de Burjuva Devrimleri ve Liberal-Kemalist Tarih İdeolojisi.* Ankara: Epos Yayınları.

Aybars, E. (2014). *İstiklal Mahkemeleri.* İstanbul: Doğan Egmont Yayınları.

Aydemir, Ş. S. (1955). *Tek Adam Mustafa Kemal (1922–1938) (*Vol 3, 2nd ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (1959). *Suyu Arayan Adam.* Ankara: Öz Yayınları.

_____ (1963). *Toprak Uyanırsa?. (Ekmeksizköy Öğretmeninin Hatıraları).* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (1972). *Makedonya'dan Ortaasya'ya Enver Paşa Vol III 1914–1922.* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (1974). *Kahramanlar Doğmalıydı.* İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları.

_____ (1976). *Menderes'in Dramı?,* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (1979). *Kırmızı Mektuplar ve Son Yazıları.* İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları.

_____ (1993). *İhtilalin Mantığı.* (5th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (1997). *Lider ve Demagog.* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (2000a). *İkinci Adam (1884–1938)* (Vol. 1, 9th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (2000b). *İkinci Adam (1938–1950)* (Vol. 2, 7th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (2000c). *İkinci Adam (1950–1964)* (Vol. 3, 6th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (2011). *İnkılap ve Kadro* (6th ed,). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Ayhan, B. (2009). *Atatürk ve Basın.* Konya: Palet Yayınevi.

Baki, E. (2010). *Ulusun İnşası ve Resmi Edebiyat Kanonu*. İstanbul: Libra Yayınları.

Balibar, E. (1993a). Irkçılık ve Milliyetçilik. In *Irk, Ulus, Sınıf: Belirsiz Kimlikler.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp.50-87.

_____ (1993b). Ulus Biçimi: Tarih ve İdeoloji. In *Irk, Ulus, Sınıf: Belirsiz Kimlikler.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp.109-133.

Baran, P. (1974). *Büyümenin Ekonomi Politiği.* İstanbul: May Yayınları.

Başar, A. H. (1981). *Atatürk'le Üç Ay ve 1930'dan Sonra Türkiye* (3rd ed.). Ankara: Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi.

Başkaya, F. (2001). *Batılılaşma, Çağdaşlaşma, Kalkınma Paradigmanın İflası Resmi İdeolojinin Eleştirisine Giriş.* Ankara: Maki Basın Yayınları.

_____ (2004). *Devletçilikten 24 Ocak Kararlarına: Türkiye Ekonomisinde İki Bunalım Dönemi* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Maki Basın Yayınları.

Belge, M. (2004). Türkiye'de Kanon. In *Kitap-lık, 11*(68), 54–59.

Beriş, H. E. (2014). *Tek Parti Döneminde Devletçilik: Türkiye'de Otoritarizmin Siyasal ve Ekonomik Temelleri*. İstanbul: Tezkire Yayınları.

Berkes, N. (2010). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma* (15th ed,). Ed by A. Kuyaş. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

_____ (2015). *Türk Düşününde Batı Sorunu.* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Bilge, R. and Kaymakçalan Ö. (1972). Atatürk Üzerine Y. Kadri ve Ş. Süreyya ile Bir Söyleşi. In *Ekonomik Yaklaşım, 12*(6), 107–120. Ankara: AİTİA.

Birinci, A. (1998). Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası. In *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 18, pp.508-511). Retrieved 11.03.2016, from http://www.tdvia.org/dia/ayrmetin.php?idno=180508

Birlik, G. K. (2010). Celal Bayar'ın Başbakanlığı İsmet İnönü'den Devralması ve Bunun Siyasi Müsteşarlık Üzerine Etkisi. In *Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, *12*(46), 255–293. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü. Retrieved 04.05.2016, from http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/45/1564/16984.pdf

Birtek, F., and Keyder, Ç. (1975). Türkiye'de Devlet Tarım İlişkileri: 1923–1950. In *Birikim,* Trans. N. İmer. Issue 22, İsanbul: Birikim Yay. pp. 31–40.

Bora, T. (2007). Milliyetçiliğin Tekinsizliğini Unutmamak. In F. Umruk (ed.) *Sosyalizmin Milliyetçilikle İmtihanı.* İstanbul: Versus Kitap, pp.1-10.

Boratav, K. (2006). *Türkiye'de Devletçilik* (2nd ed.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Bostancı, N. (1990). *Kadrocular ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Görüşleri.* Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Bozdağ, İ. (1972). *Bir Çağın Perde Arkası: Atatürk-İnönü, İnönü-Bayar Çekişmeleri.* İstanbul: Kervan Yayınları.

Carretto, G. (1985). 1930'larda Kemalizm – Faşizm – Komünizm Üzerine Polemikler I, II. *Tarih ve Toplum 3*(17): 344–348

Clausewitz, C. (1975). *Savaş Üzerine.* Trans. Ş. Yalçın. İstanbul: May Yayınları.

Çadırcı, M. (2011). *Tanzimat Sürecinde Türkiye: Anadolu Kentleri.* Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Çakır, R., and Cinemre, L. (1991). *Sol Kemalizme Bakıyor.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Çetinkaya, Y. D. (2014). *1908 Osmanlı Boykotu: Bir Toplumsal Hareketin Analizi* (2nd ed,). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Çıkla, S. (2007). Türk Edebiyatında Kanon ve İnkılap Kanonu. In *Muhafazakar Düşünce*, *4*(13–14), 47–68.

Çınar, M. (2013). *Anadoluculuk ve Tek Parti CHP'de Sağ Kanat.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Çulhaoğlu, M. (1998). Suyu Ararken Yolunu Yitiren Adam: Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. In *Toplum ve Bilim,* Issue 78, İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları, pp.92-107.

_____ (2002a). *Doğruda Durmanın Felsefesi 1970–2000 Vol 1.* İstanbul: YGS Yayınları.

_____ (2002b). *Doğruda Durmanın Felsefesi 1970–2000 Vol 2.* İstanbul: YGS Yayınları.

_____ (2007). Türkiye Modeli: 1908–1940. In *Doğruda Durmanın Felsefesi Vol. 2*, İstanbul: YGS Yayınları.

Darendelioğlu, İ. (1961). *Türkiye'de Komünist Hareketleri* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Toprak Yayınları.

Demirci, F. (2006). Kadro Hareketi ve Kadrocular. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler* Dergisi *0*(15): 35–54. https://izlik.org/JA43CB62LC.

Demirel, A. (2013). *Tek Partinin İktidarı Türkiye'de Seçimler ve Siyaset (1923–1946).* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Derin, O. E., and Baytaş, B. (2025). The Architecture of relational materialism: A categorial formation of onto-epistemological premises. *Foundations of Science*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-025-09977-0

Derin O. E., and Bozdoğan M. (2023). The fox's journey: Two folktales on the order of nature and community. *Turkologentag 2023*, Vienna, Austria, 21 – 23 September 2023, (Unpublished).

Deymer, Ş. H. (1975). A. Çavuşoğlu (ed.) *Türkiye'de Sınıflar* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Ülke Yayınları.

Duman, D. (1992). Milli İktisat ve Tasarruf Cemiyeti. In *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* (1(2), 127–143). Ankara: DEÜ Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü.

Duman, F. (2011). Sol Milliyetçi Bir Akım/Dergi: Kadro. *Demokrasi Platformu 7*(27): 121–162. https://www.demokrasiplatformu.com/dergi/article/view/181

Dumont, P. (1995). Yahudi, Sosyalist ve Osmanlı Bir Örgüt: Selanik İşçi Federasyonu. In M. Tunçay and E. J. Zürcher (ed.) *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyalizm ve Milliyetçilik (1876 – 1923): Türkiye'de Sosyalizmin Oluşmasında ve Gelişmesinde Etnik ve Dinsel Toplulukların (Makedon, Yahudi, Rum, Bulgar ve Ermeni Anasır'ın) Rolü. Trans.*M. Tunçay. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.73-111.

Eliçin, E. T. (1970). *Kemalist Devrim İdeolojisi: Niteliği ve Tarihteki Yeri*. İstanbul: Ant Yayınları.

Emiroğlu, K. (1999). *Anadolu'da Devrim Günleri: II. Meşrutiyet'in İlanı.* Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Emrealp, S. (1984). *Azgelişmişlik ve Siyasal Yapılar Türkiye Mısır Peru Devletin Görece Özerkliği Sorunu.* Ankara: Birey ve Toplum Yayınları.

Emrence, C. (2014). *Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ergut, F. (2004). *Modern Devlet ve Polis: Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Toplumsal Denetimin Diyalektiği.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.

Erkek, M. S. (2012). *Bir Meşrutiyet Aydını: Ethem Nejat 1887–1921.* İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

Ertem, S. (2013). *Türk İnkılabının Karakterleri*. Konya: Salkımsöğüt Yayınları.

Eroğul, C. (2010). 1908 Devrimi'ni İzleyen Anayasa Değişiklikleri. In S. Akşin, S. Balcı and B. Ünlü (ed.) *100. Yılında Jön Türk Devrimi.* İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, pp.85-139. Retrieved 21.03.2016, from https://cemerogul.files.wordpress.com/2012/03/1908-devrimini-izleyen-anayasa-dec49fic59fiklikleri.pdf

_____ (2014). *Devlet Nedir?.* İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Ersanlı, B. (2003). *İktidar ve Tarih: Türkiye'de "Resmi Tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu (1929 – 1937).* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ertan, T. F. (1994). *Kadrocular ve Kadro Hareketi (Görüşler, Yorumlar, Değerlendirmeler).* Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Milli Kütüphane Basımevi.

_____ (2010). *Atatürk Döneminde Devletçilik-Liberalizm Tartışmaları: Şevket Süreyya (Aydemir) – Hüseyin Vahit (Yalçın) Polemiği*. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları.

Ertem, S. (2013). *Türk İnkılabının Karakterleri.* Erzurum: Salkımsöğüt Yayınları.

Esen, K. and Akbal, İ. (2024). Kadro Dergisi/ Kadro Hareketinin Kemalist İdeolojiden Ayrıldığı Konular, *Journal of Academic Perspective on Social Studies*, (1): 29–40.

Esendal, M. Ş. (2002). *Ayaşlı ile Kiracıları* (9th ed.). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Fırat, A. H. (2007). *Kadro, Kooperatif, Fikir Hareketleri: Bir Dönemin Basın Tartışmaları.* Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Kırkıncı Yıl Kitaplığı.

Fişek, K. (1969). *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Gelişmesi ve İşçi Sınıfı.* İstanbul: Doğan Yayınevi.

Forgacs, D. (2010). *Gramsci Kitabı Seçme Yazılar (1916–1935).* Trans. İ. Yıldız. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Frank, A. G. (1995). *Lümpen Burjuvazi Lümpen Gelişim.* Trans. A. Yılmaz. İstanbul: Gökkuşağı Yayınları.

Gellner, E. (2013). *Milliyetçiliğe Bakmak* (5th ed,). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Georgeon, F. (2016). *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi (1900–1930)* (4th ed,). Trans. A. Berktay. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Gevgilili, A. (1989). *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Gelişmesi ve Sosyal Sınıflar* (2nd ed.). İsanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.

Goloğlu, M. (1974). *Tek Partili Cumhuriyet (1931 – 1938).* Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.

_____ (2011). *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi I Devrimler ve Tepkiler (1924 – 1930)* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Gökalp, Z. (2015). *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Göktürk, H. İ. (1977). *Bilinmeyen Yönleriyle Şevket Süreyya Aydemir: Yaşamı, Görüşleri, Eserleri.* Ankara: Arı Matbaası.

Gözaydın, N. (1978). Kadro ve Türk Dili. In *Kadro Dergisi Tıpkı Basımı*. Ankara: Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi.

Grew, J. (2000). *Atatürk ve İnönü: İlk ABD Büyükelçisinin Türkiye Hatırları.* Trans. M. Aşkın. İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayın.

Gülalp, H. (1987). *Gelişme Stratejileri ve Gelişme İdeolojileri* (Vol. 2). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

_____ (1993). *Kapitalizm Sınıflar ve Devlet.* Trans. O. Akınhay & A. Yılmaz. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.

Gülsunar, E. (2015). *Jakobenizm ve Kemalizm: Eleştirel Bir Karşılaştırma.* İstanbul: Yordam Yayınları.

Gülmez, M. (1986). *1936 İş Yasası'nın Hazırlık Çalışmaları*. Retrieved 22.03.2016, from http://www.journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iusskd/article/viewFile/1023013380/1023012603

Gümüşoğlu, F. (2005). *Ülkü Dergisi ve Kemalist Toplum.* İstanbul: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları.

Gürpınar, D. (2013). *Türkiye'de Aydının Kısa Tarihi.* İstanbul: Etkileşim Yayınları.

Gürses, H. B. (Ed.) (1994). *Şefik Hüsnü: Yaşamı, Yazıları, Yoldaşları.* İstanbul: Sosyalist Yayınları.

Harris, G. (2002). *The Communists and The Kadro Movement: Shaping Ideology in Atatürk's Turkey*. İstanbul: Isıs Press.

Heper, M. (2012). *Türkiye'de Devlet Geleneği.* Ankara: Doğu – Batı Yayınları.

Heyd, U. (1950). Foundation of Turkish Nationalism: The life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp. London: Luzac &Cy. Ltd. and The Harvill Press Ltd.

Hirsch, E.E. (2005). *Anılarım: Kayzer Dönemi, Weimar Cumhuriyeti, Atatürk Ülkesi* (10th ed.). Trans. F. Suphi. Ankara: Tubitak Yayınları.

Hobsbawn, E. J. (2014). *Milletler ve Milliyetçilik: Program, Mit, Gerçeklik* (5th ed.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Hüsnü, Ş. (1975). *Türkiye'de Sınıflar* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Ülke Yayınları.

İba, Ş. (2007). Şeyh Sait İsyanı ve Özdeş Toplum Oluşturma Çabaları. In F. Umruk (ed.) *Sosyalizmin Milliyetçilikle İmtihanı.* İstanbul: Versus Kitap, pp.185-200.

İnsel, A. (1996). *Düzen ve Kalkınma Kıskacında Türkiye: Kalkınma Sürecinde Devletin Rolü. Trans.* A. Sönmezay. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Jaures, J. (2013). *Demokrasi, Barış, Sosyalizm* (2nd ed.). Trans. A. Bezirci, Trans. İstanbul: Evrensel Yay.

Jessop, B. (1985). *Nicos Poulantzas Marxist Theory and Political Strategy.* Londra: Macmillan.

_____ (1990). Recent Theories of the Capitalist State. In *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place.* Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press.

Kansu, A. (2009). Türkiye'de Korporatist Düşünce ve Korporatizmin Uygulamaları. In A. İnsel (ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm* (Vol. 2, 6th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.253-267.

Karataş, E., and Yıldız, İ. (2010). Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu'nun Kadro Dergisindeki Yazıları Ve Kadro Düşüncesinin Ankara Romanına Yansımaları. In *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* (Vol. 3, Issue 14). Sinop: Sinop Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi. Retrieved 04.05.2016, from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt3/sayi14pdf/karatas_evren_ve_ipekyildiz.pdf

Karaosmanoğlu, Y. K. (1955). *Zoraki Diplomat.* İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.

_____ (1968). *Politikada 45 Yıl.* Ankara: Bilgi Yay.

_____ (1971). *Panaroma VolI-II.* İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

_____ (1974). *Milli Savaş Hikâyeleri Ergenekon III.* İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

_____ (1981a). *Atatürk: Bir Tahlil Denemesi.* İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.

_____ (1981b). *Ergenekon: Milli Mücadele Yazıları.* Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

_____ (2001). *Ankara* (12th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2004). *Yaban* (56th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Karlıklı, Y. (2010). *Türk Devriminin Temel Belgeleri Siyasal Belgeler Anayasalar Yasalar.* İstanbul: Derlem Yayınları.

_____ (2011). *Türk Modernleşme Tarihi Araştırmalarının Ana Kaynakları: Bibliyografyalar.* İstanbul: Derlem Yayınları.

Kasaba, R. (1993). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Dünya Ekonomisi: On Dokuzuncu Yüzyıl.* Trans. K. Emiroğlu. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.

Kaya, Y., and Yücer, R. (2018). Kadro ve Yön Hareketlerinin İdeolojik Analizi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi 7*(2): 561–582.

Kayalı, K. (1990). Kadro Hareketi ve Gelişimi. In *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, 6*(57), 1861–1863.

_____ (2003). 1930'lar Sonrasında Türkiye'nin Kültürel Görünümü. In *Türk Düşünce Dünyasında Yol İzleri* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2012). *Ordu ve Siyaset: 27 Mayıs – 12 Mart* (5th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2014). *Türk Düşünce Dünyasının Bunalımı: Görüntüdeki Dinamizmin Gölgelediği Tıkanıklık* (4th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kazancı, M. (2009). Özgün ve Yerli Bir Hareket Olarak Kadro ve İdeolojisi. In *Tarih Okulu*, Issue 3, pp.41-58.

Kazancıgil, A. (2009). Anti-Emperyalist Bağımsızlık İdeolojisi ve Üçüncü Dünya Ulusçuluğu Olarak Kemalizm. In A. İnsel (ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm* (Vol. 2, 6th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.235-246.

Kazgan, H. (1991). *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Şirketleşme. İstanbul: Vakıfbank Yayınları.*

_____ (1997*). Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Türk Bankacılık Tarihi.* İstanbul: Türkiye Bankalar Birliği.

Kazgan, G. (2002). *Tanzimattan 21. Yüzyıla Türkiye Ekonomisi: Birinci Küreselleşmeden İkinci Küreselleşmeye.* İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

_____ and Ulçenko, N. (2003). *Dünden Bugüne Türkiye ve Rusya: Politik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel İlişkiler.* Trans. H. Aksoy. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

_____ (2005). *Türkiye Ekonomisinde Krizler (1929 – 2001): "Ekonomi Politik" Açısından Bir İrdeleme.* İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kepenek, Y., and Yentürk, N. (1996). *Türkiye Ekonomisi* (8th ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Keyder, Ç. (1976). *Emparyalizm, Azgelişmişlik ve Türkiye.* İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.

_____ (1982). *Dünya Ekonomisi İçinde Türkiye (1923–1929).* Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

_____ (1988). Zafer Toprak, İlhan Tekeli-Selim İlkin ve Şevket Pamuk'un Tebliğlerine İlişkin Yorum. In, Ş. Pamuk & Z. Toprak (Eds.) *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923–2000).* Ankara: Yurt Yay.

_____ (1993). *Ulusal Kalkınmacılığın İflası.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

_____ and Tabak, F. (Eds.) (2009). *Osmanlı'da Toprak Mülkiyeti ve Ticari Tarım* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

_____ (2011). *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2013). Türkiye Demokrasisinin Ekonomi Politiği. In I. C. Schick & A. Tonak (Eds.) *Geçiş Sürecinde Türkiye* (6th ed.). İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, pp. 61–117.

Kıray, E. (2010). *Osmanlı'da Ekonomik Yapı ve Dış Borçlar* (4th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kıvılcımlı, H. (1936). *Marksizm Kalpazanları Kimlerdir: Kerim Sadi.* Köxüz Yay. Retrieved 20.05.2016, from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4WCAkfIVlkyY1Ewa3JrR19oaFE/view

_____ (1978). *Yol III: Partide Konuklar ve Konaklar.* Köxüz Yay. Retrieved 20.05.2016, from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4WCAkfIVlkyNFI2MlpUMzZhSVk/view

_____ (2007a). *Osmanlı Tarihinin Maddesi.* İstanbul: Sosyal İnsan Yayınları.

_____ (2007b). *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Gelişimi.* İstanbul: Sosyal İnsan Yayınları.

_____ (2008). *Gençliğe Yazılar.* İstanbul: Sosyal İnsan Yayınları.

Kocabaşoğlu, U., Sak, G., Sönmez, S., Erkal, F., Gökmen, Ö., Şeker N.,… Uluğtekin, M. (2001). *Türkiye İş Bankası Tarihi.* İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Koçak, C. (2006). *Belgelerle İktidar ve Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2011). *Tek Parti Döneminde Muhalif Sesler* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2013). *Geçmişiniz İtinayla Temizlenir* (7th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Koçak, O. (2007). Kemalizmi Aşmak. In F. Umruk (ed.) *Sosyalizmin Milliyetçilikle İmtihanı.* İstanbul: Versus Kitap, pp.141-159.

Kolaylı, T.N. (2009). İ. Ada (ed.) *Azabı Mukaddes.* İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları.

Kongar, E. (1998). *Devrim Tarihi ve Toplumbilim Açısından Atatürk* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Koraltürk, M. (2011). *Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Ekonoinin Türkleştirilmesi.* İstanbul: İletişim Yay.

Köker, L. (2013), *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi,* 14th edition, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kurtuluş Şimşek, G., and Berberoğlu, M. (2026). Kadro Hareketi'nden Günümüze Kalkınma Yaklaşımı: Devletçi Girişimcilik, Kuramsal Süreklilikler ve Çağdaş Ayrışmalar, *Politik Ekonomik Kuram 10*(1), 226–241. https://doi.org/10.30586/pek.1834878

Kuruç, B. (1987). *Mustafa Kemal Döneminde Ekonomi.* Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Kuyaş, A. (2009). Yeni Osmanlılar'dan 1930'lara Anti-Emperyalist Düşünce. In A. İnsel (ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm* (Vol. 2, 6th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.247-252.

Küçük, Y. (1971). *100 Soruda Planlama Kalkınma ve Türkiye*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi.

_____ (1985). Kemalizmin Köylü İdeologu: Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. In *Aydın Üzerine Tezler: 1908–1980* (Vol. 3). Ankara: Tekin Yayınları, pp.474-499.

_____ (1987a). *Aydın Üzerine Tezler* (Vol. 5). Ankara: Tekin Yayınları.

_____ (1987b). *İtirafçıların İtirafları.* İstanbul: Haziran Yayınları.

_____ (1987c). *Türkiye Üzerine Tezler: 1908–1978* (Vol. 2, 3rd ed.). Ankara: Tekin Yayınları.

_____ (1988). Şevket Süreyya Aydemir Benerci, Nazım Hikmettir. In *Aydın Üzerine Tezler: 1908–1980* (Vol.5). Ankara: Tekin Yayınları, p.489-498.

_____ (1989). *Türkiye Üzerine Tezler: 1908–1978* (Vol. 1, 5th ed.). Ankara: Tekin Yayınları.

_____ (1992). *Türkiye Üzerine Tezler: 1908–1978* (Vol. 5, 1st ed.). Ankara: Tekin Yayınları.

_____ (2004a). Aydın Üzerine Tezler. In *Bilim ve Edebiyat* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları, pp.315-349.

_____ (2004b). Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türk Aydını. In *Bilim ve Edebiyat* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları, pp. 526–534..

Küçükömer, İ. (2014). *Batılılaşma ve Düzenin Yabancılaşması* (5th ed.). İstanbul: Profil Yayıncılık.

Laclau, E. (1998). *İdeoloji ve Politika* (2nd ed.). Trans. H. Sarıca. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.

_____ and Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (2nd ed.). London: VERSO.

_____ (2007). *Popülist Akıl Üzerine*. Ankara: Epos Yayınları.

Lenin, V. İ. (2003). *Devlet ve İhtilal* (9th ed.). Trans. K. Somer. Ankara: Bilim ve Sosyalizm Yayınları.

_____ (2013). *Emperyalizm: Kapitalizmin En Yüksek Aşaması.* Trans. C. Süreyya. Ankara: Sol Yayınları.

Leys, C. (1976). The 'Overdeveloped' Post Colonial State: A Re-evulation. In *Review of African Political Economy* (Vol. 3, Issue 5). London: Mortimer House, pp.39-48.

Lewis, B. (2007). *Demokrasinin Türkiye Serüveni* (3rd ed.). Trans. H. Aydoğan and E. Ermert, Ankara: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Makal, A. (1999). *Türkiye'de Tek Partili Dönemde Çalışma İlişkileri: 1920–1946*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

_____ (2011). T. Bora (ed.) *Ameleden İşçiye Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Emek Tarihi Çalışmaları* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Mardin, Ş. (2014). *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895–1908* (19th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2015). M. Türköne and T. Önder (ed.) *Türk Modernleşmesi: Makaleler 4* (24th ed,). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Marguiles, R., and Yıldızoğlu, E. (2013). Tarımsal Değişim: 1923 – 1970. In I. C. Schick and A. Tonak (ed.) *Geçiş Sürecinde Türkiye* (6th ed.). İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, pp.433 – 469.

Martin, J. (2013). *Poulantzas Kitabı Seçme Yazılar.* Trans. A. Sarı & S. Güzelsarı. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Mazıcı, N. (1998). 1930'a Kadar Basının Durumu ve 1931 Matbuat Kanunu. In *Atatürk Yolu* (Vol. 5, Issue 18). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü, pp. 131–154.

Meriç, C. (2014). *Bu Ülke* (43rd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Naskali, E. G. (2015). *Celal Bayar Arşivinden Serbest Fırka Anıları.* İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.

Odabaşı, İ. A. (2012). *Osmanlı'da Sosyalizm, Türkçülük ve İttihatçılık -Rasim Haşmet Bey-* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.

_____ (2015). *II. Meşrutiyet Basınında Halkçılık Köylülük Sosyalizm.* İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Oğuzkan, F. (1954). *Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu Hayatı Sanatı Eserleri*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi.

Oksaçan, H. E. (2016). *Kadro Dergisi ve İktisadi Devletçilik*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.

Okyar, O., and Seyitdanlıoğlu, M., (2014). *Atatürk, Okyar ve Çok Partili Türkiye Mehmet Okyar'ın Anıları* (6th ed.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Oral, M. (2006). *CHP'nin Ülküsü: CHP'nin Kültür Siyasası Açısından Halkevleri Merkez Yayını Ülkü Dergisi.* İstanbul: Yeniden Müdafaa-i Hukuk Yayınları.

Ortaylı, İ. (2008a). *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı.* İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

_____ (2008b). *Tarihimiz ve Biz.* İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Örmeci, O. (2011). The 'Kadro' Movement: An Intellectual Movement in the Early Republican Period (1932–1934). *International Review of Turkish Studies* 1(1): 20–37.

Öz, E. (1992). *Tek Parti Yönetimi ve Siyasal Katılım (1923–1945).* Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.

Özkaya, Y. (1994). Gazi Mustafa Kemal Paşa'nın 1927 İstanbul ve Sonraki Gezileri. In *Atatürk Yolu Dergisi* (Issue 14). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü, pp.185-212.

Özçetin, B. (2010). Zigana Dağındaki Portakal Ağacı: Recep Peker ve Kemalizm. In *Akdeniz İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi* (Issue 20, pp.167-187). Retrieved 04.05.2016, from http://psi203.cankaya.edu.tr/uploads/files/Ozcetin,%20Recep%20Peker.pdf

Özfırat, A. (2009). Türkiye'de Sivil Muhalefet: Kadro Hareketi (1932–1934). Unpublished MS. Thesis, İnönü University, Malatya.

Pamuk, Ş. (1984). *Osmanlı Ekonomisi ve Dünya Kapitalizmi (1820 – 1913): Ticaret, Sermaye ve Üretim İlişkileri*. Ankara: Yurt Yayınevi.

_____ (1999). *100 Soruda Osmanlı – Türkiye İktisadi Tarihi (1500 – 1914)* (5th ed.). İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınları.

_____ (2012). *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e: Küreselleşme, İktisat Politikaları ve Büyüme, Seçme Eserleri* (Vol. 2, 3rd ed.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

_____ (2014). *Türkiye'nin 200 Yıllık İktisadi Tarihi* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Pasukanis, E. B. (2013). *Genel Hukuk Teorisi ve Marksizm* (3rd ed.). Trans. O. Karahanoğulları. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.

Parla, T. (1991a). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Atatürk'ün Nutku* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (1991b). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri* (Vol. 2). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (1992). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Oku* (Vol. 3). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2009). *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm* (6th ed.). İstanbul: Deniz Yayınları.

Petrosyan, Y. A. (2015). *Sosyalist Açıdan Jöntürk Hareketi.* Trans. A. Hacıhasanoğlu and M. Beyhan. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Preobrajenski, E.A. (1976). Yeni İktisattan Seçmeler. M. Tunçay (ed.) *Sosyalist Siyasal Düşünüş Tarihi* (Vol. 2). Trans. B. Kuruç, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Polanyi, K. (2013). *Büyük Dönüşüm: Çağımızın Siyasal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri* (2nd ed.). Trans. A. Buğra. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Pommery, L. (1956). *Yeni Zamanların İktisat Tarihi: 1890–1939.* Trans. C. Talas. Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi.

Plaggenborg, S. (2015). *Tarihe Emretmek: Kemalist Türkiye, Faşist İtalya, Sosyalist Rusya* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Poulantzas, N. (1975). *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism.* Trans. D. Fernbach. London: NLB.

_____ (1981). *Portekiz, İspanya ve Yunanistan'da Geçiş Süreci.* İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.

_____ (1982). *Political Power & Social Classes* (2nd ed.). Trans. T. O'Hagan. London: VERSO.

_____ (2003). *Siyasal İktidar ve Toplumsal Sınıflar.* Ankara: Epos Yayınları.

_____ (2004). *Devlet, İktidar, Sosyalizm.* Ankara: Epos Yayınları.

_____ (2012). *Faşizm ve Diktatörlük* (2nd ed.). Trans. A. İnsel. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ran, N. H. (2015). *Benerci Kendini Niçin Öldürdü?* (13th ed.). İstanbul: YKY.

Reyhan, C. (2007). *Osmanlı'da İki Tarz-ı İdare: Merkeziyetçilik- Adem-i Merkeziyetçilik*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

_____ (2008). *Osmanlı'da Kapitalizmin Kökenleri: Kent – Kapitalizm İlişkisi Üzerine Tarihsel Sosyolojik Bir Çözümleme.* İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Rozaliyev, Y. N. (1978). *Türkiye'de Kapitalizmin Gelişme Özellikleri (1923 – 1960)*. Trans. A. Yaran. Ankara: Onur Yayınları.

Sadi, K. (1934). *Cüz:4 Şevket Süreyya'nın Hatalarına Dair.* İstanbul: İnsaniyet Matbaası.

Sadiq, M. (1986). The Kadro Movement in Turkey. *International Studies (Journal of the School of International Studies Jawaharlal Nehru University)* 23–24: 319–338.

Safa, P. (1995). *Türk İnkılabına Bakışlar.* İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Savran, S. (2010). *Türkiye'de Sınıf Mücadeleleri (1908 – 1980)* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Yordam Yayınları.

Sayılgan, A. (1972). *Türkiye'de Sol Hareketler (1871–1972)* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Hareket Yayınları.

Selek, S. (1987a). *Anadolu İhtilali* (Vol 1, 8th ed.). İstanbul: Kastaş Yayınları.

_____ (1987b). *Anadolu İhtilali* (Vol 2, 8th ed.). İstanbul: Kastaş Yayınları.

Sertel, Z. (1968). *Hatırladıklarım (1905–1950).* İstanbul: Yaylacık Yayınları.

Sezgin, Ö. (1978). Kadro Hareketi. In *Kadro Dergisi Tıpkı Basımı*. Ankara: Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi.

_____ (2005). *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Siyasal Rejim Sorunu* (2nd ed.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Shaw, S. J., and Shaw, E. K. (2002). *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey: Reform, Revolution and Republic: Rise of the Modern Turkey 1808–1975* (Vol. 2, 8th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sıdal, S., and Meri, T. (2024). Kanonik Bir Metin Olarak Kadro Dergisi. *Muhafazakâr Düşünce Dergisi 20*(66): 88–117.

Solak, M. (2013). *Atatürk'ün Bakanı Şükrü Kaya (Uluslaşma, Laiklik, Toprak Reformu).* İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.

Sönmez, M. (1978). *Kapitalist Devlet İşletmeleri ve Türkiye.* İstanbul: Tüm İktisatçılar Birliği Yayınları.

Sunar, L. (2004). Kadro Dergisi/Hareketi ve Etkileri: Türk Devlet İdeolojisi ve Sol Kemalizmin Oluşumu Bağlamında Bir Analiz. In *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* (Vol. 2, Issue 1). İstanbul: Bilim ve Sanat Vakfı Türkiye Araştırmaları Merkezi, pp.511-526.

Sweezy, P., Baran, P., and Magdoff, H. (1975). *Çağdaş Kapitalizmin Bunalımı.* Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Şanda, H. A. (1975a). *Yarı Müstemleke Oluş Tarihi ve 1908 İşçi Hareketleri*. İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları.

_____ (1975b). *Reaya ve Köylü* (2nd ed. 9). İstanbul: Habora Kitabevi.

Şişmanov, D. (1990). *Türkiye'de İşçi ve Sosyalist Hareketi (Kısa Tarih 1908–1965)* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Belge Yay.

Şimşir, B. N. (1975). *İngiliz Belgelerinde Atatürk (1919–1938)* (Vol. 2). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Tanör, B. (2009). *Türkiye'de Kongre İktidarları (1918–1920)* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

_____ (2010). *Kurtuluş – Kuruluş* (10th ed.). İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitap.

_____ (2013). *Anayasal Gelişme Tezleri* (3rd ed). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

_____ (2015). *Osmanlı-Türk Anayasal Gelişmeleri (1979 – 1980)* (25th ed.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Tekeli, İ. (1984). Ekonomik Bunalımın ve Bunalımdan Çıkmak İçin İzlenen Politikaların Toplumsal Sonuçları. In *Türkiye'de ve Dünyada Yaşanan Ekonomik Bunalım.* Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, pp.229-255.

Tekeli, İ., and İlkin, S. (1982). *Uygulamaya Geçerken Türkiye'de Devletçiliğin Oluşumu.* Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üni. Press.

_____ (1984). Türkiye'de Bir Aydın Hareketi: Kadro. In *Toplum ve Bilim* (Issue 24). İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları, pp.35-64.

_____ (1988). Devletçilik Dönemi Tarım Politikaları (Modernleşme Dönemi). In Ş. Pamuk & Z. Toprak, (Eds.). *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923–2000).* Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

_____ (1997). *Para ve Kredi Sisteminin Oluşumunda Bir Aşama: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez Bankası* (2nd ed.). Ankara: T.C. Merkez Bankası Yayınları.

_____ (2003). *Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadroculari ve Kadro'yu Anlamak.* İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

_____ (2009). *1929 Dünya Buhranında Türkiye'nin İktisadi Politika Arayışları.* İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat Yayınları.

_____ (2010a). *Cumhuriyetin Harcı: Köktenci Modernitenin Doğusu* (Vol. 1, 3rd ed.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

_____ (2010b). *Cumhuriyetin Harcı: Köktenci Modernitenin Doğusu* (Vol. 2, 3rd ed.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

_____ (2010c). *Cumhuriyetin Harcı: Köktenci Modernitenin Doğusu* (Vol. 3, 3rd ed.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Tekin, S. (1992). Dr. Reşit Galip ve Üniversite Reformu. In *Çağdaş Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi* (Vol. 1, Issue 2). İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi. Retrieved 04.05.2016, from http://web.deu.edu.tr/ataturkilkeleri/pdf/1.ciltsayi2/c1_s2_saadet_tekin.pdf

Tevetoğlu, F. (1967). *Türkiye'de Sosyalist ve Komünist Faaliyetler.* İstanbul: Ayyıldız Matbaası.

Tezel, Y. S. (1986). *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi (1923–1950)* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Timur, T. (2003). *Türkiye'de Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş* (3rd ed.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

_____ (2013a). Osmanlı Mirası. In I. C. Schick & A. Tonak (Eds.) *Geçiş Sürecinde Türkiye* (6th ed.). İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, pp.21-59.

_____ (2013b). *Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası* (7th ed.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

_____ (2014). *Marx-Engels ve Osmanlı Toplumu* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Yordam Yayınları.

Tokgöz, E. (1991). *Türkiye'nin İktisadi Gelişme Tarihi.* Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi.

Toprak, Z. (2012). *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat 1908–1918.* İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.

Topakkaya A. (2006). Hegel'in Hukuk Felsefesinin Ana İlkeleri (Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechtes) Adlı Eserinde Devletin Kurumsal Yapısının Ana Hatlarıyla Analizi. In *Erzincan Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* (Vol 5, Issue 3–4, pp. 189–201). Erzincan: Erzincan Ünv. Hukuk Fak.Dergisi, Retrieved 21.02.2016, from http://eski.erzincan.edu.tr/birim/HukukDergi/makale/2006_X_2_8.pdf

Tökin, İ. H. (1940). *Müdafaa Ekonomisi.* Ankara: Akba Kitabevi.

_____ (1946). *İsmet İnönü: Şahsiyeti ve Ülküsü.* Ankara: Ülkü Basımevi.

_____ (1990). *Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatı* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Tör, V. N. (1940). *Dinimiz.* İstanbul: Yedigün Neşriyatı.

_____ (1941). *Birleşik Amerikanın İktisadi Oluşu* (Konferanslar Serisi:9). İstanbul: Türk İktisat Cemiyeti.

_____ (1976). *Yıllar Böyle Geçti.* İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları.

_____ (1980). *Kemalizmin Dramı.* İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları.

_____ (1981). *Atatürk Olmasaydı.* İstanbul: Yapı ve Kredi Bankası.

Trak, A. (1986). Development Literature and Writters from Underdeveloped Countries: The Case of Turkey. In *Current Anthropology* (Vol. 26, Issue 1). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press Books, pp.89-102.

Trotsky, L. (1978). *The Permanent Revolution & Results and Prospects* (6th ed.). New York: Pathfinderpress.

Tunaya, T. Z. (1969). *Siyasi Müesseseler ve Anayasa Hukuku* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Filiz Yayınevi.

_____ (2010). *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Tunçay, M. (1976). *Sosyalist Siyasal Düşünüş Tarihi* (Vol. 2). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

_____ (1978). *Türkiye'de Sol Akımlar (1908 – 1925)* (Vol. 1, 3rd ed.). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

_____ (1982). *Eski Sol Üstüne Yeni Bilgiler.* İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.

_____ (1991). *Arif Oruç'un Yarın'ı (1933).* İstanbul: İletişim Yay.

_____ (1992). *Türkiye'de Sol Akımlar (1925–1936)* (Vol 2). İstanbul: BDS Yayınları.

_____ (1992a). *T.C.'de Tek Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması (1923 – 1931)* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

_____ (1992b). *Türkiye'de Sol Akımlar (1925 – 1936)* (Vol 2). İstanbul: BDS Yay.

_____ (1995). Sonuç Yerine. In M. Tunçay & E. J. Zürcher (Eds.) *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyalizm ve Milliyetçilik (1876 – 1923): Türkiye'de Sosyalizmin Oluşmasında ve Gelişmesinde Etnik ve Dinsel Toplulukların (Makedon, Yahudi, Rum, Bulgar ve Ermeni Anasır'ın) Rolü.* Trans. M. Tunçay. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.239-256.

Tura, A.R. (1998). *Kemalist Devlet.* İstanbul: Kardelen Yayınları.

Tural, M. A. (1987). *Atatürk Devrinde İktisadi Yapılaşma ve Celal Bayar (1920–1938).* Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Turan, M. (2011). *CHP'nin Doğu'da Teşkilatlanması (1923 -1950)*. İstanbul: Libra Yayınları.

_____ (2013). Tek Parti Döneminin İktidar Literatüründe Osmanlı Mirası. In *Tarih Okulu Dergisi (TOD) 6*(16), 79–116. Retrieved 12.05.2016, from http://dx.doi.org/10.14225/Joh320

Turan, Ş. (2006). Dr. Reşit Galip'in Atatürk'e Yakınmaları. In *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi,* C.XXV (Issue 39, pp.1-25). Ankara: Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları. Retrieved 04.05.2016, from http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/18/34/281.pdf

Türkeş, M. (1999). *Ulusçu Sol Bir Akım: Kadro Hareketi (1932–1934).* Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.

Uğurcan, S. (2008). *Tarih İle Edebiyat Arasında: Şevket Süreyya Aydemir'in Kitaplarında Bütünlük Otobiyografi-Otobiyografik Roman-Biyografiler*. (pp. 1669–1690). Retrieved 29.08.2016, from http://www.ayk.gov.tr/icanas38/edebiyat-bilimi-sorunlari-ve-cozumleri-problems-and-solutions-of-the-science-of-literature-проблемы-литератур/

Uslu, A. (2012). Kadro Dergisi: Dil ve Edebiyat Anlayışı. In *Turkish Studies* (Y. 7), Ankara: Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, pp.1103-1114.

Uyar, H. (1997). Resmi İdeoloji ya da Alternatif Resmi İdeoloji Oluşturmaya Yönelik İki Dergi: Ülkü ve Kadro Mecmualarının Karşılaştırmalı İçerik Analizi. In *Toplum ve Bilim* (Issue 74) İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları, pp.181-193.

_____ (2012). *Tek Parti Dönemi ve Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi.* İstanbul: Boyut Yayınları.

Ülgener, F. S. (2006). *Makaleler: Toplu Eserleri* (Vol. 5). İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.

Ülken, H. Z. (1992). *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları.

Üstel, F. (2010). *Türk Ocakları: İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği (1912 – 1931)* (3rd ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____ (2014). "*Makbul Vatandaş"ın Peşinde: II. Meşrutiyetten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi* (6th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Varlı, A., and Koraltürk, M. (2010). II. Meşrutiyet'ten Erken Cumhuriyet'e Milli İktisadın Sürekliliği ve İzmir İktisat Kongresi. In *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi,* (Vol. 9, Issue 20–21). İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi/Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü, pp.127-142.

Yalımov, İ. (1995). 1876–1923 Döneminde Türkiye'de Bulgar Azınlığı ve Sosyalist Hareketin Gelişmesi. In M. Tunçay & E. J. Zürcher (Eds.) *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyalizm ve Milliyetçilik (1876 – 1923): Türkiye'de Sosyalizmin Oluşmasında ve Gelişmesinde Etnik ve Dinsel Toplulukların (Makedon, Yahudi, Rum,*

Bulgar ve Ermeni Anasır'ın) Rolü. Trans. M. Tunçay. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.133-162.

Yalman, A.E. (1997). E. Ş. Erdinç (ed.) *Gördüklerim Geçirdiklerim: (1922–1971)* (Vol. 2, 2nd ed.). İstanbul: Pera Turizm ve Ticaret Yay.

Yalman, L. G. (2009). *Transition to Neo-liberalism: The Case of Turkey in the 1980's*. İstanbul: Bilgi Uni. Press.

Yanardağ, M. (1988). *Türk Siyasal Yaşamında Kadro Hareketi.* İstanbul: Yalçın Yay.

Yerasimos, S. (1975). *Azgelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye* (Vol. 2). Trans. B. Kuzucu. İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları.

_____ (1976). *Azgelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye* (Vol. 3).Trans. B. Kuzucu. İstanbul: Gözlem Yay.

_____ (2013). Tek Parti Dönemi. In I. C. Schick & A. Tonak (Eds.). *Geçiş Sürecinde Türkiye* (6th ed.). İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, pp.119-172.

Yetkin, Ç. (1980). *Türk Halk Hareketleri ve Devrimleri.* Ankara: Karacan Yayınları.

Yıldırım, İ. (2001). *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Demiryolları (1923 – 1950).* Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi.

Yıldırım, V. E. (2015). *Atatürk Döneminde Sanayi Alanında Özel Sektör Devlet İlişkileri.* İzmir: Egeus Yayınları.

Yıldız, A. (2009). Kemalist Milliyetçilik. In A. İnsel (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm* (Vol. 2, 6th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.210-234.

_____ (2011). *Üç Dönem Bir Aydın: Burhan Asaf Belge (1899–1967).* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yılmaz, E. (2008). *Yakup Kadri'nin Romanlarında Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Değişim Süreci.* İstanbul: Birey Yayınları.

Yüksel, N. (2004). *Fikir Hareketleri Dergisi.* PhD. Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü/Kamu Yönetimi ve Siyaset Bilimi (Siyaset Bilimi) Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Wallerstein, I. (1993a). 11. Yüzyıldan 21. Yüzyıla Kavram ve Gerçeklik Olarak Burjuvazi. In *Irk, Ulus, Sınıf: Belirsiz Kimlikler.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp.169–192.

_____ (1993b). Halklığın İnşası: Irkçılık, Milliyetçilik ve Etniklik. In *Irk, Ulus, Sınıf: Belirsiz Kimlikler.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp.91–108.

_____ (1993c). Kapitalist Dünya Ekonomisinde Sınıf Çatışması. In *Irk, Ulus, Sınıf: Belirsiz Kimlikler.* Metis Yayınları, pp.145–156.

Zürcher, E. J. (1995). Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyalizm, Milliyetçilik ve Tarih Yazımı. In M. Tunçay & E. J. Zürcher (Eds.). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyalizm ve Milliyetçilik (1876 – 1923): Türkiye'de Sosyalizmin Oluşmasında ve Gelişmesinde Etnik ve Dinsel Toplulukların (Makedon, Yahudi, Rum, Bulgar ve Ermeni Anasır'ın) Rolü.* Trans. M. Tunçay. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.7-32.

_____ (2005). Ottoman Sources at Kemalist Thought. In E. Özdalga (Ed.). *Late Ottoman Society: The Intellectual Legacy.* London: Routledge Curzon, pp.13-24.

_____ (2009). Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları. In A. İnsel (Ed.). *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm* (Vol. 2, 6th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp.41-55.

Zedung, M. (2008). *Pratik ve Çelişki Üzerine.* Trans. A. Kırmızıgül. Ankara: Epos Yayınları.

Zizek, S. (2011). *İdeolojinin Yüce Nesnesi* (4rd ed.). İstanbul: Metis.

The Kadro Movement: A Search for National Socialism after the Great Depression

Ozan Ekin Derin

This study aims to analyze the political practice of the Kadro movement in the context of the early Republican period in Türkiye. Examining the problematic relationship of the Kadro movement with segments of the Turkish bourgeoisie and landowners, this study attempts to show how the Kadro group tried to realize its statist projects through strategic articulations and conflicts. In this context, the ideological, economic, and political theses developed by the Kadro journal, their organizational forms, and the oscillation of these theses between nationalism and socialism are investigated in depth, and this movement is evaluated as an alternative version of the national socialist constructions that emerged after the 1929 World Economic Depression.

ÖZGÜR PRESS

ISBN 978-625-5019-46-2