



**Universiteit Leiden**

**Left-Leaning Interpretations of Kemalism within the Scope of  
Three Journals: Kadro, Markopaşa and Yön**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Research Master of Arts in the department of Middle Eastern Studies, Leiden University, November 2016.

**Banu İdrisoğlu**  
**Student No: 0896845**  
**ResMA**

**Supervisor**  
**Prof. Dr. Erik-Jan Zürcher**

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Abbreviations.....	4
Introduction.....	5
1. Kadro.....	12
1.1 Nationalism.....	15
1.1.1 Kadro Writers and Their Relation with Nationalism Prior to Kadro.....	15
1.1.2 Nationalism and National Economy.....	18
1.1.3 Anti-Imperialism.....	20
1.1.4 Exclusivist Policies of Kemalism.....	28
1.2 Populism.....	36
1.2.1 Elitism.....	39
1.2.2 Classes and Society.....	40
1.3 Republicanism.....	45
1.4 Etatism.....	52
1.5 Reformism.....	63
1.6 Laicism.....	70
2. Markopaşa.....	77
2.1 Nationalism.....	79
2.2 Populism.....	86
2.2.1 People.....	87
2.2.2 Society and Classes.....	89
2.2.3 Elitism and Authoritarianism.....	91
2.3 Republicanism and Democracy.....	94
2.4 Laicism.....	97
2.5 Reformism.....	101
2.6 Etatism.....	105
3. Yön.....	108
3.1 Nationalism.....	111
3.2 Populism.....	117
3.3 Etatism.....	125

3.4 Reformism.....	132
3.5 Laicism.....	137
3.6 Republicanism.....	141
Conclusion.....	146
Bibliography.....	153

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

AP	Justice Party (Adalet Partisi)
CUP	Committee of Union and Progress (İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti)
DP	Democrat Party (Demokrat Parti)
FRP	Free Republican Party (Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası)
KUTV	Communist University of the Toilers of the East
MDD	National Democratic Revolution (Milli Deokratik Devrim)
RPP	Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi)
TIP	Workers Party of Turkey (Türkiye İşçi Partisi)
TKP	Communist Party of Turkey (Türkiye Komünist Partisi)
TSP	Turkish Socialist Party (Türkiye Sosyalst Partisi)
TWPSP	Turkish Workers and Peasants Socialist Party (Türkiye İşçi ve Çiftçi Sosyalist Fırkası)

## **INTRODUCTION**

This study examines the Kemalist discourse of the *Kadro*, *Markopaşa* and *Yön* journals and their role in the connections between Kemalism and leftist ideas. Analyzing and comparing these three journals throughout the 1930s, 1940s and 1960s will provide valuable information on left-wing interpretations of Kemalist ideology by different left-leaning groups which have had varying objectives.

Kemalism emerged as the ideological framework for the Turkish Republic in the early 1920s and often refers to the hegemonic ideology of the republic. It includes political thought and practices of Mustafa Kemal and his party, the RPP (Republican People's Party). Kemalism's tenets are crystallized in the "six arrows of the RPP", which are nationalism, populism, laicism, republicanism, reformism, and etatism.

Despite its clear directions, Kemalism has never been formulated clearly, although it has functioned as the official ideology of the republic. Due to its relative ambiguity and its changing reference points, several people from different periods and political backgrounds were able to adopt Kemalist ideology. Consequently, how to define Kemalism has led to big questions in political life as well as in academic world in Turkey: Is Kemalism a way of "Turkish enlightenment"? Is it democratic or authoritarian? Is it a modernizing or a conservative ideology? Does it fit left-wing or right-wing politics? Does it carry features of solidarism or socialism? What is its exact relation with ideologies like positivism and corporatism?

As such, understanding the left-leaning interpretations of these influential journals may shed light on the attitudes of different types of intellectuals about Kemalism. In order to understand this, discussing Kemalism and putting it in a certain ideological context seems unavoidable. This is an important issue, since many of studies on *Kadro* and *Yön* do not question the very nature of Kemalism clearly, and therefore the exact relationship between these journals and Kemalism does not reveal itself. Although the scope of this thesis cannot include lengthy discussions about Kemalism, some of these crucial questions will be answered, especially in the *Kadro* chapter where they appear for the first time.

*Kadro*, *Markopaşa* and *Yön* are not only journals but also political currents of different scales. It is quite common for Turkey's intellectuals to gather forces around journals, which sometimes

evolve into political or literary currents within time. As such, the journals became crucial for many groups for expressing themselves, as they have done since the Ottoman times. For example, as expressions of different currents, “Meşveret”, “Servet-i Fünun”, “Halka Doğru”, and “Büyük Doğu” are all such journals. However, journals became particularly important for leftists in the republican era. Although not abundant in numbers, their existence was crucial for people who published them, especially when expressing leftist views or being involved in politics through legal channels was not possible. Particularly, the “Aydınlık” journal of Turkish Workers and Peasants Socialist Party by 1921 and “Resimli Ay” of Zekeriya Sertel by 1924 functioned as a platform for many famous intellectuals and activists such as Sabiha Sertel, Nazım Hikmet, Vala Nureddin, Ethem Nejat, Şefik Hüsnü, Suat Derviş, future Kadro writers Vedat Nedim, Burhan Asaf, İsmail Hüsrev, Şevket Süreyya and Markopaşa’s Sabahattin Ali.

These efforts continued in the following years and the journals that are discussed in this thesis are also such intellectual currents which came into prominence in a vanguard role. Kadro proved its foresight with its anti-imperialist ideas about the independence movements of underdeveloped countries almost twenty years before the “third-world” term was invented. Markopaşa came forward with its unique oppositional style and its courageous stand against the government, even though this resulted in grave consequences for its writers. Eventually, Sabahattin Ali was killed, mainly due to the events which were triggered during the Markopaşa period,<sup>1</sup> and his case became a harsh reminder for all leftists of the “dangers of being a dissident.”<sup>2</sup> Finally, Yön served as a platform for progressive and leftist intellectuals and showed its influential role in Turkey by breaking the taboo subjects. It questioned the Kurdish issue, named it the “Eastern Problem” for the first time, and published the work of the communist poet Nazım Hikmet, who died in diaspora in Russia in 1963.

Analyzing the relations of these three journals with Kemalism as the dominant formal ideology of their time is crucial as this will provide a concrete discussion about the three different intellectual attitudes towards Kemalist ideology. In this way, it will be possible to see what exactly these intellectuals understood from Kemalism and how they interpreted it according to their world-view. This is important because Kadro, Markopaşa and Yön members all described themselves as Kemalists, although they had different positions towards the regime. It will be interesting to see

---

<sup>1</sup> Geriye Kalan, Aziz Nesin, Tekin Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1975, p.17

<sup>2</sup> Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi, Levent Cantek, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001, p. 40

how diverse or similar these intellectuals were in their ideologies and practices. In order to do this, the journals will be examined in light of the tenets of Kemalism.

Until now, studies were undertaken by historians and political scientists who strictly focused on Kadro and Yön, but not on Markopaşa. There is academic work that directly focuses on Markopaşa such as Levent Cantek's "Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi" and that study is very helpful to grasp Markopaşa's history and style as an oppositional satirical journal, however, its focus was mainly on journalism. As a result, there has not been enough attention on Markopaşa to examine its relationship with Kemalism, especially through text analyses. Therefore, examining Markopaşa articles in detail in order to understand its interpretation of Kemalism might be quite helpful. In addition, comparing this leftist journal to the Kadro group, which worked for the Kemalist regime while Markopaşa writers were deeply troubled by it, may provide interesting insights about Kemalism, especially because both journals claimed to have Kemalist ideology. Therefore, it is crucial to add Markopaşa to the comparisons between left-leaning journals to see if they have any common point in Kemalism to bring them together. In this way, this research will provide new perspectives for this discussion.

Related to the above-mentioned issues, the following questions will be examined in the study: As left-leaning intellectuals, what was the exact relation of the writers with the Kemalist regime of their time? What were their interpretations of Kemalist ideology? Was their interpretation in the same line with Mustafa Kemal and the RPP or at least derived from it? How did they deal with ambiguities and blurred lines of Kemalism? How did they cope with the authoritarian tendencies of Kemalism as being left-leaning intellectuals? Did they contribute to Kemalist ideology by employing their intellectual power or did they challenge it? How were interpretations of these journals affected by the complex nature of Kemalism, which includes eclectic and sometimes contradictory features that is often open to both left-wing and right-wing interpretations? Did they try to attribute left-oriented concepts or ideas to Kemalism? Did they integrate Kemalism into a left-wing discourse? If so, how did this discourse change over a forty year period? On expressing the views of the left-leaning intellectuals in Turkey in the mid-1930's, the late 1940's and in the 1960's, how did they differ from each other or resemble each other in their interpretations of Kemalism?

The thesis consists of three main chapters and each chapter is devoted to one journal. In every chapter, there is brief background information about the journals. Following this, their views and

position regarding Kemalism are discussed on the basis of the six arrows of Kemalist ideology. In this way, the nationalist, populist, etatist, laicist, reformist, and republicanist tenets will be discussed for each journal in connection with other arrows.

The core of this research is based on the journals' discourse and interpretations. Therefore, in every chapter, there will be text analyses based on the primary sources, and comparisons between the journals. Text analyses based on the primary sources are crucial for this research, since it gives a clear idea about what exactly the writers think, how they laid out their ideas, their strengths as well as their contradictions. When necessary, the secondary sources will also be used, especially for background information.

The first chapter is devoted to Kadro, a monthly journal of political, economic and social ideas, published between 1932 and 1934. Except for Yakup Kadri, the members of the journal were former communist intellectuals who tried to develop a socio-political ideology for the regime and sought support from it. The basic discussions about Kemalism and its six tenets will be briefly covered in the first chapter.

When discussing Kadro, the focus will often be on Şevket Süreyya Aydemir. Although other writers are very important and their role in Kadro's success is indisputable, Şevket Süreyya's tireless enthusiasm seemed to be the driving force in Kadro to make it an influential journal. His efforts in connecting Kemalism, anti-imperialism and independent movements of the underdeveloped world never ceased. Almost thirty years after the Kadro period, he also contributed to Yön journal with his articles. Therefore, he is the main link for many scholars who point out the similarities between two journals.

The second chapter addresses Markopaşa, a weekly political satire magazine from 1946 and 1949 published under different names. This exceptional publication became very successful and popular in a quite short time with its harsh criticism against the RPP regime and set a unique example. Its writers Sabahattin Ali, Aziz Nesin, Rıfat Ilgaz and Mim Uykusuz frequently confronted courts and jails due to their journal. Although it was one of the most influential and oppositional journals in the history of the republic, it was often overshadowed by larger scale leftist political movements like the TIP (Workers Party of Turkey) or by other left-leaning publications which had a larger volume and more serious outlook, like Kadro and Yön. Nevertheless, Markopaşa was the first left-wing publication which was able to reach a large



number of people. Although it was only a four-page magazine, it was as important as the Kadro and Yön journals and it left a legacy behind for dissidents and leftists. For example, in the Gezi Park protests of 2013, a symbolic special edition with the same name was published with the contribution of leftist journalists and intellectuals who chose a similar oppositional position towards the government. Regarding this, in this research, Markopaşa - which has been mostly examined as a part of a legacy of journalism before - will be analyzed with a special focus on its relationship to Kemalist ideology.

The only difficulty studying this journal is that it does not provide as much material in the way Kadro and Yön do. Although the main articles are enough to have a clear idea about the line of the journal, it requires some time to gather tangible material from other parts due to their short and satirical style.

Finally, the third chapter will be about Yön, a weekly political journal which was published between 1961 and 1967 mostly by leftist or left-leaning intellectuals who became more active in political life through their journal. The members of this group expressed their desire to bring a socialist order to Turkey. This journal became a very important platform towards opening the press and politics to leftists and normalized their ideologies by discussing them openly in the journal. After members felt disappointed in parliamentary methods, the Yön movement changed direction and started to consider a radical transformation of society through a military intervention. After Yön was closed down, some of its members published another journal called “Devrim” (Revolution), between 1969 and 1971, in order to evaluate and clarify military intervention options for a transition period towards socialism. In this chapter, however, the major focus will be on the Yön journal, rather than Devrim.

The primary source material for the thesis consists of the Kadro, Markopaşa, Yön and, Devrim journals. Additionally, some of the books and articles from other publications that belonged to the writers of these journals were also used when it was necessary. The IISH in Amsterdam and Leiden University Library provided most of the primary and secondary sources for this study. IISH’s rich collection was indispensable for obtaining original Markopaşa series and Yön issues, and Leiden University Library for the Kadro issues and most of the secondary sources. For Devrim, rather than the actual journals, a collection of articles of Doğan Avcıoğlu named “Atatürkçülük, Milliyetçilik ve Sosyalizm: Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön ve Devrim Yazıları” were used.

Given their clear role in the formation of left-wing Kemalism with strong nationalist tones (Ulusal Sol), Kadro and Yön journals have provided a fertile soil for a great deal of scholarly publications. Tekeli and Ilkin's book "Bir Cumhuriyet Oyküsü: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak" provides detailed information about Kadro's journey, while Mustafa Türkeş's book "Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım" and his articles about Kadro provide valuable arguments about the ideological background and objectives of the journal. Şevket Süreyya's book "İnkılap ve Kadro" was also often used. This book was written just before Kadro's publication. It was also referred to by other Kadro writers in their articles, since it served as a summary of Kadro's ideas in general.

Markopaşa journal's name changed very often, thus, it will appear under different titles. Still, the main focus will be on the early Markopaşa series, which includes Markopaşa, Merhumpaşa, Malumpaşa, and Ali Baba, which were published when all the main writers could still contribute. When necessary, the series that was published without Sabahattin Ali, such as the secondary series of Markopaşa, Hür Markopaşa, and Yedi Sekiz Paşa were also used. Regarding the matters about Markopaşa series, the "Başdan" journal, which was published by Aziz Nesin following the Markopaşa period, was also quite helpful. Although Başdan provides clearer information about ideas of Aziz Nesin and many other leftists, it is not the main focus of this thesis because of its different style compared to the original Markopaşa series. Moreover, Zincirli Hürriyet of Zekeriya Sertel also used for Sabahattin Ali's article in it since it was helpful to understand his ideas in a detailed way.

As secondary sources, Levent Cantek's "Markopaşa, Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi" and Mehmet Saydur's "Markopaşa Gerçeği" provide almost all the necessary background information about the series and inner dynamics of the group in chronological order. Additionally, Kemal Bayram Çukurkavaklı's book "Sabahattin Ali Olayı" (Sabahattin Ali Case) and Kemal Sülker's "Sabahattin Ali Dosyası" are good sources in order to grasp the series of events that led to Ali's murder.

Along with the Yön and Devrim journals, Doğan Avcıoğlu's books "Türkiye'nin Düzeni" (The Social Order of Turkey) and "Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi" (The History of National Liberation) were also used. The first one is a valuable source to follow Avcıoğlu's ideas in a clear way. Although there are several academic studies about Yön, Gökhan Atılğan's book "Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar" proved to be the most useful source in

this subject by providing almost all of the necessary background information as well as beneficial arguments about Yön and leftist movements of the time. Fahrettin Altun's article "Discourse of Left Kemalists in Turkey: Case of Yön" and Özgür Mutlu Ulus' study "The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism" were also used since they bring respected discussions to the subject.

There is a wide variety and vast number of scholarly work on Kemalism. Still, Taha Parla and Erik-Jan Zürcher's research and arguments on Kemalism were the most suitable for this research, even though they have very different understandings of Kemalism. Particularly Parla & Davidson's study on Kemalism, "Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order" and several articles from Zürcher were very helpful for clearing up the ambiguities in Kemalist ideology as well as collection of articles on Kemalism and leftist movements of Turkey by the "Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce" (Political Thought in Modern Turkey) series.

Many other sources were also used for background information when necessary. Although only a number of them appear in the thesis, the memoirs of some of the most prominent intellectuals of Turkey, such as Sabiha Sertel, Zekeriya Sertel, Vala Nureddin, Müzehher Va-Nu, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Vedat Nedim Tör, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Aziz Nesin and Rıfat Ilgaz were read as a background information. These memoirs were extremely helpful to observe different opinions over crucial events of Turkish politics, and more importantly, to grasp the spirit of their period.

## 1 KADRO

The Kadro journal was published between January 1932 and December 1934. Its founders were Yakup Kadri Karaosmanođlu, the franchise holder; Őevket Sreyya Aydemir, the ideologue of the movement; Vedat Nedim Tr, the editor; and Burhan Asaf Belge, İsmail Hsrev Tkin and Mehmet Őevki Yazman, who were regular writers.<sup>3</sup>

Except for Yakup Kadri, who came from a large landowner family and belonged to the Mustafa Kemal fraction since the early 1920s, all Kadro writers came from middle-class families and they were involved in radical leftist movements before 1930.<sup>4</sup> Őevket Sreyya was a pan-Turanist until he witnessed the Bolshevik Revolution in Azerbaijan and became a communist in his early twenties. However, after his imprisonment following his prosecution in the mid-1920s, he ended his relationship with the leftist movement and after 1927 he supported the Kemalist regime. İsmail Hsrev's ideas were affected by anarchism, and later he studied with Őevket Sreyya in Russia. Vedat Nedim and Burhan Asaf studied in Germany and due to the influence of the Spartacist movement they adopted socialist ideas.<sup>5</sup> In the following years, all of them cut their relations to leftist movements. Just after the Great Depression, when the Kemalist regime was seeking new ways into economy, Kadro members had a chance to contribute to the construction of Kemalist ideology via their journal. In 1932, Yakup Kadri, who was already a deputy in the RPP, obtained permission for the journal through Mustafa Kemal. Prime Minister İsmet İnn was already aware of Kadro members' efforts to publish a journal, and he also supported it.<sup>6</sup>

From the beginning, Kadro writers were warned not to be involved in daily politics. Consequently, these self-appointed intellectuals intentionally stayed away from commenting on daily political events and tried to affect the state's economic programs via their journal. Indeed, they were aware of the fact that Mustafa Kemal, as the "real" ideologue of the state, would not allow them to own the notion of being the "ideologue of the regime."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Sometimes writers like Hakkı Mahir, Tahir Hayredin, Ahmet Hamdi BaŐar and Falih Rıfkı also contributed the journal.

<sup>4</sup> For more information about Kadro movement see: Bir Cumhuriyet Oyks: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, İlhan Tekeli & Selim İlkin, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 2003; Kadro Hareketi: UlusŐu Bir Sol Akım, Mustafa TrkeŐ, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara, 1999

<sup>5</sup> "Kadro ve Kadrocuların Oyks", İlhan Tekeli & Selim İlkin *in* Modern Trkiye'de Siyasi DŐnce: Sol, volume 8, İletiŐim Yayınları İstanbul, 2008, p. 602

<sup>6</sup> Bir Cumhuriyet Oyks: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & İlkin, 2003, p. 142

<sup>7</sup> "Kadro ve Kadrocuların Oyks", Tekeli & İlkin, 2008, p. 611

Kadro eventually came into prominence with an ideology which was a superficial combination of Marxism, nationalism, and corporatism.<sup>8</sup> The journal tried to develop an ideological framework in which the Turkish revolution was interpreted as a struggle against imperialism as part of a world-wide struggle for political and economic independence by the exploited countries.<sup>9</sup> According to Kadro, underdeveloped colonies and semi-colonies enabled in development of capitalism. This situation caused a growing conflict between industrialized metropolitans and non-industrialized colonial and semi-colonial countries.<sup>10</sup> The new era would have witnessed national wars of independence and would have been determined by new autarkical-national states.<sup>11</sup> Turkey, as the only country that succeeded in its struggle for independence, would have set an example to those who were still in need of political independence.<sup>12</sup>

As an underdeveloped country, the main issues for Turkey were industrialization and accumulation of capital.<sup>13</sup> Kadro argued that because of this new type of economic structure, the state should organize society with the right to interfere in all social and economic activities. In this way, the development of capitalism and class conflicts could be avoided. Kadro insisted that the journal had an alternative third-way between capitalism and socialism.

Due to their education, Kadro writers were influenced by a wide range of intellectuals. As a result, it is possible to encounter ideas of influential leftist ideologues such as Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, and Sultan Galiyev as well as more conservative ideas of Durkheim, Sombart and Ziya Gökalp in the Kadro journal.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System, Kemal Karpat, Princeton University Press, Princeton-New Jersey, 1959, p.70

<sup>9</sup> İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Muallim Ahmet Halit Kütüphanesi, Ankara, 1932, p. 47-55

<sup>10</sup> "Emperyalizm Şahlanıyor mu", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 16, p. 6-9, April 1933; "The Ideology of the Kadro (Cadre) Movement: A Patriotic Leftist Movement in Turkey", Mustafa Türkeş *in* Middle Eastern Studies, vol. 34, no: 4, Turkey Before and After Atatürk: Internal and External Affairs, October 1998, p. 113-115

<sup>11</sup> "A Patriotic Leftist Development Strategy Proposal in Turkey in the 1930s: The Case of the Kadro Movement", Mustafa Türkeş, *in* International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 33, No: 1, February 2001, p. 100-101; "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin Cihanı Telakki Tarzı" *in* İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi", Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 34-38; "Çökmekte Olan Cihan Nizamı", Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 1, p. 22-27, January 1932

<sup>12</sup> İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 45

<sup>13</sup> Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System, Karpat, 1959, p. 70

<sup>14</sup> "Kadro Dergisi", Mustafa Türkeş, Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce: Kemalizm, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, volume 2, p. 465

Although “cadre” as an ideological group was never defined clearly,<sup>15</sup> Kadro believed in the leadership of a political elite *cadre* who could understand and solve the problems of the Turkish society.

Kadro’s writers identified themselves with the republican regime and stayed loyal to it. However their close relations with the government made them a target of their former comrades, such as Şefik Hüsnü and Nazım Hikmet, and they were accused of being traitors and fascists due to their changing sides in politics. When they tried to affect the regime with their etatist plans, they disturbed people with liberal tendencies within and out of the parliament as well as hardliners of the RPP such as Recep Peker and Necip Ali as well. Journalist Ahmet Ağaoğlu, the RPP deputy Mahmut Soydan and Celal Bayar, who was the leader of İş Bank Group and who led the liberal wing of the RPP, did not favor Kadro’s strict plans about etatism.

It should be noted here that neither liberal minded deputies nor hardliners of the RPP were against etatism. They were against Kadro’s interpretation of etatism due to its intense anti-capitalist discourse and its demand for large-scale intervention of the state to the economy. On the other hand, hardliners, especially Recep Peker, did not appreciate the efforts of Kadro’s members to contribute to Kemalist ideology. He objected to the publication of the journal from the beginning because he perceived Kadro’s efforts as an intrusion into his area of expertise.<sup>16</sup> Being the target of several groups as well as being kept under the watchful eyes of the regime forced Kadro members to be very careful. Still, they were sometimes labeled as “communists” or “fascists” by the abovementioned groups due to their use of Marxist conceptions or state-led economy planning which resembled Russian or Italian examples.

Kadro survived from closing down much earlier due to İsmet İnönü’s support,<sup>17</sup> since İnönü was more open to Kadro’s ideas about extensive etatism policies than Mustafa Kemal. However, by the time Kadro became an issue between İsmet İnönü and Mustafa Kemal, Mustafa Kemal seemed to favor ideas of Celal Bayar and İş Bank Group more. Celal Bayar’s appointment as minister of economy in September 1932 in İsmet İnönü’s cabinet settled the situation. However, the tension about Kadro escalated when Mahmut Soydan published a critical article in Milliyet Journal about an article which was published in Kadro in October 1933 by İsmet İnönü

---

<sup>15</sup> “The Ideology of the Kadro (Cadre) Movement: A Patriotic Leftist Movement in Turkey”, Türkeş, 1998, p. 115

<sup>16</sup> Bir Cumhuriyet Oyküsü: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & İlkin, 2003, p. 142

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 349

in which İnönü defended his interpretation of etatism.<sup>18</sup> Recep Peker's constant complaints about Kadro to Mustafa Kemal added more tension to the disagreements.<sup>19</sup> At the end, the franchise holder Yakup Kadri was appointed to Tirana as an ambassador and the journal was forced to cease its publication in 1934.<sup>20</sup> After all, Kadro's contribution was not indispensable for the regime. As a result, Kadro journal could not influence the regime as much as its members wished, and the Kemalist regime sought more practical solutions than Kadro offered.

## **1.1 Nationalism**

In this chapter, Kadro's interpretations of Kemalist nationalism regarding Kadro's ideological connections to nationalism, the journal's stress on connecting nationalism with etatism and anti-imperialism as well as Kadro group's position towards exclusivist sides of Kemalist nationalism will be discussed.

### **1.1.1 Kadro Writers and their Relation with Nationalism Prior to Kadro**

Kadro wanted to bring a solution to economic problems of the new nation-state. The journal was a result of the Kemalist regime's search for new strategies in the economy after the Great Depression. Due to its writers' leftist background and tendencies, the journal often focused on economic issues. Kadro declared that regarding economic matters, the journal favored nationalism. Even before their collaboration with Kemalists, Kadro members had already focused on etatist-nationalist plans.<sup>21</sup>

The nationalist world-view of Kadro members had been shaped prior to their involvement with the leftist movement. The early education of all of the Kadro members was a result of the modernized late Ottoman education system. They were probably affected by positivism as well as the waves of European-rooted nationalism in those schools. In that sense, their understanding of nationalism was not substantially different from Mustafa Kemal, except for Kadro's assertion of an economy-centered understanding to this arrow.

---

<sup>18</sup> 100 Soruda Türkiye'de Devletçilik, Korkut Boratav, Gerçek Yayınevi, 1974, İstanbul, p. 179-180

<sup>19</sup> Bir Cumhuriyet Oyküsü: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & İlkin, 2003, p. 349-350

<sup>20</sup> Zoraki Diplomat, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara, 1967, p. 6-9; Politikada 45 Yıl, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2013, p. 100-103

<sup>21</sup> Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım, Türkeş, 1999, p. 90-91

As Şevket Süreyya points out, many of the prominent leftists of Turkey started their intellectual journey as youngsters who sought new ways to save their country. In the beginning, the primary aim of those patriotic young people was to save what was left from the Ottoman Empire.<sup>22</sup> In the meantime, some of them encountered leftist ideas in the whirlwind of 1910s and early 1920s and adopted them. In other words, many Turkish leftists who were interested in socialism started their political life as avid patriots under the influence of a strong nationalism, and subsequently confronted with leftist ideas.

Nevertheless, Turkish leftists' condition was not an exception. At that period, several people who were involved with leftist ideas and Bolshevism followed a similar path. As is explained by Benningsen and Wimbush, many people from Turkic and Muslim minorities in the Russian Empire, who joined the Bolsheviks, had a pragmatic side. According to them socialism and internationalism would elevate them to equality with the Russians. They considered the realization of socialism as a prelude to the achievement of national liberation. And although the most members of these native groups had a commitment to radical change like Bolsheviks, they were not true Marxists but radical nationalists.<sup>23</sup> In many cases, these native elites considered socialism as an organization plan, and not as a comprehensive body of doctrine promising to restructure their national society along proletarian internationalist lines. They saw socialism as a technique for underground work as well as a useful technique for mass action. Indeed, in some cases, socialism meant the promise of outside support for them.<sup>24</sup>

As Mete Tunçay points out, despite its insistence on using Marxist terminology, the TKP (Turkish Communist Party)<sup>25</sup> was one of the most nationalism-oriented groups within the

---

<sup>22</sup> Suyu Arayan Adam, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Öz Yayınları, Ankara, 1959, p. 45, 168-170

<sup>23</sup> Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union: A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial World, Alexandre A. Benningsen & S. Enders Wimbush, Publications of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Number: 11, Chicago, 1980, p. 33

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 13-14

<sup>25</sup> Around 1920, there were three main organizations of Turkish communist movement: "Communist Party of Turkey" (TKP) under the leadership of Mustafa Suphi in Baku; "People's Participation Party" (Türkiye Halk İştirakiyun Fırkası) which was formed by Binbaşı Salih and "Turkish Workers and Peasants Socialist Party" (Türkiye İşçi ve Çiftçi Sosyalist Fırkası) under the leadership of Şefik Hüsnü and Ethem Nejat. "Aydınlık" was the journal of TWSP, which was called later as TKP, since the leader Mustafa Suphi and many of the important members of the first TKP were murdered in 1921. Nazım Hikmet, Şefik Hüsnü, Sadrettin Celal, Şevket Süreyya, İsmail Hüsrev, Vedat Nedim, and Burhan Asaf were prominent members of Aydınlık group. Some of the members of this group studied in Germany and were inspired by Spartacist movement, while some of them studied in KUTV in Russia. Since Mustafa Suphi and Green Army of Binbaşı Salih were eliminated within a short time, the party of Şefik Hüsnü was the only communist organization which managed to resist until 1925. There was another, a "formal", TKP which was formed in 1920 by request of Mustafa Kemal to control the communists and to please to Russia but it did not last long. see: "Türkiye'de Komünist Akımın Geçmişi Üzerine", Mete Tunçay *in* Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Sol, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, p. 349-355; Türkiye'de Sol Akımlar (1908 - 1925), Mete Tunçay, Bilgi Yayınevi, 2nd Edition, Ankara, 1967; Turkey's Politics, The Transition to A Multi-Party System, Karpat, 1959, p. 355



Comintern, and this condition was mainly due to Vedat Nedim and Şevket Süreyya's stance within the organization.<sup>26</sup> Nonetheless, Şevket Süreyya and Vedat Nedim were not exceptions. Prominent leaders of the leftist movement such as Mustafa Suphi and Ethem Nejat also had strong nationalistic tones.<sup>27</sup>

Except for Yakup Kadri, Kadro writers were active members of the radical leftist movement in the first half of the 1920s, before the establishment of Kadro journal. Even then, their nationalism-oriented ideas were the main characteristic of their world-view. Around 1924-1925, Şevket Süreyya and Vedat Nedim advocated nationalist policies within Aydınlık group. Şevket Süreyya-Vedat Nedim fraction which also included Burhan Asaf and Ismail Hüsrev,<sup>28</sup> argued that Comintern's new decisions were not in favor of Turkey anymore, because the decisions were reflecting the self-interests of Soviet Union.<sup>29</sup> They stated that Marxism should have interpreted according to Turkey's circumstances because policies of Comintern had changed over the time dramatically and protected self-interests of Soviet Russia solely. Obeying every single order from Comintern would not help Turkey to achieve a better system because Comintern did not protect benefits of the Turkish leftists anymore. In order to develop a new, unique strategy for the country, Turkish leftists should have been more independent and should have made their own decisions.

Although their articulations had a point and were not necessarily wrong, Şevket Süreyya and Vedat Nedim's nationalist interpretation of the new situation generated a debate within the Aydınlık group and caused a splitting of the group into two factions. After the prosecutions towards the left, Şevket Süreyya, Ismail Hüsrev, Vedat Nedim and Burhan Asaf cut their relations with the leftist movement. Vedat Nedim's leave became a controversial issue within the leftist movement due to his collaboration with police and his handing over of information about the organization following the 1927 prosecutions.<sup>30</sup>

Yakup Kadri, on the other hand, was not involved in any leftist activity. He had a friendship with Mustafa Kemal and he never abandoned his nationalist approach. He was also married to Burhan Asaf's sister Leman Hanım. Burhan Asaf's disengagement from the leftist movement was related

---

<sup>26</sup> Mete Tunçay, *Milliyet Sanat Dergisi*, 4 April 1976 as cited in *Türk Siyasal Yaşamında Kadro*, Merdan Yanardağ, Siyah Beyaz Basın Yayın Dağıtım, İstanbul, 2008, p. 111

<sup>27</sup> "Türkiye'de Komünist Akımın Geçmişi Üzerine", Tunçay, 2007, p. 350

<sup>28</sup> *Yıllar Böyle Geçti*, Vedat Nedim Tör, Milliyet Yayınları, 1976, p. 10

<sup>29</sup> *Türkiye'de Sol Akımlar (1908-1925)*, Tunçay, 1967, p. 169

<sup>30</sup> *Yıllar Böyle Geçti*, Vedat Nedim, 1976, p. 10-11

to his close relationship with Yakup Kadri, who was an RPP deputy and one of the regular guests of Mustafa Kemal in the presidential residency. Compared to other Kadro members, he cut his relations with the leftist movement earlier. At the time of the 1925 prosecutions, unlike many leftists, Burhan Asaf was not arrested but only interrogated. After this incident, he left the organization, and he went to Ankara same year to work in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.<sup>31</sup> Burhan Asaf had a crucial role in bringing Kadro group together by introducing Şevket Süreyya and Vedat Nedim to Yakup Kadri. In this way, by 1931, future Kadro writers Burhan Asaf, Vedat Nedim, Şevket Süreyya and İsmail Hüsrev came together in Hakimiyet-i Milliye newspaper for the first time.<sup>32</sup> In the following years Burhan Asaf became an RPP deputy and in the 1950s he joined Democrat Party. His nationalist approach can be followed throughout his political career.

### 1.1.2 Nationalism and National Economy

The nationalist arrow, as one of the main tenets of Kemalist ideology, basically included nationalization policies, especially in the 1920s and 1930s.

As Zürcher explains, around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the effect of Turkish intellectuals from the Russian Empire was growing among the Ottoman ruling elite. Those intellectuals were inspired by İsmail Gasprinskij's "Usul-u Cedit", which meant awareness of and pride in Turkishness as a distinct identity. Due to this effect, intellectuals like Ahmet Rıza, Abdullah Cevdet, and Ziya Gökalp made valuable contributions to the idea of Turkish nationalism. Although pan-Turkist sentiments, like pan-Islamist ones, were present at the time, CUP (The Committee of Union and Progress) never opted for a Turkish state over an Ottoman one.<sup>33</sup> However, in 1923, Ottomanism was no longer an option for Turkey and the Muslim nationalism of the years of 1912-1922 was abandoned.<sup>34</sup> With an immense effort at nation-building, Kemalists based the new republic on the idea of a "Turkish nation", which was situated as an alternative to the religious community of Ottoman "ümme". Since the role of religion was excluded from this context, the nation was described as a social and political formation that linked citizens by *unity of language, culture and ideal*.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Bir Cumhuriyet Oyküsü: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & İlkin, 2003, p. 102

<sup>32</sup> For detailed information: Üç Dönem Bir Aydın: Burhan Asaf Belge, Aytaç Yıldız, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011, p. 43- 47

<sup>33</sup> "Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought", Erik-Jan Zürcher in Late Ottoman Society: Intellectual Legacy, Elisabeth Özdalga, (ed.), New York, Routledge/Curzon, 2005, p. 18

<sup>34</sup> "Ottoman Legacy of the Turkish Republic", Erik-Jan Zürcher, in The State and the Subaltern: Authoritarian Modernization in Turkey and Iran, (edited by) Touraj Atabaki, I. B. Tauris, London - New York, 2007, p. 108

<sup>35</sup> For more information: "Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought", Zürcher, 2005, p. 17-20

Kadro writers supported Kemalist attempts on invention and construction of a new national identity in the absence of religion. In this sense, like rest of the Kemalists, Kadro saw nationalism as a social project, i.e. a unifying regulatory power. Along with their interpretation of “populism”, nationalism was a key element for the journal to create a classless, cooperated, homogeneous and well-ordered nation.

According to Kadro, nationalism was a progressive and a revolutionary power, and it constituted a crucial part of economic development. A well-planned powerful economy was one of the main components of being a nation.<sup>36</sup>

Kadro regarded economic development as the core of its ideology. In this context, its main criticism over Kemalist nationalism was its lack of emphasis on the etatist arrow, which was one of the six arrows of Kemalism that was introduced in 1931 and refers to the statist policies of the economic wing of the Kemalist nationalist policies. According to Vedat Nedim, without economic development, political independence always would have been in danger.<sup>37</sup> Şevket Süreyya insisted on inserting “economic unity” to the description of the “nation,” along with “unity of language, culture and ideal.”<sup>38</sup> Here it can be said that, with its strong focus on economy, Kadro’s description of nation resembles Marxist descriptions as it can be followed in Stalin’s work,<sup>39</sup> rather than the Kemalist version.

In the early issues of the journal, Şevket Süreyya was eager to define Kadro’s understanding of nationalism as “social nationalism” (sosyal milliyetçilik - sosyal nasyonalizm). As Türkeş points out, what Şevket Süreyya meant with “social nationalism” was an integrated national economy and rejection of class dictatorship of the proletariat or any other class.<sup>40</sup> In this way, Şevket Süreyya expressed his desire for the continuation and deepening of socio-economic reforms and hinted that the journal’s distance towards socialism. However, soon after Hitler started to use “national socialism”, Şevket Süreyya disowned this term.

---

<sup>36</sup> İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 92

<sup>37</sup> “Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına I”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 1, p. 8, January 1932

<sup>38</sup> İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 96-97

<sup>39</sup> Stalin pictured concept of nation as “*a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.*” in *Marxism and the National Question*, Joseph Stalin Works, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1953, volume 2, p. 307

<sup>40</sup> “The Ideology of Kadro (Cadre) Movement: A Patriotic Leftist Movement in Turkey,” Türkeş, 1998, p. 114

When the description of the “nation” was discussed, Şevket Süreyya returned to articles of Ziya Gökalp, whose ideas were adopted by the Kemalists to a great extent. Gökalp’s descriptions about “nation” and “national unity” were used by the Kemalists, except for the relatively important role of the religion in society. As Zürcher mentions, Gökalp opposed the traditional Islamic position that Islam and nationalism were incompatible, and he saw Islam as a constituent element of the Turkish national identity as well as a source of strength for nation-building.<sup>41</sup> According to Şevket Süreyya, Gökalp’s ideas were important, since he gave a structure to the concept of “the nation”, which was a heterogeneous mass under the cosmopolitan rule of Ottomans until Gökalp’s formulations. However, Şevket Süreyya also pictured Gökalp as a narrow-minded, pre-First World War thinker who failed to understand the importance of the economy for a nation’s existence. Although his contributions were very significant, his formulizations lacked economic structure. Şevket Süreyya insisted on the necessity of challenging Gökalp’s ideas, because the new Republic needed a new “economic-nationalism.”<sup>42</sup>

Türkeş points out that Şevket Süreyya was anxious to draw a line between the intellectuals of the Unionist Era and those of republican period, since the former put the main emphasis on history, culture and ethnicity; while Kadro put economic development to the center.<sup>43</sup> Şevket Süreyya’s criticisms towards Ziya Gökalp can be taken as an indirect criticism towards Mustafa Kemal, who disappointed Kadro members by not focusing on etatism in the way they had anticipated.

### **1.1.3 Anti-Imperialism**

Kadro’s nationalist tendencies became more pronounced in their interpretation of anti-imperialism. As Türkeş explains, according to Kadro, the twentieth century was going to be the age of national liberation movements.<sup>44</sup> All the colonies and semi-colonies, like Turkey, were going to gain their political independence which would be followed by economic independence.<sup>45</sup>

Nevertheless, Kadro’s perception of anti-imperialism objected to internationalism in a Marxist sense. The journal declared that Kadro was against both internationalism and cosmopolitanism,

---

<sup>41</sup> “Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought,” Zürcher, 2005, p. 18

<sup>42</sup> “Ziya Gökalp”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 2, p. 33-40, February 1932

<sup>43</sup> “The Ideology of Kadro (Cadre) Movement: A Patriotic Leftist Movement in Turkey”, Türkeş, 1998, p. 94

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 115

<sup>45</sup> “Müstemele İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına II”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 2, p. 9-10, February 1932; “Çökmeekte Olan Cihan Nizamı”, Burhan Asaf, p. 27, January 1932

since the first one was regarded as a part of the socialist system and the latter as a result of the capitalist system. Instead of being an internationalist (socialist) or cosmopolitan (liberal-capitalist) society, Turkey should have focused on its national virtues. Under these circumstances, staying as a “nation state” was the best way for Turkey to keep its independence politically and economically. Indeed, Türkeş draws attention to the fact that Kadro hinted at not having internationalist qualities even in its first issue by declaring that the world-view of the Turkish revolution was going to be a unique one.<sup>46</sup>

In this respect, the journal interpreted anti-imperialism as independent nations’ support for each other and objected to the disintegration of nations in favor of a unified proletariat in an internationalist movement. “*Are all nations moving towards a single world order?*” asked Şevket Süreyya and replied: “*No! We think that the new societies in the world will be separate, self-contained institutions politically and economically.*”<sup>47</sup>

Kadro writers, especially Şevket Süreyya, argued that maintaining political and economic independence and national consciousness depended on protecting the country against imperialists. Turkey’s economic and political independence was bound to the faith of the colonies and underdeveloped countries which had the opportunity to establish an alliance against imperialists. Without the support of those countries, facing capitalist powers and keeping economic independence at the same time was not possible. Turkey’s victory of 1923 was a unique experience as well as an inspiration for those who had been fighting against imperialists. Therefore, Turkey, as the representative of national independence movements, meant to keep its connection to the anti-imperialist movements of the underdeveloped countries.<sup>48</sup> In the meantime, dealing with the economy and improving it with rapid development plans were the most important issues for Turkey.<sup>49</sup> If this strategy had been followed, Turkey could have benefited from the atmosphere of the Great Depression, since the crisis brought new opportunities for underdeveloped countries.<sup>50</sup>

As seen here, Kadro was in harmony with the regime in terms of seeking nationalist solutions for development. Still, the journal tried to convince the regime to focus on rapid industrialization and plan the economy as soon as possible and not to neglect its link with the underdeveloped

---

<sup>46</sup> “Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 1, p. 3, January 1932

<sup>47</sup> “İnkılap Bitti mi? (İnkılabın İdeolojisi)”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 3, p. 6-7, March 1932

<sup>48</sup> İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 45, 67-70

<sup>49</sup> “Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına I”, Vedat Nedim, p. 10-11, January 1932

<sup>50</sup> “Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına II”, Vedat Nedim, p. 11, February 1932

countries which engaged in national liberation movements, although the writers were aware of Kemalist regime's reluctance towards the last issue.

Since anti-imperialism was one of the most important features of Kadro's ideology, looking at the ideas of Kadro members on anti-imperialism in detail may help to understand how the writers perceived it; how their version of anti-imperialism linked to Kemalist thought; and whether they contributed to Kemalist ideology by making this connection.

In the early 1920s, Şevket Süreyya and İsmail Hüsrev were inspired by the anti-imperialist ideas in Russia. Both studied in KUTV (Communist University of the Toilers of the East), which was the most important center for transmissions of national communist-socialist ideas. As Benningsen and Wimbush explain, KUTV opened in September 1921, and it remained as an active and influential forum until 1924, when its staff was purged for the first time. From the beginning, KUTV became an intellectual headquarters for revolutionary high cadres from the colonial world. There, the students encountered the ideas of the Muslim national communists<sup>51</sup> in a systematic fashion as well as ideas of Lenin and other Marxist theoreticians. The important Muslim national communist leaders, including Sultan Galiyev, Turar Ryskulov, Nariman Narimanov were among the permanent teachers. Many of them insisted that the success of a revolution in Europe depended on the success of the revolution in the East.<sup>52</sup> Nazım Hikmet, Vâlâ Nureddin, Şevket Süreyya, and İsmail Hüsrev were among their students.

This schooling must have made quite an impact on Şevket Süreyya and İsmail Hüsrev's ideas, since anti-imperialism provided new insights for them to combine their ideas of nationalism and communism. As Şevket Süreyya pointed out, socialist leaders did not focus on problems of oppressed minorities and the question of nationalism prior to the Bolshevik Revolution.<sup>53</sup>

As stated by Jeremy Smith, Marx and Engels viewed nationalism as a product of the growth of capitalism as well as a result of the competition between the bourgeoisies of the various national

---

<sup>51</sup> "Muslim national-communism" refers to a group of ideas which were developed in Soviet Russia, especially starting from 1917 by non-Russian (mostly of Turkic-origin), Muslim minorities who wanted to combine communism, Islam and nationalist ideas, mostly to achieve their national autonomies. In January 1918, The Central Commissariat for Muslim Affairs (Muskom) was formed by the Bolsheviks as part of Narkomnats. A year later Sultan Galiyev became its leader. For further information: Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union: A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial World, Benningsen & Wimbush, 1980; Sultan Galiyev: Bütün Eserleri, Özgür Erdem (ed.), İleri Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006, p. 13-43

<sup>52</sup> Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union: A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial World, Benningsen & Wimbush, 1980, p. 110

<sup>53</sup> "Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi II: Marksizm", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 19, p. 13-16, July 1933

states. Nationalism was an ideological weapon which would tie workers to an illusory common interest with their own ruling classes. However, the workers had no country and at the end, the supremacy of the proletariat would bring an end to all national differences.<sup>54</sup> Besides, according to the Benningsen and Wimbush, the eyes of socialist leaders were all fixed on Europe, because they believed that a revolution in Europe was going to change the world. The East was not a target of their socialist advances because it had no proletariat, and therefore it could have no revolution. According to them, the “national problem” was marginal, destined to die a natural death in the socialist world. With the exception of Stalin and to a lesser degree Lenin, almost all of the Bolshevik leaders, as true internationalists, remained indifferent to the national-colonial question.<sup>55</sup>

According to Smith, Lenin agreed with Rosa Luxemburg and the orthodox Marxist opinion that nationalism was the product of capitalism, and that it was reactionary and divisive. Still, unlike Luxemburg and the Austro-Marxists, Lenin insisted on a critical distinction between the nationalism of oppressor nations such as Great Russian Chauvinism and the nationalism of the oppressed non-Russian minorities in the Russian Empire<sup>56</sup>

As d’Encausse points out, when discussing the economic development of Poland, Rosa Luxemburg argued that in some cases national struggle for independence would have adverse consequences. The workers’ movement was already spreading throughout the empire, thus as long as the state was developing democratically, socialists should not have supported a nationalist movement, or in other words, “a bourgeois goal”.<sup>57</sup> Lenin essentially shared her view, but after 1905, he became convinced that the Russian working class needed allies to overthrow power, and those nationalist aspirations could contribute to the struggle. In this period, Lenin’s central concern was to maintain the unity of working class movement prior to the revolution.<sup>58</sup> As a result, although he was in agreement with Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin considered her strategy to be mistaken. Here, the axis of Lenin’s program was to keep the concept of the “nation” out of working class ideology and to create a temporary alliance between national movements and the working class. At this point, he did not develop an overall theory about nationalism, but he tried to define a national program that would still preserve the hegemony of the proletariat. Although his adversaries accused Lenin of

---

<sup>54</sup> The Bolsheviks and the National Question (1917-1923), Jeremy Smith, Studies in Russia and East Europe Series, London, 1999, p. 8-10

<sup>55</sup> Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union: A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial World, Benningsen & Wimbush, 1980, p. 7-8

<sup>56</sup> The Bolsheviks and the National Question (1917-1923), Smith, 1999, p. 15

<sup>57</sup> The Great Challenge: Nationalities and the Bolshevik State (1917-1930), Helene Carrere d’Encausse, Holmes & Meier Publishers, New York, 1992, p. 39

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 39-40

focusing the attention of oppressed nationalities on the national question and distracting them from the true task of the proletariat, Lenin's concessions to the nation were temporary, limited and conditional.<sup>59</sup> In response, he wrote "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination" as a critique of Rosa Luxemburg's arguments which insisted that national interests were a deception. Lenin rejected her idea, and he claimed that the proletariat had to fight for national emancipation because the proletariat was against all kinds of oppression. In this way, it could be possible to gain the support of national movements for the revolution in Russia. Thus, Lenin's support for self-determination was strategic and it based on an internationalist outlook.<sup>60</sup>

It also should be noted here that after he became the leading spokesman on nationality affairs in 1913 with Lenin's request, Stalin made his most significant contribution by developing a Bolshevik theory of nationalism. With the encouragement of Lenin, Stalin wrote his article, "Marxism and the National Question" in 1913 about self-determination. According to d'Encausse, although Stalin had been instructed by Lenin to refute Austro-Marxist arguments against self-determination, he, in fact, refashioned their ideas. Similar to some Austro-Marxists, he was impressed by the development of strictly national liberation movement in the Caucasus. Although he tried to deny it, Stalin described nationalities as a historically stable community of people who possess an identity that has evolved centuries. And he did not exclusively link it to the stages of capitalism. In this sense, as d'Encausse claims, Stalin was the first in Russian Social Democrat Labor Party to recognize the seriousness and permanence of the national problem. In the end, Stalin's work became a fundamental contribution to Marxist thought;<sup>61</sup> although Lenin disapproved of some of the elements of his work strongly.<sup>62</sup>

All this said, the Marxist thesis on nationalism was not satisfying for Kadro. According to Şevket Süreyya, Marxism overlooked the reality of nationhood.<sup>63</sup> As a result, Kadro writers became interested in the theories of Lenin and Stalin, since Leninism was an important inspirational source for them, especially with its anti-imperialist theory. Kadro writers must have been aware of the fact that the theorization of the encounter between Marxism and the non-European world was achieved mainly by Lenin. Nonetheless, the priority that was given to the proletariat in Lenin and Stalin's work seems to have disappointed Şevket Süreyya. He argued that Lenin and Stalin improved the

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., p. 40

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 41-42

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 35, 38

<sup>62</sup> The Bolsheviks and the National Question (1917-1923), Smith, 1999, p. 18

<sup>63</sup> İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 28, 30; "Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi II: Marksizm", Şevket Süreyya, p. 13-15, July 1933



theory around national movements and socialism, but they failed when they degraded the role of national independence movements into a secondary position.<sup>64</sup>

As Türkeş emphasizes, Kadro was influenced by Lenin but did not fully adopt his arguments.<sup>65</sup> At this point, theories of nationalist-communists from Russia and Eastern countries within the anti-imperialist struggle might have been more interesting for Kadro members, since they had more to offer concerning the role of nationalism. As a result, there is a great deal of resemblance between Kadro and some of the nationalist-communists who joined the Bolsheviks, such as Sultan Galiyev.<sup>66</sup> However, this does not necessarily mean that Kadro members borrowed their ideas directly from Galiyev, since they were also prominent intellectuals who were eligible enough for creating similar ideas.

Kadro's different stance from Lenin on anti-imperialism was particularly revealed in the discussions regarding the nation-state's role. In Lenin's writings, the "nation state" mostly appeared as a temporary phase that preceded a socialist revolution; therefore as a transition period. However, for Kadro, becoming a "nation state" was regarded as an aim to be fulfilled for a nation. Unlike Lenin, Kadro explicitly objected to any form of unity and cooperation on the basis of internationalist class solidarity; and the journal preferred cooperation of independent nation states instead. Kadro's definition of revolution had two stages: The first stage was the War of Liberation and the second stage was the achievement of economic independence. At this juncture, Kadro's explanations of the revolution within stages resemble Stalin's ideas and his "two stage" theory.<sup>67</sup> However, Kadro might have bent the meaning of the stages; because Stalin did not intend to create independent national states in the way Kadro meant.

Anti-imperialism was crucial for the journal's ideology; however, it was re-formulated by Kadro writers to be in line with journal's nationalist world-view. For them, the first step of anti-imperialism was ignoring its internationalist qualities and limiting its meaning mainly to the solidarity of underdeveloped nations which engaged in liberation movements. The second step for Kadro was incorporating anti-imperialism into the Kemalist ideology by claiming Turkey as the first country to win its independence against imperialist powers. However, the second goal turned out to be quite a difficult one to achieve, since the journal's interpretation of anti-imperialism was

---

<sup>64</sup> *Inkılâp ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi*, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 58-61

<sup>65</sup> "The Ideology of Kadro (Cadre) Movement: A Patriotic Leftist Movement in Turkey," Türkeş, 1998, p. 94

<sup>66</sup> For further information: *Türk Siyasal Yaşamında Kadro, Yanardağ*, 2008

<sup>67</sup> *Marxism and the National Question*, Joseph Stalin Works, 1953, p. 300

not shared by the leading Kemalists such as Mustafa Kemal, İsmet İnönü, and Recep Peker. Indeed, they did not seek any serious involvement with the emancipation struggle of underdeveloped nations. As a result, this issue became a point of tension between Kadro members and the leading Kemalists.

Kadro's insistence on attributing anti-imperialist features to the Kemalist ideology is quite visible in the articles, in fact. The writers, especially the ones with a leftist background, often brought on the intrinsic anti-imperialist qualities of the "Turkish revolution" and insisted on describing the War of Independence as the first national victory of independence in the anti-imperialist struggle. Nevertheless, although he adopted an anti-imperialist discourse in the early 1920s, at a time when help from the Soviet Union was needed; Mustafa Kemal was quite reluctant to adopt the same term in the 1930s. At the time of the War of Independence, when Kemalists were fighting against the imperialist countries, Mustafa Kemal mentioned the anti-imperialistic character of their struggle. However, those anti-imperialist utterances seem to be rather tactical moves rather than being ideological ones.<sup>68</sup> This can be followed in Mustafa Kemal's references to anti-imperialism, since he often refers to a glorious past of the Ottoman Empire that had ruled a large part of the world, rather than aiming internationalism in a socialist context. The main reason for Mustafa Kemal's anti-imperialist utterances was his need for Soviet Union's support. Besides, Enver Pasha was a dangerous rival for him, since Enver cooperated with Turkish leftists in Russia and was offering himself as an alternative choice to Soviet Union, in case Mustafa Kemal fails in Anatolia.<sup>69</sup> The anti-imperialist discourse of the early 1920s diminished by time, as Kemalists secured their political power, which also supports the idea that their discourse was tactical.

Apparently, Kadro ignored this and deliberately accentuated Kemalism's anti-imperialist content and the writers insisted on connecting Turkey to an international network of underdeveloped countries.

Kadro writers were most likely aware of the fact that their effort on this matter was hardly acceptable for Kemalists. However, the writers were concerned about the deceleration of reforms, and they were probably disturbed by the rapid bureaucratization within the state. As a result, they tried to offer a solution by pointing out the advantages of being in touch with anti-imperialist

---

<sup>68</sup> "Yeni Osmanlılar'dan 1930'lara Anti-emperyalist Düşünce", Ahmet Kuyaş *in* Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, p. 248-249

<sup>69</sup> For detailed information: The Unionist Factor: The Role of the Committee of Union and Progress in the Turkish National Movement: 1905-1926, Erik-Jan Zürcher, Brill, Leiden, 1984, p. 118-141

movements. Regarding anti-imperialism, their efforts can be read as their demand to keep the spirit of “revolution” of the early years of the republic alive. It was also an implicit criticism towards the government for ignoring new possibilities in the economy just after the Great Depression.

In short, Kadro used anti-imperialism in a nationalist context as the conflict between developed imperialist nations and underdeveloped nations. Nonetheless, Kadro’s ideas were not appreciated enough by the regime. In the 1950s, the theoreticians of Dependency Theory also accentuated anti-imperialism. Their arguments about the conflict between developed and underdeveloped nations resemble Kadro’s formulizations, due to the fact that they built on the same sources: Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg. Thus, Kadro is considered to have formulated the conflict between center and periphery countries before the theoreticians of Dependency Theory by several academics.

It should also be kept in mind that the *Aydınlık* group supported the independence movement of Turkey as well as anti-imperialist attributions about it from the beginning.<sup>70</sup> After its 4<sup>th</sup> Congress in 1922, Comintern decided to support the independence movement in Anatolia, in case it would evolve into a socialist movement later. With the necessity of being in harmony with both Kemalists and Comintern’s decisions between 1922 and 1924, communists in Turkey attributed some characteristics of communism, such as anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism, to the Kemalist regime, which in fact did not embody those characteristics intrinsically and fully. Once the nationalists seized power, their anti-socialist attitude became clearer and the leftists were eliminated within a relatively short time. However, with their attributions, early leftists set the stage for leftist interpretation of Kemalism which was theorized and improved by Kadro to a great degree between 1932 and 1934. The anti-imperialist interpretations of Kemalism became a strong tendency within the leftist movement of Turkey, and it left a blueprint behind to be followed by many who wanted to combine Kemalism with leftist ideas in the following years. As such, nationalist tendencies within Turkish left helped to link Kemalism to leftist interpretations to a great extent.

Nationalism and its connection to anti-imperialism and internationalism are still an issue for leftist movement. Abolition of frontiers for internationalism or not, supporting national resistance against imperialism or opposing to nationalism within the context of class consciousness are still the problems that are disputed. It seems Kadro made a significant contribution to associate leftist ideas with nationalism and Kemalism.

---

<sup>70</sup> “Türkiye’de Komünist Akımın Geçmişi Üzerine”, Tunçay, 2007, p. 350

### 1.1.4 Exclusivist Policies of Kemalism

The subject of Kadro and nationalism has been studied several times, with the majority of studies usually focused on etatism and Kadro's efforts on relating nationalism with anti-imperialism. However, these studies sometimes overlook the high degree of harmony between Kadro and the exclusivist policies of Kemalist nationalism.

As Parla mentions, the "nation" was described as the unity of language, culture, and ideal by Mustafa Kemal. As a result, Turkish identity was non-restrictive in ethnic terms, in the sense that all persons of different ethnic backgrounds could consider themselves to be "Turks." As article 88 of the 1924 Constitution states, "The people of Turkey regardless of their religion, and race, in terms of their citizenship, to be Turkish."<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, Turkish nationalism did not consist of all-inclusive features. The concept of "Turk" in Kemalism mostly carried exclusive, supremacy-oriented, ethno-racialist elements. After all, Mustafa Kemal's famous sentence was "How happy is one who says, 'I'm a Turk'", not "How happy is one who says, 'I'm a Turkish citizen.'"<sup>72</sup>

Parla states that particularly in the early years of the republic, nationalism carried a defensive reflex and emphasized national sovereignty. This was partly a counter-discourse of Kemalism towards colonial concepts which considered the Turks as a group of people who were "unable to stand alone in the modern world."<sup>73</sup> Thus, in practice Kemalist nationalism aimed to demonstrate that Turks were an independent nation and they were able to govern themselves without any intervention of Western powers. However, the same defensive reflex sometimes included a strong exclusive discourse, especially when the authority or the legitimacy of Kemalists was challenged or was in danger, like in the cases of Kurdish upheavals or Armenian territorial claims. In this sense, general understanding of nationhood was not directly ethno-racist, but in practice, ethnic differences were monitored carefully and easily led to discriminatory practices.<sup>74</sup>

Although the Kemalist nationalism's main emphasis was on its unifying aspects, and Kemalists aimed to boost the image of the Turkish nation and to create a national pride with Turkish nationalism; racist elements became more visible within the Kemalist ideology in the 1930s, in line

---

<sup>71</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Taha Parla & Andrew Davison, Syracuse University Press, New York, 2004, p. 71

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p. 80

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., p. 68

<sup>74</sup> "Kemalist Milliyetçilik", Ahmet Yıldız in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, volume 2, p. 213

with the developments in Europe.<sup>75</sup> Especially in the 1930s and 1940s, discrimination against Jews and Christians was quite strong. The government-backed “Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş” (Citizen, Speak Turkish) campaigns towards minorities, which were started in 1928 by law students and continued during the 1930s; Turkish Resettlement Law of 1934, which was part of Turkifying projects of the state and triggered the Jewish Pogroms in Thrace in 1934 as well as the Dersim massacres in 1938; and the introduction of a “Wealth Tax” to eliminate non-Muslim bourgeoisie in November 1942 were obvious examples. These discriminatory practices continued in the following years and resulted with the Istanbul Pogrom against non-Muslims, especially Anatolian Greeks, in September 1955.

Here it can be questioned that as a left-leaning journal, how Kadro coped with exclusivist features of Kemalist nationalism and how the journal responded to the regime’s discriminative potential towards different ethnic and religious identities.

Şevket Süreyya stated that the Kadro group disapproved of any ethno-racial reductionism and discrimination.<sup>76</sup> However, in a closer look, some of the Kadro articles reveal exclusivist traits of Kemalist nationalism with strong ethno-racial elements. Although these traits were not a primary feature for Kadro, their existence exhibits the high degree of harmony between the Kemalist regime and Kadro’s ideology.

Akin to the RPP’s Kemalist line of the early 1930s, issues about non-Turkish and non-Muslim groups were easily turned into sensitive subjects for Kadro. This becomes quite visible when different nationalities, particularly when Kurds and their uprisings were in question. At this point, Kadro writers did not seem to question the official ideology. Instead, they supported the prevalent Kemalist view, especially on issues about the Eastern provinces. This attitude might have been rooted in the Turkish side’s fear of possible independence and territorial claims by the Kurdish community in the first half of the 1920s. Continuous Kurdish upheavals in the East from the early years of the republic must have been unpleasant reminders of this anxiety. As Zürcher points out, huge amount of territorial loss and traumatizing events following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, which meant in many cases the loss of hometowns for leadership cadres, must have made

---

<sup>75</sup> “The Ottoman Legacy of The Kemalist Republic”, Zürcher , 2007, p. 108-109

<sup>76</sup> “Emperyalizm Şahlıyor mu?”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 8-9, April 1933

quite an impact on the minds of the founding cadres of the Kemalists.<sup>77</sup> This also explains their sensitivity about territorial claims in the new Turkish Republic to a degree.

The Kemalist government's methods towards the upheavals of Sheikh Said, Dersim and Ağrı were quite rigid. The regime's methods often meant the merciless suppression of riots and the rejection of Kurdish identity as well as many other ethnic groups. As a result, in practice, adoption of Turkish nationalism led to the forced assimilation of thirty percent or so of the population which did not have Turkish as its mother tongue.<sup>78</sup>

Kadro's full support for the methods of the regime on this issue can also be read as Kadro's harmony with the regime as well as its members' discomfort towards the riots and upheavals in general. Like the rest of the Kemalists, Kadro members seemed to be affected by positivism and its distrust of masses to a certain degree.

In parallel with the official ideology, the Kadro journal refused to recognize Kurdish people as a nation. Ismail Hüsrev wrote that: *"In the absence of a Kurdish national movement, is it possible to talk about the existence of a 'Kurdish nation'? Our answer to this question is negative. In the Eastern regions, instead of a Kurdish nation, there are some Kurdish-speaking tribes along with Turkish elements who were forced to speak Kurdish for hundreds of years. Besides 'nation' is a paramount social category which requires many qualities, such as mutual collaboration between individuals and common ideals on benefits on economy, culture, history, and politics. Considering Kurdish society, which even lacks the simplest harmony among its members and is far from any sort of national unity except for a common language, as a nation would be wrong."*<sup>79</sup>

Şevket Süreyya explicitly defended assimilation policies of the regime towards Kurds between 1924 and 1931. According to him, those measures were necessary, because they were taken against "reactionary powers". "Kurdishness" as a term did not represent nationhood but a reactionary and feudal system.<sup>80</sup> In this way, he added an economic dimension to the subject. By degrading the riots into reactionary and feudal uprisings, Şevket Süreyya justified the Kemalist intervention in the area. According to him, the Turkish army was there, because the republic and new order needed to be

---

<sup>77</sup> "Jön Türkler: Sınır Bölgelerinin Çocukları" in Savaş, Devrim ve Ulusallaşma: Türkiye Tarihinde Geçiş Dönemleri (1908-1928), Erik-Jan Zürcher, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, p. 153

<sup>78</sup> "The Ottoman Legacy of The Kemalist Republic," Zürcher, 2007, p. 109

<sup>79</sup> "Şark Vilayetlerinde Derebeylik İP", Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 12, p. 21-22, December 1932

<sup>80</sup> "Dersim ve Derebeyi", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 6, p. 41-45, June 1932

defended against the agents of a backward feudal regime. As a result, in Kadro articles “Kurd” usually meant “ignorant reactionary,” not a member of a specific nation or ethnic group.

Here it should be noted that assimilation policies towards non-Turkish and non-Muslim minorities were already part of the Kemalist regime. In 1925, just after the Sheikh Said rebellion, the “Reform Plan for the East” (Şark Islahat Raporu) was prepared under the orders of Mustafa Kemal to take necessary measures in the Eastern provinces. These plans were mainly used for “Turkifying” the East with ethnic demography policies such as eviction of Armenian or Kurdish villages, replacing the area with emigrants from Caucasus, and the deportation and forced migration of Kurdish people to western regions.<sup>81</sup> Especially in 1927, with the “Law on the Transfer of Certain People from Eastern Regions to the Western Provinces” (Bazı Eşhasın Şark Menatıkından Garp Vilâyetlerine Nakillerine Dair Kanun) these plans took a concrete form, and certain families and persons were deported. It seems Kadro’s ideology already included Kemalist arguments about these reports and following measures about Eastern provinces. However, Kadro strengthened and justified those Kemalist ideas by backing them with strong arguments and by adding powerful economic insight to the debate.

Consequently, some of the Kadro articles carried supremacy-oriented ethno-racialist language, especially about Kurds. According to Şevket Süreyya, *"The history of cities like Van and Diyarbekir in Ottoman times is also a history of suppression and assimilation of the Turkish population, Turkish language and Turkish culture in the area. The history of Ottoman period was marked by conflicts between economically and legally free Turkish elements (villagers and city-dwellers) and Kurdish feudalism which enslaved these individuals economically and legally. We see that the Ottoman Palace always sided against Turks in this conflict. At those times, due to fear of Persian raids, Ottomans kept Kurdish feudal chiefs on their side and placed them nearby the eastern borders. The Ottomans sacrificed the region's Oğuz Turk population, who were there long before the Ottomans, to Kurdish feudalism. In those regions, Ottomans' imperial orders served to spoil Turkish blood and to ruin Turkish laws and Turkish economy. (...) In this way, the Turkish population who represented free trade, small-scale agriculture and highly civilized culture, from the Aegean Sea and to the Tuna River, was betrayed in Diyarbekir and Van provinces by the Ottoman palace; and was enslaved to feudal system which represented nothing but illiteracy and lack of culture compared to the high level of Turkish civilization. (...) Kurdishness is an economic*

---

<sup>81</sup> “Kemalist Milliyetçilik,” Yıldız, 2009, p. 231

*system which is based on serfdom, poverty and lack of land of the agrarian producers.”*<sup>82</sup> He further argued that Dersim was in fact land of Oğuz Turks, not of Kurds.

Kurdish people are the largest ethnic minority and have been subjected to assimilation policies throughout the history of the republic. In Kadro journal, the Kurds were often described as reactionary, inferior feudal elements, which were threat to the republic, Turkishness, and laicism. This discourse glorified the Turkish race, as part of an extreme nationalistic view of the Kemalist regime of the 1930s. In this way, Kadro strengthened the link between the economic backwardness of the Eastern provinces and the inferiority of the Kurdish people. In this sense, Kadro not only shared the prevailing Kemalist view but also helped the regime to reshape its ideological discourse to justify the assimilation policies of the following years.

Kadro’s economy oriented world-view can be followed easily in their arguments. While Kemalists rejected Kurdish identity and described their riots as mere results of reactionary and religious activities; Kadro added an economic substructure to the matter and explained that the problems of the east mainly pertained to economic backwardness. The writers usually claimed that with an improved economy, many of the existing problems would have been automatically solved.<sup>83</sup> The crucial role of the economy in Kadro’s descriptions of “the nation” was also striking. One of the main reasons for Kadro’s rejection of recognizing Kurdish people as a nation was their economic backwardness and failure of forming an economic unity.

Still, although the Kadro group did not recognize Kurdish people’s identity as a nation, they occasionally brought up problems about Kurdish issue. In a way, Şevket Süreyya captured a part of the truth when explaining the backwardness of Eastern provinces with economic determinism. However, his reasoning did not stop there. He negatively described Kurdishness, placing it opposite to Turkishness. Whether he was aware of it or not, he explicitly categorized the Turkish nation above Kurds. In his articles, Kurdishness was often negatively pictured, not only due to its close link to economic- feudal relations but also due to its ethno-racial connotations.

Kadro journal’s position towards Kurds indicates some inconsistencies as well as complexities of combining nationalism with anti-imperialist elements. The first indication of this is Kadro’s categorization of any form of Kurdish disobedience as a reactionary activity, even though the

---

<sup>82</sup> “Dersim ve Derebeyi”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 41-45, June 1932

<sup>83</sup> “Şark Vilayetlerinde Derebeylik II”, İsmail Hüsrev, p. 24, December 1932; “Dersim ve Derebeyi”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 44, June 1932



journal called for the support of the struggle for independence of exploited people in underdeveloped countries. Despite the fact that Kadro blamed developed Western countries for their ignorance towards the struggle for liberation of backward nations and held them responsible for their underdevelopment, Kadro intellectuals failed to recognize similar problems for Kurdish people. By reducing the existence of Kurds into reactionary-feudal groups which lacked any form of unity except for a common language, Kadro did not have to question the predicament that Kurds in Eastern provinces faced, as well as the stern measures taken against them. Subsequently, Kurds were not taken into account by Kadro as one of the oppressed nations, and the Turkish Republic was not considered as an oppressive regime. Moreover, Kurds were depicted as strong enough to exploit and assimilate the Turkish elements of the Eastern Anatolia; thus they should have been stopped and modernized by the republican regime. According to Şevket Süreyya, *“Kurdishness with a feudal structure aims for the elimination of the Turkish population, language, and free thinking altogether. (...) Kurdish feudal chiefs dominated the area at the expense of land, blood, religion and dignity of Turks who were assimilated forcefully and they were Kurdified.”*<sup>84</sup>

With this logic, Kadro justified assimilation policies towards other ethnic minorities as well. Since their identities lacked the necessary qualities to be acknowledged by the regime, it was normal to define them as “Turkish”, regardless of any consideration about their consent.

Here, it should also be noted that Kurds drew a great deal of negative attention from the regime due to their large population and their dissatisfaction with the republic, which often emerged as disobedience towards the regime in frequent riots. Compared to Kurds, assimilation policies towards other non-Turkish Muslim minorities, such as the Laz, Abhaz, and Circassians, were less severe, possibly due to the less threatening position of those minorities towards the regime. Their assimilation process often took place in an indirect way, such as not supporting their language and cultural diversity through education or other official means.

The exclusivist tone of Kadro was not limited to the Kurds, however some of the articles revealed the blurry line between national pride and ethno-racialism and Kadro’s language occasionally exhibited a threatening tone of Turkish nationalism towards other ethnic and religious minorities. Sometimes the minorities were blamed for treason. According to Burhan Asaf, having both non-Turkish and non-Muslim identities meant having an intrinsic quality or at least a natural inclination for being a treacherous citizen. In his article, he warned the minorities to be more aware of the

---

<sup>84</sup> “Dersim ve Derebeyi”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 43-44, June 1932

value of the tolerance of the Turks by comparing their position with the Jews in the Nazi Germany: *“We did not seek necessary solutions for teaching our language to our minorities to an extent that at least they could do grocery shopping in Turkish. In Germany, neither Jews speak Spanish nor do Polacks speak Polish. If you asked them, you would see that they all consider themselves as German. Still, the great German nation needed to take drastic measures to penalize the minorities among them. However, here, from Tatav to Tünel, between Balat and Fener, the disobedient spirit of Ottoman religious communities rules. I doubt that those people who even cannot do shopping in Turkish would learn our language, give up the language that they speak, integrate to our cultural life, and eventually give up their non-Muslim Galata identity! It’s a lot of work! I hope that the measures taken against the Jews in Germany set a good example for the minorities in our country. They should not forget that to be as hospitable as Turks; a nation should be as superior and tolerant as Turks. But our hospitality is not limitless. As being guests in our country, minorities should learn how to integrate to our culture eventually. Otherwise, they should leave. Until now, our minorities did not become members of our community because they insisted on being different. From now on, for their own sake, they should find ways to confirm their sincerity and loyalty to us without our constant guidance.”*<sup>85</sup>

Burhan Asaf’s discourse may have been partially rooted in nationalization policies of the economy. Minorities like Armenians, Anatolian Greeks, and Jews had a great deal of shares in commerce, business, and banking; therefore were subjected to the dramatic effects of nationalization policies, starting from late Ottoman period.

On the other hand, Yakup Kadri was sensitive about Armenian genocide claim and he was offended by it: *“Then times came that even the European nations believed those hypocrite fictitious stories. When American theaters showed fairy tales about Armenian massacres; the eyes of Yankees were filled with tears, even though their hands had covered with the blood of black Americans. We (Turks) were pictured as if we were perpetrators of all the horrendous crimes in the world. Those were painful times for all of us.”*<sup>86</sup>

Concerning the exclusivist language towards the non-Turkish and non-Muslim minorities, there was a striking resemblance between Kadro members and some of the prestigious figures of Kemalist regime, such as Falih Rıfkı Atay. According to him, *“The Turkish revolution also has a*

---

<sup>85</sup> “Bizdeki Azlıklar”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 16, p. 52, April 1933

<sup>86</sup> “Ankara, Moskova, Roma III”, Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 9, p. 35, September 1932

*name, as the French and Russian revolutions have, and that is called Kuvayi Milliye (National Forces). This refers to the revolution that has been fought in the name of Turkish people. Kuvayi Milliye knows that anybody who does not carry a genuine Turkish origin is the enemy, who exploits Turkish element to its core. Kuvayi Milliye does not distinguish between the Ottoman Palace, Bab-ı Ali (the imperial government), Ottoman Galata, Süleymaniye Mosque-Madrasah, Fener Church and School from the enemy's bayonet that kills the unborn babies of the Anatolian mothers.”<sup>87</sup>*

As it is clear from above-mentioned examples, Kadro's expressions with respect to nationalism display compatibility of its ideology with the Kemalist nationalism, even with its extreme rightist sides. This may be explained by the nationalist ideologies of the Kadro members prior to their involvement with leftist movement as well as by the effect of the strong hegemonic power of Kemalism on the minds of intellectuals at the time. The single-party regime and the political climate of the world, which favored authoritarian regimes, can be also taken as important complementary elements in the formation of the journal's ideological choices.

Kadro's ideology and its strong nationalist tendencies were severely criticized by some of the prominent leftists of Turkey such as Nazım Hikmet<sup>88</sup> as well as conservative writers such as Peyami Safa.<sup>89</sup> The journal was often described as a fascist group by leftists, and Şevket Süreyya and Vedat Nedim were considered traitors.<sup>90</sup> Although Şevket Süreyya and Burhan Asaf defended their ideas in an article towards these accusations,<sup>91</sup> negative criticisms forced Kadro writers to be more careful about their language and especially about the journal's position towards rising fascist powers of Europe. Consequently, they had to put a lot of effort to distinguish themselves from both racism and traditional-conservative nationalism. According to its writers, Kadro's ideology was misunderstood about nationalism and it didn't carry any racist or fascist elements. They insisted that Kadro group introduced a unique socio-economic dimension to nationalism; therefore their interpretation was a new kind of “dynamic nationalism” and was not connected to socialism and

---

<sup>87</sup> “Kuvayi Milliye”, Falih Rıfki Atay, Kadro, issue 16, p. 12, April 1933

<sup>88</sup> For Nazım Hikmet's reaction to Kadro see: Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadro'yu ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & Ilkin, 2003, p. 183-184

<sup>89</sup> “İnkılabımızın İdeolojisi”, Peyami Safa, Cumhuriyet, 29 June 1933 as cited in Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadro'yu ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & Ilkin, 2003, p. 321

<sup>90</sup> See the letter that was thought to be written by leader of TKP, Şefik Hüsnü, to Şevket Süreyya: Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadro'yu ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & Ilkin, 2003, p. 557-573

<sup>91</sup> “Benerci Kendini Niçin Oldürdü?”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 4, p. 31-39, April 1932; “Burhan Asaf'ın Peyami Safa'ya Mektubu”, June 1933 as cited in Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadro'yu ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & Ilkin, 2003, p. 576-577

fascism.<sup>92</sup> With these claims, Kadro tried to present its nationalist approach as a dynamic modernization project peculiar to Turkey.

Apart from accusations of fascism, as Şevket Süreyya claims, Kadro was also stigmatized as a communist publication by Milliyet newspaper and the İş Bank Group, which was led by Celal Bayar. The hardliners of the RPP such as Necip Ali and Recep Peker did not trust Kadro either.<sup>93</sup> The leftist past of the writers was often presented as a strong indication of the journal's *real* nature, and the writers were pictured as supporters of the Bolshevik system due to their etatist ideas. Even İsmet İnönü, who supported Kadro about etatism, had his share of these accusations.<sup>94</sup> Under these circumstances, emphasizing nationalism helped Kadro as a legitimating mechanism, since being a nationalist was perceived as a basic necessity in order to be a patriotic citizen by the regime. Other than proving Kadro's nativity and patriotism, embracing a nationalist discourse probably made it relatively easy for Kadro members to discuss subjects such as etatism, planned economy or anti-imperialism, which were easily attributed communism.

In short, a nationalist aspect was already embedded in the world-view of Kadro members long before their journal was published. Kadro supported the Kemalist nationalist project to unify the nation under the same Turkish identity, even in the times this effort included exclusivist, ethno-racial discourse and implementation of heavy measures. The writers tried to add a distinct economic dimension to nationalism and attempted to keep the link between Kemalism and anti-imperialism alive. Their main aim was connecting Turkey to the world-wide movement of emancipation of underdeveloped countries. Nationalism also helped former leftists of Kadro as a practical legitimizing mechanism and helped them to work for the Kemalist regime with less conflict.

## 1.2 Populism

Analyzing the main points of Kemalist populism, from which Kemalist leadership derived an ideological base for its legitimating mechanism to claim power, may be useful for understanding Kadro's, as well as Markopaşa and Yön's, interpretations of Kemalism. Since left-oriented interpretations of Kemalism were partially derived from some of the basic elements of Kemalist

---

<sup>92</sup> "Sosyal Milliyetçiliğin Zaferi", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 35-36, p. 8-12, December 1934-January 1935

<sup>93</sup> Suyu Arayan Adam, Şevket Süreyya, 1959, p. 493-495; Yıllar Böyle Geçti, Vedat Nedim, 1976, p. 130

<sup>94</sup> "Başvekilin Makalesi: Fırkamızın Devletçilik Vasfı", Mahmut Soydan, Milliyet, 5 November 1933 *as cited in* "Bir Cumhuriyet Oyküsü: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak", Tekeli & İlkin, 2003, p. 343

populism, subjects which are connected to Kemalist populism such as the society, classes and elitism will be discussed in this chapter.

Kemalist populism is not related to modern-day populism but to the German and Russian romantic idealization of “the people”; in German “Völkisch” and Russian “Narodniki” movements. As Zürcher explains, the Russian Narodniki movement<sup>95</sup> had quite an impact on the emergence of this populist ideology in the minds of Turkish-Ottoman intellectuals. As a result, a Kemalist understanding of populism included romantic idealization of “the people”, in particular, the Anatolian peasantry, which directly owed something to the romantic nationalist “Halka Doğru” (Towards the People) movement of the World War I and, indirectly, to the Narodniki in Russia.<sup>96</sup> With the World War I, early Narodnik impact gradually disappeared, and populism gained a new dimension, a solidarist outlook, under the influence of French sociology.<sup>97</sup>

In the early years of the independence movement, the concept of populism was very important for nationalists to unite representatives of different groups in the Great National Assembly, as well as to gain support from the Soviets for the independence movement. As Tekeli and Şaylan argue, although Mustafa Kemal tried to base his movement upon the people from the start of the War of Independence, he did not propose a populist program until some other groups came up with “populist” programs to the GNA. Therefore, it is possible to say that the Populist Program of 1920 was put forward tactically by Mustafa Kemal in order to eliminate his opponents within the GNA.”<sup>98</sup> Besides, populism gained a different meaning and function due to the changes during and after the War of Independence. When there was no need for the vast support of “the people” and Soviet Union anymore, the Kemalist understanding of populism changed.<sup>99</sup> Consequently, once the Kemalist nationalists secured their power, the pluralistic tone of Kemalist populism of the early years of national struggle weakened. Under the single-party rule, the slogan “for people, by people” was replaced by the concept of “for people, despite people”.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Narodnichestvo movement (narodnik: people) refers to a Russian populist movement, which was initiated by a group of intellectuals who organized “towards the people” movement with a romantic idealization of people and a strong emphasize on the peasantry, mainly from 1870 to 1890. Their ideas were often carried to Turkey via Tatar and Azeri emigrates from Russia such as Yusuf Akçura and Ahmet Ağaoğlu. For further information: “Narodnizm”, *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi*, volume 2, İletişim Yayınları, 1988, p. 495-509

<sup>96</sup> “Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought”, Zürcher, 2005, p. 21

<sup>97</sup> *The Populism of the Village Institutes: A Contradictory Expression of Kemalist Populism* (Phd Thesis), Nuran Aytemur, METU, 2007, p. 31

<sup>98</sup> “Türkiye’de Halkçılık İdeolojisinin Evrimi”, Tekeli and Şaylan, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 1978, p. 66-67 *as cited in* *The Populism of The Village Institutes: A Contradictory Expression of Kemalist Populism*, Aytemur, 2007, p. 39

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48

<sup>100</sup> *Türkiye’de Siyasal Kültürün Resmî Kaynakları: Kemalist Tek Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP’nin Altı Oku*, Taha Parla, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1992, volume 3, p. 235-236

Kadro appeared at the beginning of the 1930s, when the Great Depression already discredited political and economic liberalism in Turkey. While strengthening the single-party rule in parallel to the general tendency of the world that favored strict regimes, Kemalists sought more secure solutions in the economy. Under these circumstances, developing an economic plan and seeking ways to affect Kemalist policies via their journal were the two primary objectives for Kadro members. However, their main aims were connected to their economic targets; therefore the populist arrow was not essential for them. They did not define their journal as a populist publication, since they did not need a populist discourse as much as Kemalists needed it during the War of Independence and in the early years of the republic.

Although the Kemalist discourse emphasized the importance of populist arrow, Kemalists did not bring any clear explanation about the nature of their populism. The concept of the “nation” (*millet*) and the “people” (*halk*) were often used interchangeably. Taha Parla points out that since the link between populism and nationalism was a significant component of the Kemalist internal legitimation strategy, the nationalist and populist arrows were closely related.<sup>101</sup> Mustafa Kemal consciously and actively enforced the relationship between populism and nationalism. In this way, the Kemalists used their view of “the people” to justify their sole position as rulers of the state by using their strategic legitimation advantage. They created a conceptual continuity between RPP and the nationalist movement, in other words between populism and nationalism. As a result, the populist discourse of the Kemalists ensured RPP’s claim to represent the whole society and the party’s assumed role to protect the interests of the whole nation.<sup>102</sup>

Kadro did not provide any clear description for “the people” either. The writers used the “people” and the “nation” interchangeably. According to prominent liberal journalist Ahmet Ağaoğlu, despite their frequent usage of the word “people”, Kadro writers were unable to explain this word elaborately. Although the issues about the economy were subject to detailed analyses, “the people” was used in an ambiguous way; because it was an abstract, even romanticized idea in Kadro’s ideology. He claimed that Kadro’s lack of clarity on this matter was a sign of the journal’s ignorance about the people, as well as its general tendency to reduce “people” into a mass which needed to be led by an elite “cadre”.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> In this sense, Turkey was similar to Italy and Germany, since those countries also had a similar understanding.

<sup>102</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 82-85

<sup>103</sup> Devlet ve Fert, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Sanayi-i Nefise Matbaası, İstanbul, 1933, p. 60

### 1.2.1 Elitism

As one can see from the journal's title, Kadro aimed at forming an elite cadre which would create an ideological framework for the regime. According to Kadro, identifying the problems of the nation and achieving ideal solutions under the guidance of an intellectual group of bureaucrats was the best possible way to deal with problems. Kadro members probably considered themselves as future members of this cadre. In this way, the writers clearly showed that the journal's ideology was "elitist" towards politics. Here two influences may have been at work: On the one hand positivism, with its reliance on a managerial class and on the other Bolshevism, with its preference for a small cadre-led vanguard party.

Despite their elitist tendency however, Kadro writers were aware of the gap between educated classes and ordinary citizens. Yakup Kadri, who was a famous novelist as well as a journalist and politician, crystallized this problem in his influential novel, "Yaban" (Stranger). By describing the predicament of a high-ranking army officer in a remote village of Anatolia during in the War of Independence, he tried to explain the difficulties that were experienced by the intellectual, once he is confronted with ignorance, poverty, and the illiteracy of peasants.

When Kadro tried to persuade the RPP leaders to form a group of intellectuals to consult, the journal's desire for an "elite cadre" was not welcomed by the many within the parliamentary. The main reason for this negativity was the ambiguous nature of the "cadre". In order to prevent connotations to communism, Kadro explained the differences between its "vanguard cadre" and the Leninist notion of a "professional revolutionary" carefully. The writers claimed that the "cadre" belonged to the whole nation, rather than being representative of a specific social class, as it was in Leninism.<sup>104</sup> Besides, Russia's development path was completely different than Turkey's. In order to gain economic independence, Turkey needed an intellectual nationalist cadre,<sup>105</sup> which had nothing to do with communism.<sup>106</sup>

At this point, Kadro was not crucially very different from rest of the Kemalists. Despite its rhetoric of the "people's government", Kemalist understandings of governance was elitist to some extent. Like Ziya Gökalp and many other Ottoman intellectuals, the Kemalist leadership believed that the right of governance in Turkey belonged to the well-educated intellectual elite and prominent

---

<sup>104</sup> "İnkılabımızın Sesi", Burhan Asaf, p. 34, November 1932

<sup>105</sup> İnkılap ve Kadro (İnkılabın İdeolojisi), Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 149-150

<sup>106</sup> "Fırka Mektebi", Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 9, p. 32-33, September 1932

members of society, more than the masses.<sup>107</sup> Due to their education and background, Kemalists were conditioned to believe in progress in a certain European way. However, rather than the egalitarian and democratic ideas, they were often inspired by right-wing currents of Europe such as solidarism and positivism.<sup>108</sup> Therefore, with its significant impact on the founders of the republic, positivism can be taken as one of the major contributors to the elitist features of Kemalism, which already carried elitist features due to political tradition of the country. As a result, Kemalists claimed the power as state-elites, and they did not intend to form an administration in which they could share the power with common people.

Whether Kadro's writers were influenced by positivism via their early Ottoman education or later via Leninism, they shared the "elitist" traits of Kemalism. Besides, Kadro members supported the regime's elitist features by arguing that the state had every right to implement certain policies to enforce reform projects over the society via a certain group of state-elites and intellectuals. By accepting elitism as an essential element, Kadro showed its approval for top-down decisions of the single-party regime. Therefore it can be said that elitism enabled the Kemalist regime to adopt strict top-down policies with ease, and opened the way for authoritarian tendencies. Indeed, the elitism of the regime coincided with overall trend of the world which was already tolerant for authoritarian regimes and strict top-down policies at the time.

### **1.2.2 Classes and Society**

In general, discussing the ideas of Kemalists on economic-social classes and society can be beneficial to grasp Kadro's conceptualization of the society.

Kemalists shared Ziya Gökalp's solidarist perception of society which was influenced by Durkheim, who thought of the society in terms of harmony rather than conflict. As a result, Kemalists often defined society in "classless", "united" and "complementary" groups without conflicting interests.<sup>109</sup>

As Parla points out, the first aspect of Kemalist populist discourse was the claim that classes in Turkey were not in conflict. This claim can be read as a defensive response to Soviets and Marxist

---

<sup>107</sup> Ziya Gökalp, *Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, Taha Parla, Deniz Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, p. 165

<sup>108</sup> *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order*, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 266

<sup>109</sup> "Genel Sekreter Recep Peker'in Açıklaması", CHF Programının İzahı Mevzuu Üzerinde Konferans (1931) *as cited in* Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Oku, Parla, 1992, p. 112-113



concept of class struggle. Mustafa Kemal insisted on Turkey's incompatibility with communism, due to lack of class conflicts. According to him, although the Turkish nation possessed various classes, the present classes would not have followed very different interests from one another; because they were in the nature of being necessarily complementary of each other. Mustafa Kemal's "classes in harmony" rhetoric was helpful for securing the position of RPP, since in the absence of the class conflicts the party was enough to secure rights of all social classes, because it represented the whole nation in the GNA.<sup>110</sup>

The second aspect of Kemalist discourse about society and social classes appeared around the beginning of the 1930s and claimed that social classes did not exist in Turkey. This rhetoric was also in agreement with policies of the anti-liberal wing of RPP and anti-liberal political climate of the world after the Great Depression.<sup>111</sup> This view became evident in the 1931 program and continued with a slightly modified version in 1935 program. However, as Zürcher points out, the Italian labor code was implemented in 1936 in order to prohibit all class-based organizations, despite the fact that the regime denied the presence of the classes.<sup>112</sup> It seems that the indecisive attitude of the Kemalists towards classes and Turkey's social structure was one of many contradictions within the ideology.

With *Kadro*, the main discussions about classes came from Şevket Süreyya, İsmail Hüsrev, Burhan Asaf and Vedat Nedim; in other words from the writers with a leftist background. Despite the official Kemalist view of the 1930s, *Kadro*'s writers often tried to acknowledge class divisions. According to Vedat Nedim, Turkey could not be considered as a classless society, because every inch of the country was filled with people who belonged to a different social class due to their position in economic life.<sup>113</sup> The variety and structure of those classes resembled the classes of a liberal economy.<sup>114</sup> However, according to their needs in the discussion, some of the writers sometimes preferred to ignore the presence of classes. For example, while Şevket Süreyya, Vedat Nedim and İsmail Hüsrev referred to the existence of classes, Burhan Asaf emphasized the classless structure of Turkey. According to him, Turkey's lack of industrial development prevented Turkish society from forming clearly divided social classes.<sup>115</sup> At the beginning of the Turkish revolution,

---

<sup>110</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 81-83

<sup>111</sup> "Here we should note that this second aspect did not occur suddenly. Similar statements can be found in both Mustafa Kemal's utterances and chief RPP documents as early as 1923" in Ibid, p. 82

<sup>112</sup> Turkey: A Modern History, Erik-Jan Zürcher, I. B. Tauris, London-New York, 2007, p. 200

<sup>113</sup> "Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti", Vedat Nedim, *Kadro*, issue 11, p. 17-18, November 1932

<sup>114</sup> "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi II", İsmail Hüsrev, *Kadro*, issue 26, p. 20-22, February 1934

<sup>115</sup> "Cihan Buhranı Bitti mi", Burhan Asaf, *Kadro*, issue 10, p. 38-39, October 1932

the Turkish nation was a classless society. Thus, it was still possible to prevent the formation of classes due to the weak nature of existing divisions.<sup>116</sup>

In the 1930s, when the leaders of the regime were claiming different economic classes did not exist, writing about social classes in detail was challenging for Kadro. Due to the writers' leftist backgrounds, their arguments about class conflict and particularly about "classless society" -which in fact were not dramatically different than Kemalist solidarist view- were not received well. Mahmut Soydan, a deputy and a representative in the liberal İş Bank Group claimed that Kadro propagandized communism.<sup>117</sup> As a devoted liberal, Ahmet Ağaoğlu was also very critical about journal's anti-liberal perception of the classes.<sup>118</sup> His criticism urged Kadro members to prove their ideological distance towards socialism and communism when they commented about classes.

Kadro intellectuals were after a well-controlled etatist economy however, so this objective often manifested itself in their descriptions of society, which was usually pictured as a well-controlled, well-ordered structure. They often idealized a "classless", "united" and "complementary" society as an essential necessity to realize reforms and economic plans.<sup>119</sup> In this way, the whole society was going to be in order, free of class conflicts and also ready for necessary implementations in a top-down fashion. As seen, whether they ignored or acknowledged the existence of the classes, Kadro writers interpreted their existence as a negative effect in Turkey. The writers often stated that any class-based progress should have been prevented in the country, since the formation of the social classes would have triggered class struggles and lead the way to the development of liberalism, capitalism or socialism, all of which were harmful systems for the country.<sup>120</sup> In this respect, they were quite similar to most of the Kemalists who had anti-liberal views at the time, although the idea of "classless society" might have been borrowed from Marxism by Kadro.

Like Mustafa Kemal, Kadro also connected nationalist and populist arrows but usually with more emphasis on economy. As stated by Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro was against the domination of one class on another, regardless of the nature and position of that class. Elimination of socio-economic

---

<sup>116</sup> "Faşizm ve Türk Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi," Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 8, p. 38, August 1932

<sup>117</sup> 5 November 1933, Milliyet newspaper *as cited* in Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım, Türkeş, 1999, p. 128

<sup>118</sup> Devlet ve Fert, Ağaoğlu, 1933, p. 14-15

<sup>119</sup> "Plan Mefhumu Hakkında", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 5, p. 12, May 1932; "Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti, Vedat Nedim, p. 19, November 1932

<sup>120</sup> "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin Ana Prensipleri", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 8, p.11, August 1932

classes was a necessity for movements of national independence, due to the possible destructive effect of class conflicts within the nation.<sup>121</sup>

As seen, while in the early years of the republic, Kemalists defined society and classes to defend and legitimize their own power, Kadro writers did a similar thing to legitimize their economic targets in the early 1930s. In this respect, it is possible to say that Kadro's interpretation of society and classes was deeply related to the journal's vision and plans about the economy. Vedat Nedim proved this very clearly by pointing out that the most vital issue for the Turkish revolution was achieving the goal of being a classless society and rapidly attaining a developed economy at the same time. For him, the only way to achieve that purpose was via the formation of an etatist economy.<sup>122</sup>

Kadro believed that the state, as a classless organ, was also above all classes.<sup>123</sup> As Türkeş emphasizes, according to Kadro, the state did not belong to any particular class or act on behalf of any particular group. The state was composed of a conscious "cadre", which would act on behalf of the whole nation.<sup>124</sup>

The above-mentioned remarks of Kadro about the harmful results of class conflicts can be taken as an effort to show the ill-effects of capitalism to the Kemalist regime, which usually followed a capitalist route in economy. According to the journal, capitalism had a potential to evolve into socialism, along with other problems. Therefore, the best thing to do was to achieve new solutions to create an independent economic system which was free of both capitalism and socialism.<sup>125</sup>

Along with capitalism, Kadro opposed socialist development in Turkey as well. According to the journal, Turkey was too fragile to be part of the aggressive capitalist system and it lacked essential necessities to achieve a socialist order, such as class conflicts, well-developed industries, and a strong proletarian class. Şevket Süreyya and Burhan Asaf held capitalism responsible for existence of liberalism and occurrence of social classes; therefore they pictured socialism as one of the harmful results of capitalism.<sup>126</sup> However, preventing socialism was possible. If the state would

---

<sup>121</sup> "Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi I", İsmail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 25, p. 34, January 1934

<sup>122</sup> "Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti", Vedat Nedim, p. 17-21, November 1932

<sup>123</sup> "Türkiye'de Milli Sanayi Hareketi", İsmail Hüsrev, Kadro, Issue 10, p. 20-25, October 1932

<sup>124</sup> "A Patriotic Leftist Development Strategy Proposal in Turkey in the 1930s: The Case of the Kadro Movement", Türkeş, 2001, p. 106-107

<sup>125</sup> "Müstemele İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına II", Vedat Nedim, p. 9, February 1932

<sup>126</sup> "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketleri İçinde Bizim Tezimiz", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 12, p. 40-41, December 1932; "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketleri ve Bunların İnkılap Nazariyeleri", Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 9, p. 42, September 1932

have controlled the economy for the benefit of the whole nation, there would not have been any ground for the formation of conflicting classes.<sup>127</sup>

Kadro writers insisted that their ideas did not originate from any specific ideology, even though the influence of the Soviet Union on their economical plans as well as the anti-imperialist discourse of Leninism on “the conflict between developed and non-developed nations” were quite obvious. Due to Kadro’s left-oriented discourse, which often argued about anti-imperialism, class-conflicts, classless society, and etatism, the journal was referred as a leftist publication by many.<sup>128</sup>

As Türkeş mentions, economic and social developments of human history were often explained by Kadro writers, especially by Şevket Süreyya and Ismail Hüsrev, in accordance with historical materialism or sometimes with dialectic materialism.<sup>129</sup> However, it should be kept in mind that the same writers were very critical towards Marxist ideology and socialist order at the same time. Şevket Süreyya criticized the shortcomings of Marxism on recognizing different paths of development of Eastern examples, especially in Asian and African societies.<sup>130</sup>

At this point, the presence of Marxist / Leninist concepts in the journal’s discourse, but also Kadro’s usage of those left-oriented concepts and the context in which they appeared deserve equal attention. As it is evident from the articles, Kadro writers made crucial changes in the concepts that they borrowed from Marxism, sometimes by keeping the main schema while emptying its Marxist core or sometimes by using the schema in an entirely different context. For example, the idea of class conflict was easily replaced by the conflict between developed and underdeveloped nations in Kadro’s ideology. In other words, the idea of “conflict” was present but it was used in a different context in Kadro. In this way, the notion of “conflict” lost its Marxist core and gained a new nationalist aspect. It was the same for Kadro’s interpretation of anti-imperialism, which was borrowed from Leninism but gained a nationalist dimension with the journal’s interpretations, akin to the ideas of some of the Muslim national communists of Russia. Kadro ignored that Lenin’s main focus was on the dictatorship of the proletariat and his support for national liberation movements was conditional and temporary.

---

<sup>127</sup> “Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi II”, Ismail Hüsrev, p. 25, February 1934

<sup>128</sup> See: Kadrocular ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Görüşleri, Naci Bostancı, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990, Ankara, p. 89: “*When Kadro’s interpretations about the classless society are carefully examined, their wish for a ‘commune’ life (therefore communism) becomes very visible. Their ideas about etatism and reformism can be taken as their wish for a communal system as well.*”

<sup>129</sup> Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım, Türkeş, 1999, p. 142

<sup>130</sup> “Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi II: Marksizim”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 15-16, July 1933

When all these factors are taken into consideration, it is better not to take Kadro's rejection of Marxism merely as a defense reflex under the watchful eyes of Kadro's opponents. Kadro members' disengagement from the leftist movement as well as above-mentioned ideological differences with Marxism and socialism are important indicators of Kadro's ideological distance from socialism. It should be kept in mind that even though some of the influential ideas of Kadro were inspired by Marxism and Leninism, Kadro's interpretation of class and society seems quite compatible with Kemalist solidarist alternative, which aimed at achieving a united and well-ordered society in harmony, and without strong class divisions.

Elitism, romantic idealization of the concept of "the people" along with a distrust of the masses, authoritarian tendencies, intolerance for upheavals, anti-liberal and anti-socialist attitudes, and a solidarist view of a united and well-controlled society were the features shared by Kadro like the most of the Kemalists. Therefore it is possible to say that the traits of positivism and solidarism were clearly present in their ideology. Despite Kadro's statist, left-oriented plans, and its discourse which were heavily inspired by Soviet Union, Kadro's ideology was quite compatible with Kemalist populism, regarding Kadro's interpretations of elitism, the people, society, and social classes. At this juncture, Kadro's Kemalist interpretations and its transformation and tailoring of left-oriented concepts place the journal closer to Kemalism and its solidarist - positivist rightist core rather than Marxism and socialism. Therefore, addressing Kadro as a "left-leaning" and "patriotic ideology" within Kemalism, rather than a "leftist" group seems more convenient.

Kadro was clearly elitist and did not aim at reaching the general population but rather state elites. As a matter of fact, Kadro intellectuals were not closely attached to the idea of populism. In this respect, they were quite different than the Markopaşa journal of the late 1940s, which set a different example than Kadro, even though it was also published by a group of Kemalist intellectuals.

### **1.3 Republicanism**

Republicanism is one of the six arrows of Kemalist ideology. For Kemalists and RPP "the republic" was the broadest institutional agent of their transformation as well as the expression of anti-

monarchism, anti-theocratism and national sovereignty.<sup>131</sup> As Parla mentions, the meaning of republicanism, therefore, can not be comprehended apart from the meanings of nationalist and populist arrows; because these two arrows express anti-monarchical interest of popular organs over and against the organs of arbitrary government by the Ottoman regime.<sup>132</sup>

Since it was based on republican principles of governance and it replaced absolutist, imperial and monarchical governing structures of Ottoman Empire; Kemalist republicanism can be taken as a modern system for Turkey.<sup>133</sup> However, Kemalist republicanism does not only consist of these modern and progressive features. As Parla points out, it also includes the notion of charismatic leadership, authoritarian tendencies and hierarchical structuring; therefore the republic idea in Mustafa Kemal's thinking is not a "democratic" republic in its core.<sup>134</sup> In this respect, Kemalism has a contradictory nature.

According to Şerif Mardin, Young Turks' desire for parliamentary regime was a desire to find a system in order to prevent the decline of the Ottoman Empire, which was struck with waves of nationalism at the time. The discussions about the parliamentary system aimed at strengthening and saving the empire, rather than people's participation in politics or demanding more freedom.<sup>135</sup> In this sense, Young Turks were introducing a new concept but were they using it in order to conserve the existing order. Here, an analogy can be made between Young Turks and the Kemalists, since the Kemalists introduced the republic but they employed it to strengthen their power and rule, rather than improving freedom and active participation in politics. In this respect, Kemalists were quite similar to late Ottomans, and there were striking similarities between mentality of late Ottomans and leaders of Turkish Republic. At least, the course they followed indicates that governing mentality of the Kemalists bear great resemblance with late Ottomans.<sup>136</sup>

Kadro's 22<sup>nd</sup> issue was devoted to the republic and republicanism due to the tenth anniversary of Turkish Republic. In this issue, Şevket Süreyya wrote that the biggest reform which ever took place in Turkey was foundation of the Turkish Republic. Without republic, there would not have been

---

<sup>131</sup> Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları, Atatürk'ün Nutku, volume 1, Taha Parla, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1991, p.138; Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları, Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Oku, Parla, 1992, p.40

<sup>132</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 87

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., p. 55

<sup>134</sup> Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları, Atatürk'ün Nutku, Parla, 1991, p.138

<sup>135</sup> Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri (1895-1908), Şerif Mardin, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1983, p. 35

<sup>136</sup> In order to see Kemalist regime's ideological connections with Ottoman thought: "Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought", Zürcher, 2005, p.13-26

enough ground to keep independence of Turkey.<sup>137</sup> In the same issue, Kadro declared that Kadro's primary duty was protecting the Turkish Republic and its reforms.<sup>138</sup>

Although Kadro glorified the republic continuously as other Kemalists did, the journal preferred to use the word "inkılap" (reform) more often than "republic." In the articles "inkılap" usually was used instead of "Turkish Republic." This urged Ahmet Ağaoğlu to criticize Kadro for avoiding usage of the term "republic", therefore for not giving enough importance to the republicanist arrow. His comments indicated that republican system might have not been very important to Kadro as a political system due to left-oriented ideas of its writers.<sup>139</sup>

It seems intellectuals of Kadro interpreted the republican arrow as a complementary instrument in order to shape the country. Like rest of the Kemalists, the republic was the first step for Turks to become a proud and independent nation for them. Other than that, Kadro did not pay too much attention to the republican arrow and chose to focus on the anti-imperialist character of the independence struggle and continuation of the reforms. Although the regime was quite content with the republic and its gains, Kadro group warned that Turkey's former exploitation was mostly based on economic reasons; therefore heading towards non-capitalist, non-liberal etatism policies was an urgent issue for the republic. Apparently, Kadro's ideas that were inspired from leftist ideologies were not in conflict with the republican regime as the way Ağaoğlu criticized. Kadro's main concern was not about republican system but the regime's shortsightedness in the economic field.

Kadro members shared anti-monarchist and anti-theocratic ideals of Kemalism. Like Mustafa Kemal or any other Kemalist at the time, they highlighted the differences between the Kemalist republic and the Ottoman Empire and consequently contributed to the efforts to create a constructed version of official history about Ottoman past. Similar to hardliner RPP deputy Recep Peker, who blamed Ottomans for discriminating Turkish elements in the empire,<sup>140</sup> Şevket Süreyya blamed Ottoman period for its downgrading policies towards Turks. He claimed that the Ottoman palace always sided with Kurdish feudal powers in the Eastern provinces and deliberately discriminated Turkish people in that region in every possible way.<sup>141</sup> According to Burhan Asaf, both theocracy and monarchy had a tendency to be used as a tool by the imperialist powers. The caliphate, for example, could have easily been used in order to control Muslims. Besides, basic principles of these

---

<sup>137</sup> "İnkılap Neslinin Şarkısı", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 22, p. 9-13, October 1933

<sup>138</sup> "Kadro", Kadro, issue 22, p. 7, October 1933

<sup>139</sup> Devlet ve Fert, Ağaoğlu, 1933, p. 84

<sup>140</sup> İnkılap Dersleri, Recep Peker, Ankara, Ulus Basımevi, 1936, p.3

<sup>141</sup> "Dersim ve Derebeyi", Şevket Süreyya, p. 42-43, June 1932

establishments were incompatible with codes of the modern world; therefore they were nothing but obstacles for modern society. Thus, abolition of those establishments was quite useful for the “Turkish inkılap.”<sup>142</sup>

According to Vedat Nedim, “*Europe is like tower of Babel. Everybody talks, argues, explains things according to their own values and philosophy; still nobody understands each other. Because those people are individualist and every single person is the captain of his/her own ship. I think today’s Germany is victim of French democracy, rather than the Versailles Treaty. People are lost and confused between numerous political parties and fractions there. The democracy has been abused by everybody, especially opportunist politicians like Hitler. He is against democracy but he owes his very existence to the chaos that was created by democracy. Without extreme tolerance of democratic system there would be no Hitler, who is symbol of the self-destructive nature of liberal-capitalist system.*”<sup>143</sup>

Kadro was against parliamentary democracy and sided with one-party rule. According to the journal, democracy was part of the capitalist and liberal system, and it could be hazardous to Turkey’s system by triggering class conflicts. According to Kadro, democracy and the liberal system lost their credibility with the Great Depression. At that juncture, what Turkey needed was a state-controlled economy. Since a controlled economy needed a controlled political atmosphere, democracy should have been avoided.<sup>144</sup>

As seen, the Kadro group often confirmed the authoritarian tendencies of the Kemalist regime. Apparently, Kadro’s ideological opposition against liberalism made it easy for them to justify authoritarian policies of the regime. Although they had a tense relation with hardliners of RPP due to disagreements about etatist arrow,<sup>145</sup> when it comes to strict policies, Kadro members did not seem to be in conflict with them. At this point, their ideas were quite similar to Recep Peker who stated that reforms often required the use of force due to resistance of the reactionary elements against new movements. According to Peker, taking rigorous steps and exercising strict policies was quite normal for Turkish reform in order to protect and establish itself.<sup>146</sup> However those

---

<sup>142</sup> “İnkılabımız ve Hilafet”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 1, p. 38, January 1932

<sup>143</sup> “Kreuger, Hitler, Goethe”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 4, p. 27, April 1932

<sup>144</sup> “Rejimler Nasıl, Niçin Değişiyor”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 12, p. 28-30, December 1932

<sup>145</sup> Yıllar Böyle Geçti, Vedat Nedim, 1976, p. 130

<sup>146</sup> İnkılap Dersleri, Peker, 1936, p. 8



policies did not deprive Turkish people of their freedom, because in Turkey every kind of freedom existed.<sup>147</sup>

When elaborating their ideas about liberalism, Kadro writers often categorized concepts such as individualism, freedom and liberty as part of the liberal-capitalist thought. As a result, these concepts appeared in connection with those systems and they were subjected to negative comments in several articles. By referring to these concepts mostly in connection with liberalism and by reducing them into technical terms, Kadro also tried to justify the strict regime of the single-party period. Since the writers interpreted democracy and multi-party system as harmful outcomes of capitalism, they praised RPP's single party system. They intentionally ignored its shortcomings and flaws, since they perceived it as a useful tool to implement state-led economy policies. Şevket Süreyya advocated the state's domineering power over public sphere in many levels.<sup>148</sup> Vedat Nedim claimed that state was the only and sole power and all the individuals were in fact "state's material."<sup>149</sup> Burhan Asaf approved RPP's domineering role in politics and he demanded even stricter control of the government over the press and the radio. According to him this was necessary to defend the state against its enemies and the best way to use the press for advantage of the government.<sup>150</sup> Şevket Süreyya advised to use the radio in a controlled way as well.<sup>151</sup>

Apparently, one-party rule and its strict style to create a solidaristic, well-orderly nation was quite convenient, particularly for non-liberal wing of the RPP and Kadro group in order to exercise their own top-down plans.

Leadership was also an important component in Kemalism as it was in the countries like Italy and Germany. As Parla mentions, since authoritarian systems need leaders and chiefs, Kemalism was prepared to do this by cultivating myth of leadership of Atatürk in Turkey. This effort can easily be followed in Recep Peker's ideas. According to Peker, "*The leadership requires special qualities, since the Chief illuminates his party and his surroundings with his warmth and enthusiasm. He easily leads people to the purposes and goals that were shaped and justified by him. The chief of a nation is always the most advanced person in his society in every way, along with his superior moral values, willpower, courage and culture.*"<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., p. 27

<sup>148</sup> "Plan Mefhumu Hakkında", Şevket Süreyya, p. 8-12, May 1932

<sup>149</sup> "Müstemele İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına II", Vedat Nedim, p. 9-10, February 1932

<sup>150</sup> "İnkılabımızın Sesi", Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 11, p. 35, November 1932

<sup>151</sup> "Halkevleri," Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 3, p. 36, March 1932

<sup>152</sup> İnkılap Dersleri, Peker, 1936, p. 63, 65

It is possible to come across similar expressions about Mustafa Kemal and his role as a leader in Kadro. For example, Şevket Süreyya joined the Kemalist efforts to create a myth of leadership around Mustafa Kemal by referring to him as “the chief” and making comparisons between him and main figures of the Ergenekon legend of the Turkic people.<sup>153</sup> In another article, he attributed special qualities to the leadership mission exactly like Recep Peker. According to Şevket Süreyya, in the final chapters of the world history, Mustafa Kemal was the only leader who had power and capacity of “making a nation” following a military victory. “The chief” appeared in history when political victory ended and reforms began. The chief always led the way with his wisdom. Due to his intuition and farsightedness, he was always one step further than the rest and he shaped the events and occurrences beforehand. He was the one who gathered all those special qualities in himself.”<sup>154</sup>

Mustafa Kemal’s success in the War of Independence and his respectability can be taken into account as reasons for those praises. Still, it is difficult to overlook Kadro’s voluntary contributions to leadership myth of Mustafa Kemal.

Here, it should be noted that authoritarianism was a common tendency in the world in the 1930’s. The Great Depression caused fear and instability and damaged the trust in liberalism and the democratic system. A climate of political and economic insecurity also set the stage for authoritarian-totalitarian regimes as it had happened in Germany and Italy. Soviet Union, on the other hand, already started new economic plans and implemented NEP by 1921 and later a planned economy in order to strengthen industry. Under the leadership of Stalin, a strict political atmosphere was formed which was followed by political purges against opposition. Under those circumstances, countries like Soviet Union and Italy were seen as powerful countries which survived from the Great Depression without any apparent vital damage. As Zürcher mentions, in Turkey after the declaration of the Law on the Maintenance of Order in March 1925, the government was already an authoritarian one-party regime and at the party congress of 1931, Turkey’s political system was officially declared as a one-party state. Indeed, except for the Free Republican Party (Serbest Fırka) experiment in 1930, legal opposition to RPP was not possible until after the WWII.<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> “Ergenekon Efsanesi”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 13, p. 9, January 1933

<sup>154</sup> “Bir Münakaşanın Manası”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 17, p. 5-8, May 1933

<sup>155</sup> Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p.176

Relative stability and success of the regimes of Russia and Italy were appreciated by Kadro. This is also obvious in Yakup Kadri's series of articles named "Ankara, Moskova, Roma". In one of his articles, he wrote that Mussolini was like a foreman, rather than a dictator and owing to him, Italy worked like clockwork. After all, fascism was just a method for the state, a new model with new technologies. There was not trace of any political or philosophical ideology or doctrine in fascism."<sup>156</sup>

Due to their tolerance for authoritarian tendencies of the regime as well as their positive comments about the fascist regime of Italy, Kadro writers were heavily criticized by prominent leftist figures such as Şefik Hüsnü, the leader of the Turkish Workers and Peasants Socialist Party,<sup>157</sup> and poet Nazım Hikmet, who studied in KUTV along with Şevket Süreyya and İsmail Hüsrev in the early 1920s.<sup>158</sup> Because of constant criticism and in the face of the rising power of Hitler and Mussolini, Kadro had to defend and redefine its ideology. Kadro members argued that the Kadro movement was aware of the dangers of fascism and its shortcomings. What Kadro was formulating was a unique solution for Turkey, not a fascist doctrine.<sup>159</sup>

Kadro's sympathy for strict regimes drew the attention of the liberal Ahmet Ağaoğlu to a great degree. He claimed that although Kadro writers denied supporting fascist ideas, their articles indicated the opposite. Indeed, they often advocated the methods that were implemented by the fascist regimes. Similar to fascists, Kadro also had a great devotion to "the state" and the writers

---

<sup>156</sup> "Ankara, Moskova, Roma V", Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 11, p. 38-39, November 1932

<sup>157</sup> See the letter that was thought to be written by Şefik Hüsnü to Şevket Süreyya in "Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadro'yu ve Kadrocuları Anlamak, Tekeli & İkin, 2003, p.557-573

<sup>158</sup> Nazım Hikmet, who was an idealistic communist, was very critical about Şevket Süreyya's political choices as well as his closeness to Vedat Nedim, after Vedat Nedim's controversial leave from the leftist movement. According to Müzehher Vâ-Nu, Nazım Hikmet probably never forgave Şevket Süreyya for what happened in that period. (see: Bir Dönemin Tanıklığı, Müzehher Vâ-Nu, Cem Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1975, p. 150-153) The tension between two became public in 1932, when Şevket Süreyya tried to defend his actions in an article in the Kadro journal. In his article "Benerci Kendini Niçin Oldürdü", he tried to explain the reasoning behind his decisions, he described Nazım Hikmet as a romantic idealist who had to be more realistic and he invited him to his side implicitly. However, Nazım Hikmet replied Şevket Süreyya fiercely with a poem, "Cevap Dört", in his book "Gece Gelen Telgraf." In a small note in the beginning of the poem, he described Kadro as a "neo-fascist" group and pictured Şevket Süreyya as a traitor. And he continued as follows:

*"Brothers, if you come across them (Kadro members) in the street,*

*Turn your head to the other side.*

*If you are stared at by those lashless yellow eyes (he means Şevket Süreyya)*

*Beware!*

*You might be stabbed in the back soon (...)*

*Brothers, if you've ever touched them,*

*Wash your hands with seven bowls of water. (...)*

*Brothers! If your names resemble theirs, change them.*

*Enter the houses with black plaque but do not set foot in their houses.*

*(Because) They want our heads to be rolled in front of them."*

<sup>159</sup> "Milli Kurtuluş Hareketleri İçinde Bizim Tezimiz", Şevket Süreyya, p. 38-44, December 1932

expressed their desire to give an unlimited power to state to rule over the whole nation. Besides, their definition of state was quite vague. However, the nation should not have been categorized under the state as a passive power. The nation was above state, since the state was supposed to work in favor of the nation, not as an organ for its own good. Ağaoğlu also criticized Kadro for its forgetfulness about importance of political position of the people, since the people were always described by Kadro as a passive group, which was obliged to obey orders regardless of their individual choices.<sup>160</sup> In this way, Kadro reduced the people's role into a passive input in socio-economic matters. According to him, in Kadro's language "the people" often disappears and the ambiguous nature of state takes its place as the sole executive power without question.<sup>161</sup>

Despite the Kemalist rhetoric, the republican regime was hardly a "governance of people by people", especially after 1925. In this sense, Kemalists were following their Ottoman forefathers' governing mentality.

Apparently, except for the occasions that they romanticized the people as an abstract idea, Kadro's ideology carried Kemalist understandings of republicanism which lacked democracy and freedom, despite its modernizing features. Kadro members were, in fact, content with the Kemalist governance which, according to Parla, blurred the classical republicanist distinction between "the state" and "the political party"; glorified the state and the leader rather than the people.<sup>162</sup> Kadro members did not seem to be interested in a fundamental alteration in existing mentality of power relations or governing. The journal's main concern was not lack of freedom or lack of people's participation to politics but lack of power to influence political machinery to implement Kadro's own plans by using the top-down structure of single-party system. Consequently, they tried to justify those policies in several occasions. The existence of economically powerful totalitarian states like Italy and Russia made it easy for Kadro to approve of the strict regime of Turkey.

#### **1.4 Etatism**

Etatism was perceived by the Kemalists as the economic wing of nationalist policy, and it was designated to raise Turkey rapidly to the level of modern civilization.<sup>163</sup> It was the final arrow introduced by the Kemalists as well as the first to be eroded after 1947.

---

<sup>160</sup> Devlet ve Fert, Ağaoğlu, 1933, p. 54-55

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., p. 60

<sup>162</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 90

<sup>163</sup> Ibid., p. 125

Etatism became part of the Kemalist economic program in 1931 in response to deteriorating conditions for capital accumulation in the late 1920s.<sup>164</sup> Although its meaning was never clearly defined,<sup>165</sup> the role and meaning of etatism provoked a lot of discussion within RPP and among intellectuals of the time, especially between the third (1931) and the fourth (1935) RPP congresses.<sup>166</sup>

As Dumont states, in the Kemalist republic etatism refers to a strategy of state intervention in all social, economic, cultural and educational activities; and, in a more limited sense, it indicates a specific economy policy. Like its predecessor, the Kemalist state was the supreme authority for all important initiatives and decisions. When etatism appeared in the early 1930s, Turkey had already had a long history of state intervention in economic affairs, starting from the mid-nineteenth century. Although the Young Turks favored the idea of liberal economics for a while, CUP displayed more interventionist tendencies and tried to have an active role in stimulating the economy from 1912. In this sense, although the republican government tended to present its economic policy of the 1930s as a new departure, Kemalist etatism was in fact extension of previous experiments and discussions which began during the last decades of the nineteenth century.<sup>167</sup>

As Zürcher explains, in the early 1930s, like many governments around the world, the Turkish government was not sure what to do about the crisis. Consequently, the years from 1929 to 1932 became a period of searching. Even the debate between the RPP and the opposition party FRP (Free Republican Party) was mostly about economic policy. While FRP advocated liberalism, RPP under the leadership of İsmet İnönü demanded a greater role for the state in economy.<sup>168</sup> In the end, in accordance with its general tendency, the state acquired greater responsibilities in the management of the industry and control over the economy.<sup>169</sup>

Kadro group was formed in 1931 by a group of intellectuals when the regime was seeking new solutions for the economy. They came together in the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper, which was

---

<sup>164</sup> Ibid., p. 125-126

<sup>165</sup> Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 197

<sup>166</sup> "A Patriotic Leftist Development Strategy Proposal in Turkey in the 1930s: The Case of the Kadro Movement", Türkeş, 2001, p. 92

<sup>167</sup> "Origins of Kemalist Ideology", Paul Dumont in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, (edited by ) Jacob M. Landau, Brill, Leiden, 1984, p. 39-41

<sup>168</sup> Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 197

<sup>169</sup> Turkey's Politics, The Transition to a Multi-Party System, Karpas, 1959, p. 68

established by Mustafa Kemal in 1920. When these writers volunteered to solve existing economic problems, Mustafa Kemal gave permission for the publishing of a journal. The journal owed its existence to the Kemalist regime's need to achieve new strategies. When the journal's publication started in January 1932, its main focus was on economy. In this sense, etatism can be taken as the most important Kemalist arrow for the Kadro journal. This fact can be observed even in the first issue, since six of the twelve articles were directly about etatism and state's crucial role in economy.

According to Ismail Hüsrev, as an underdeveloped country, the main issues for Turkey were rapid industrialization and accumulation of capital. Turkey's economy still depended on the rules of liberal economy, which as an exploitive system hindered the achievement of a self-sufficient economy in Turkey. In order to strengthen the economy, cutting relations with the liberal economy and capitalism was crucial for Turkey. At this point, Kadro advocated, what the writers called, "nationalist etatism."<sup>170</sup>

Vedat Nedim argued that the principles of nationalist etatism aimed at protecting nationalist interests against foreign powers, and ending Turkey's economic dependence to them. Etatism was going to create a national economy, which, in turn, would function as a benefit to the whole nation. Indeed, if the implementation of an etatist program would be realized, the disadvantages caused by the Great Depression could have been turned into Turkey's advantage.<sup>171</sup> According to Şevket Süreyya and Burhan Asaf, the new era was going to witness wars of national independence, and was going to be an age of the new autarkic-national states.<sup>172</sup> Since Turkey was a unique example for rising anti-imperialist independence movements, its solution for economic independence should have been original as well. This solution was often named as "nationalist economy", "nationalist etatism" or "independent nation economy" (*müstakil millet iktisadiyatı*) by the journal.

As Türkeş points out, nationalist etatism was perceived by Kadro's writers as an alternative to both capitalism and communism. As often explained by Ismail Hüsrev and Vedat Nedim, there were three types of etatism: The first was one "fiscal etatism" in which the state had a direct role in economy for earning income for the state budget. This was usually seen in liberal economies like Turkey. Here, the main aim was maintaining the capitalist system. The second option was "socialist

---

<sup>170</sup> "Türkiye'de Milli Sanayi Hareketi", Ismail Hüsrev, p. 20, October 1932

<sup>171</sup> "Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Memleket İktisadiyatına I", Vedat Nedim, p. 8 - 11, January 1932

<sup>172</sup> Autarky refers to self-sufficiency and self-reliance in economic development. For further information: "Türkiye'de Korporatist Düşünce ve Korporatizm Uygulamaları", Aykut *in* Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, volume 2, p. 264- 271

etatism” in which the state assumed the main role in order to establish a socialist order on behalf of a specific class. The aim of this system was using the capitalist system in favor of a socialist order. The final and the third way was “nationalist etatism” in which the state could act on behalf of the whole nation.<sup>173</sup> According to Kadro, this alternative and “original” system required the establishment of a nationalist economic plan in order to break away from the capitalist and socialist systems with the aim of forming an independent economy.<sup>174</sup>

Kadro members continuously wrote about the crucial importance of a state-led economy and its possible benefits. Although expressed implicitly, they criticized some of the Kemalists who had liberal tendencies and did not support Kadro. Şevket Süreyya was probably aware of the similarities between the national economy program of CUP around WWI and Kemalist etatist plans in the republican era.<sup>175</sup> He warned the regime to be more considerate about economic issues by reminding the failures of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) and devastating effects of their shallow understanding of economy. According to him, the people who ruled Turkey after 1908 only had ideals. They attributed too much meaning to politics and they ignored the real needs of the country such as the technical development of the economy. Instead of following the latest industrial and scientific developments firsthand, they hired foreigners to do that for them. Therefore, the new Turkey should not have forgotten that the fiasco of CUP was connected to its failures in economy.<sup>176</sup>

Kadro advocated practices to gradually change society in order to apply top-down etatist plans. Compared to the milder interpretation of etatism by Mustafa Kemal, who tended to perceive etatism as a mere tool rather than an ideal, Kadro’s interpretation seemed to be more specific and stricter. In this sense, the journal’s view was closer to İsmet İnönü, who supported Kadro’s ideas about etatism as well as its discussions about land reform projects more than Mustafa Kemal.

Despite Kadro’s strict ideas about etatism, the journal did not oppose private enterprise. As Türkes has discussed extensively, Kadro believed private enterprises should have been allowed as long as their activity did not influence the decision-making process of the state apparatus. The state

---

<sup>173</sup> “A Patriotic Leftist Development Strategy Proposal in Turkey in the 1930s: The Case of the Kadro Movement”, Türkes, 2001, p. 99-100

<sup>174</sup> “Türkiye’de Milli Sanayi Hareketi”, İsmail Hüsrev, p. 24-25, October 1932; “Müstemeleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına I”, Vedat Nedim, p. 10 -11, January 1932; *İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi*, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 34-38; “Çökmekte Olan Cihan Nizamı”, Burhan Asaf, p. 22-27, January 1932

<sup>175</sup> For more information about CUP and its relations with economy: *İttihat Terakki ve Devletçilik*, Zafer Toprak, Tarih Vakfı-Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995

<sup>176</sup> “Ergenekon Efsanesi”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 8, January 1933

enterprises should have occupied leading positions. The revenue acquired via state-led enterprises should have been invested in industrial projects by the state.<sup>177</sup>

Kadro also proposed a partial land reform project in order to abolish strong feudal structures in the Eastern provinces. As Türkeş also discusses in detail<sup>178</sup>, the writers believed that the effects of big landownership were quite pervasive in the Eastern provinces.<sup>179</sup> Big landowners had a great deal of power not only on local populations but also within politics due to their strong connections. In this sense, Eastern provinces required extensive reform projects, which could start with the state's intervention in the economy and gradually evolve into other areas.<sup>180</sup> A land distribution project in the Eastern regions in favor of small-scale farmers and landless peasants could have been beneficial to decrease the influence of the big landowners.<sup>181</sup> As Türkeş emphasizes, Kadro linked this issue to Kurdish upheavals and claimed that land distribution projects would have helped to ease the situation in the East. In this way, the peasants who owned their private land would not have depended on big Kurdish landowners and they would have sided with the regime.<sup>182</sup>

Although Kadro's above-mentioned ideas did not convince the regime about a land reform project in the 1930s, İsmet İnönü did a partial land re-distribution in 1945. Kadro's ideas may have affected the implementation of 1945's land reform by İnönü, since, as an early Kemalist group to defend a land distribution project, Kadro devoted several articles to this matter and brought about new insights in the 1930s.

Apart from their suggestion for a partial land reform, Kadro writers did not suggest changing the power relations fundamentally on property. In this sense, they were not very different than Mustafa Kemal and the rest of the Kemalists, who did not attempt to change existing property relations either. This also shows Kadro members' devotion to Kemalism, because although they tried to insert left-oriented concepts into Kemalist ideology, they did not intend to shift core ideas of Kemalism fundamentally.

---

<sup>177</sup> "A Patriotic Leftist Development Strategy Proposal in Turkey in the 1930s: The Case of the Kadro Movement", Türkeş, 2001, p. 100

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104-106

<sup>179</sup> "Şark Vilayetlerinde Derebeylik I," İsmail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 11, p. 28, November 1932

<sup>180</sup> "Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatında Borçlanma Şekilleri," İsmail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 3, p. 34, March 1932; "Dersim ve Derebeyi," Şevket Süreyya, p. 44, June 1932

<sup>181</sup> "Dersim ve Derebeyi", Şevket Süreyya, p. 44, June 1932

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, p.44; Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım, Türkeş, 1999, p. 192



Being consistent with their understanding of society, Kadro's writers considered etatism as a regulatory power to organize society. According to Vedat Nedim, economic and industrial developments were going to change society gradually. With a well-planned, rapidly growing economy, Turkey was going to achieve a society free of class struggles. In this sense, etatism was not only an economic project but also a precaution against the formation of social classes.<sup>183</sup> After all, in Turkey the main role and objective of the state was leading an indivisible united nation, not the representation of different social classes.<sup>184</sup>

Nevertheless, there are a few major differences between Kadro and some of the Kemalists within RPP, regarding etatism. These differences were probably caused by the left-oriented ideological background of Kadro writers.

The first problematic issue about the etatism was whether etatism was an ideal or a mere tool for developing the economy. There were already different opinions on the possible duration of the etatist policies within the Kemalist group. Many considered it as a tool, rather than an ideal. For the groups with liberal tendencies, such as İş Bank Group led by Celal Bayar, etatism was a temporary solution. However, İsmet İnönü perceived it as a useful method which could work for a longer period. At this point, Kadro tried to gain full support of İsmet İnönü, who wrote an article on etatism in the Kadro journal in which he defended his view of etatism and implicitly drew attention to possible negative outcomes of anti-etatist views from İş Bank Group.<sup>185</sup>

The journal differed from the İş Bank Group, who perceived etatism as a temporary solution, by putting etatism in the center of their ideology. According to Vedat Nedim, the etatist arrow was not a temporary concept; therefore the RPP had to adopt etatist principles as much as it adopted republican, nationalist, populist, laicist and reformist principals.<sup>186</sup> In this way, Kadro was forcing its interpretation of etatism to the high cadres of the RPP to be accepted. Due to the journal's constant focus on etatism, its members were accused of trying to influence the regime's economy policies by their communist ideas. On the other hand, liberals such as Ağaoğlu complained about Kadro's desire for strict control of the state and pointed out Kadro's tolerance for authoritarianism and fascism.

---

<sup>183</sup> "Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti", Vedat Nedim, p. 21, November 1932

<sup>184</sup> "Devletin Yapıcılık ve İdarecilik Kudretine İnanmak Gerekir", Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 15, p. 14, March 1933

<sup>185</sup> Mustafa Kemal also wrote an article in Kadro due to the tenth anniversary of the republic. Still, İnönü's article dedicated to etatism was seemingly more in the same line with Kadro regarding the etatist arrow, even though İnönü's understanding of etatism was not as broad as Kadro's.

<sup>186</sup> "Türk Devletçiliği İhtibas Devletçiliği Değildir", Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 17, p. 19-20, May 1933

Kadro perceived etatism as a necessity for sustaining reform projects, which started in the late Ottoman period and intensified with the foundation of the republic. The writers were aware of the fact that the speed of reform projects was slowing down. According to them, the formation of a nationalist-etatist program and connecting Kemalism to anti-imperialist and anti-colonial movements of the underdeveloped countries of the East could prevent the decreasing speed of reforms. They believed that this connection would have brought back the revolutionary spirit of the national liberation and would have helped Turkey to secure its economic independence. However, the Kemalist regime was clearly reluctant to share Kadro's enthusiasm on "continuous" reform projects, particularly within an anti-imperialist context. Even Ismet İnönü, who took Kadro's etatist plans seriously, did not seem to have much interest for the journal's efforts within an anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist framework. After all, Kemalists did not intend to break their relations with capitalism but come to an agreement for working with foreign capital and investments.<sup>187</sup>

As Ahmet Insel points out, the increasing effect of anti-imperialist and anti-colonial movements of the 1930s should be taken into account when the etatism policies of the 1930s are discussed, since in most of cases, the proponents of etatism attached these features to their etatism definitions.<sup>188</sup> Although Kadro was a vanguard rather than a follower of this subject, it seems the journal exhibited what Insel mentioned. The leftist background of the Kadro members and the powerful effect of the anti-imperialist discourse of Leninism in their early years could be understood as important contributions to this end.

Kadro was impressed by the countries with strong economies such as Soviet Union, Italy and Germany, which dealt with the Great Depression seemingly well, at least in the beginning of 1930s. However, it was difficult for Kadro to support the political regimes of Italy and Germany due to their fascist ideologies. Besides, Kadro opposed capitalism as an exploitive system and blamed it for the backwardness of underdeveloped countries. At this point, Kadro's writers displayed a special interest for the Soviet style of development, although the journal disapproved of socialism and communism explicitly. They often emphasized possibilities of the Soviet style economy in order to build an independent, anti-imperialist economy.

---

<sup>187</sup> 100 Soruda Türkiye'de Devletçilik, Boratav, 1974, p. 47

<sup>188</sup> "Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Devletçilik", Ahmet Insel *in* Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1988, p. 1915

Like Kadro, Mustafa Kemal also claimed to achieve a third way in the economy, as an alternative to socialism and capitalism. His discourse carried anti-liberal concepts of the 1930s but, in fact, he did not object to capitalism directly, except for some of his utterances during the War of Independence when Turkey needed support from the Soviets. At this point, as Parla emphasizes, Mustafa Kemal's attitude towards capitalism seems consistent with the ideas of Ziya Gökalp, the ideological forefather of the Kemalists. Gökalp claimed to oppose both the socialist and capitalist systems, although his arguments were not completely directed against a capitalist economy since he was advocating for a solidarist-capitalist model at the same time. Therefore, what Gökalp really opposed was not capitalism as a whole, but the liberal version of it.<sup>189</sup> Kemalists rejected corporatism, mainly due to its association with fascism. Nonetheless, they never rejected the solidarist form of capitalism, because they did not intend to break away from the capitalist system. They often applied a mixed economy, especially in the 1920s. In this way, they often used a solidarist-corporatist rhetoric which criticized liberal and socialist systems, but they opted for staying within the borders of a capitalist economy.<sup>190 191</sup>

Although Kadro members insisted that Turkey should not follow a capitalist route, they were probably aware that the Kemalist etatism of the 1930s was anti-liberal and anti-socialist, but not anti-capitalist. Under those circumstances, they tried to convince the Kemalist regime to implement Kadro's ideas about etatism which had a broader extent than what Mustafa Kemal intended.

Another problematic area for Kadro was the originality of their "nationalist etatism" program. The journal was devoted to etatism but the writers were never able to clarify the reason why their version of etatism was an alternative third-way to both capitalism and socialism. This point did attract the attention of Kadro's opponents who were already annoyed with the journal's interpretations. As a result, the journal was criticized of being communist, fascist, neo-fascist, nationalist-communist, national-socialist, social-fascist and neo-Hitlerist publication.<sup>192</sup>

Kadro members defended their interpretation of etatism by explaining some of its key concepts. According to them, the journal's version had a patriotic motive, not a communist one. The writers

---

<sup>189</sup> Ziya Gökalp, *Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, Parla, 2009, p. 206

<sup>190</sup> *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Kemalist Tek Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Oku*, Parla, 1992, p. 44

<sup>191</sup> At this point it should be noted that Kemalist economic program had been highly state-oriented, even before the declaration of etatism as a formal strategy. For further information: *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order*, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 125

<sup>192</sup> "Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi I: Faşizm", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 18, p. 5, June 1933; *Bir Cumhuriyet Oyküsü: Kadro ve Kadrocuları Anlamak*, Tekeli & İlkin, 2003, p.154-157

demanded a realization of economic planning, which they believed would be successful in Turkey as it had succeeded in Russia. They also insisted that the concept of a “five-year economic plan” and “state-led economy” did not necessarily belong to a socialist economy. In order to make their point, the writers tried to prove that five-year economic plans were not communist but rather capitalist methods in essence, therefore, they did not pose a threat to Turkey. According to Vedat Nedim, Russia started a communist revolution in 1917, on the basis of Karl Marx’s ideas. However, Russia broke off from the ideals of Karl Marx when five-year programs were implemented. In spite of Russia’s claims of communism, what was applied in Russia was a populist program in a broad sense, due to the central role of “state entrepreneurship” in those programs. Whether “state entrepreneurship” was applied deliberately or not, Russia was changing its system and breaking away from the socialist regime.<sup>193</sup>

An interesting point here was Vedat Nedim’s choice of words. While he explained his ideas on this matter, he preferred to use the term “state entrepreneurship” instead of “state-capitalism”. However, the capitalist character of early five-year plans was quite obvious in Russia. Lenin considered state capitalism as a temporary solution until the state acquired enough revenue via state-led enterprises.<sup>194</sup> However, in order to be consistent with Kadro’s pragmatic plans and also with the need for convincing his readers, Vedat Nedim ignored this, and he called Russia’s implementations a “populist program.” Otherwise, he would have contradicted with what Kadro was advocating: an alternative economic system, free from socialism and capitalism.

Regarding capitalism, the attitude of other Kadro members was similar to Vedat Nedim. Instead of “capitalism”, they - especially Şevket Süreyya - used “autarky”, which meant a self-sufficient economy by Kadro’s definition. However, when leftists such as Şefik Hüsnü and liberal Ağaoğlu blamed Kadro for adopting a fascist ideology by pointing out the association between corporatism, fascism, and autarky, the journal had to abandon this term. In fact, what Kadro was proposing with “autarky” was a nationalist economic program for Turkey, which was already following a solidarist-capitalist route.

---

<sup>193</sup> “Cihan İçinde Türkiye: Bir İcmal”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 6, p. 34-35, June 1932

<sup>194</sup> “Devlet Kapitalizmi” in Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, edited by Murat Belge, volume 2, İletişim Yayınları, 1988, p. 593, 596; “NEP”, Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, volume 3, 1988, p. 694-695

As Boratav points out, etatism is not an independent system on its own but an economic policy within the capitalist system.<sup>195</sup> Accordingly, Parla emphasizes that between the two world wars, almost all of the third way (“*tertium genus*”) projects were in fact either a solidarist-corporatism or fascist-corporatism, despite their claim to be an alternative to both socialism and capitalism. They were, in fact, subgenres of corporatism; therefore they could be placed within a capitalist system.<sup>196</sup>

It seems that Kadro’s etatist interpretations fit Parla’s and Karpat’s descriptions. Besides, the abovementioned discussions reveal Kadro’s dilemma with the nature of their etatism. In spite of their claims of uniqueness, the writers, in fact, were not advocating an alternative system to capitalism. The “third-way solution” of Kadro was still within the limits of a capitalist economy. When Kadro attempted to convince its audience about a planned economy and the state’s dominant role in it, the journal implicitly confessed what it proposed was a method within capitalism.

Being the target of their ex-comrades, as well as liberals such as Celal Bayar, Mahmut Soydan from the İş Bank Group and hardliner RPP politicians such as Recep Peker all at the same time, while trying to be careful not to offend leaders of the regime must have been a difficult position for Kadro members. It seems, due to the delicacy of the circumstances as well as the complexity of their ideology, they sometimes struggled to verify some of their claims, as it seen in the issue about the nature of their etatist plans.

Despite introducing some of leftist concepts to Kemalism, their ideological similarities with other Kemalists as well as with Ziya Gökalp should not be underestimated. Similar to the main figures of the RPP, Kadro members were anti-liberal and anti-socialist in the 1930s. Although the journal was inspired by Marxist ideas to a great degree, it was openly against Marxism. Besides, as Türkeş points out, Kadro rejected corporatism due to its clear association with fascist Italy but by not writing about solidarism, they did not reject it categorically.<sup>197</sup>

The main difference in Kadro’s etatist interpretation was its efforts for attributing anti-imperialist features to the Kemalist-type etatism, in order to connect Turkey to anti-colonial independence movements. The regime was not interested in such objective, in fact, nor as Kadro’s persistent insistence on putting the etatist arrow in the center of the Kemalist ideology. Indeed, by explicitly being against capitalist development, Kadro brought a new interpretation to Kemalism, particularly

---

<sup>195</sup> Türkiye’de Devletçilik, Korkut Boratav, Savaş Yayınları, (second edition) 1974, Ankara, p. 2

<sup>196</sup> Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye’de Korporatizm, Parla, 2009, p. 102-103

<sup>197</sup> Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım, Mustafa Türkeş, p. 104

to Kemalist etatism. In this way, the journal set a different example from the intellectual tradition of CUP and Kemalists cadres.

Here it should not be forgotten that Kadro's etatism was not limited to the field of economy. It had a broader spectrum compared to Mustafa Kemal's interpretations. Kadro wanted to give more space for the state's intervention in economy and even in society. At this point, Kadro seems to be in line with Ismet İnönü and Recep Peker, who also gave a great deal of space to a state organism above everything else. This also becomes evident in similar utterances of Recep Peker and Şevket Süreyya who expressed similar things about state's upper hand over the society.

Peker was against Kadro's attempts to join discussions about Kemalism and the economy, since he thought that this issue should have been handled within the RPP strictly.<sup>198</sup> Still, he shared similar tendencies with Kadro members when it came to strict policies and state's role in economy and society.

As mentioned before, Kadro placed the state above all classes to operate as an unbiased and objective institution in the hands of an intellectual cadre. Ağaoğlu published a book called "Devlet ve Fert" (State and the Individual), which was a collection of his articles in Cumhuriyet newspaper, in order to criticize these issues in detail. In the 1960s, the leftist thinker Hikmet Kıvılcımlı blamed Kadro for misleading young generations by presenting capitalism as if it was a novel and unique model. According to Kıvılcımlı, Kadro's writers created this confusion intentionally to meet their ends. However, the confusion that Kadro caused proved to be a persistent one, since it became a blueprint for many, like Yön, and it turned out to be an obstacle for the people who wanted to achieve something within a socialist context.<sup>199</sup>

Regardless, etatism became the most important Kemalist arrow for the journal, since it was the main reason for Kadro's existence as well as the main culprit for its closing down. By 1932 the tension between Celal Bayar and Ismet İnönü about etatism resulted in favor of Bayar, since Mustafa Kemal appointed Bayar as the minister of economic affairs in İnönü's cabinet.<sup>200</sup> This meant a relative isolation period for İnönü. During this period, Kadro's views maintained criticism

---

<sup>198</sup> 100 Soruda Türkiye'de Devletçilik, Boratav, 1974, p.153; Yıllar Böyle Geçti, Vedat Nedim, 1976, p. 130; Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım, Mustafa Türkeş, p. 91

<sup>199</sup> 27 Mayıs ve Yön Hareketinin Sınıfsal Eleştirisi, Hikmet Kıvılcımlı, Sosyal İnsan Yayınları, İstanbul, 2008, p. 100

<sup>200</sup> Later "in 1937, prime minister Ismet İnönü was replaced by Celal Bayar, a more liberal approach was adopted, but from 1939 onwards the more statist approach of İnönü dominated economic field once more." see: Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 198

from Bayar's side. As it was mentioned before, İnönü also had its share from criticism due to his support for Kadro. These tensions, as well as the slightly changing hand of power over the economy caused Kadro to cease its publication. However, Kadro writers, especially Şevket Süreyya and İsmail Hüsrev, continued to work on etatism, mainly with their contribution to the Five-Year Plans.

### **1.5 Reformism**

Reformist arrow is one of the main tenets of Kemalism and often refers to extensive reform projects that were undertaken by the Kemalists, who claimed to reshape Turkey by replacing traditional mentality and institutions of the Ottoman period with modern ideas and institutions.

As Dumont emphasizes, Kemalists' conception of "inkılap" was not peculiar to the republicans. Tanzimat men, Young Turks and Unionists had pursued the same aim: to change the society by scientific means and to apply methods that had proved quite effective in the West. In this sense, reformism already started by Ottoman sultans and the process accelerated after the Young Turk Revolution. As a result, Mustafa Kemal's "inkılap" was an extension of a reformist movement whose first manifestations had appeared almost in the beginning of the nineteenth century.<sup>201</sup>

As Zürcher mentions, the correct interpretation of the term "inkılâpçılık" has been a matter of debate in Turkey for a long time. What Mustafa Kemal and his followers meant when they used this term was "reformism", rather than revolution. Although the French Revolution was an inspiring event for Kemalists as it was for the Young Turks, they were not revolutionists. They carefully avoided using the term "ihtilâl" (revolution), when they mentioned the changes they made in Turkey.<sup>202</sup> In 1935, Kemalists changed the term from "reformism" (inkılâpçılık) to "revolutionism" (devrimcilik), but they still meant reformism with this term. In general, what Kemalists meant with "inkılap" or "devrim" was series of reforms which aimed at transformation of society by radical measures.

Similar to the regime's rhetoric, Kadro made it clear what it had proposed with the reformist arrow was not revolution but reformism too. Nevertheless, Kadro's interpretation of reform seemed more dynamic than Mustafa Kemal as well as some of the hardliners of RPP such as Recep Peker's views.

---

<sup>201</sup> "Origins of Kemalist Ideology", Dumont, 1984, p. 35

<sup>202</sup> "Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought", Zürcher, 2005, p. 21

Kadro's descriptions of events about War of Independence carried implications that the writers interpreted it as revolution of Turkish nation. However, the writers were quite careful about terminology they used, since their usage of certain terms and concepts, such as "ihtilâl", could easily be perceived as trace of communism in their ideology. Consequently, they preferred the words "reform", "transformation", and "change" in their descriptions.

Here it should be noted that, Şevket Süreyya's book, "İnkılap ve Kadro", which was published just before the Kadro journal, was used as a referral point by the Kadro writers regarding their interpretation about reformist arrow. For example Burhan Asaf mentioned "İnkılap ve Kadro" in one of his articles and suggested this book to his readers who wanted to understand Kadro's interpretations of reformism in general.<sup>203</sup>

Parallel to official history, Kadro also referred to the transition from Ottoman Empire to Turkish Republic as a fundamental change, and stressed the uniqueness of the "Turkish reformation". Indeed, it stressed the foundation of the republic was a ground-breaking incident and it was peculiar to Turkey. It severed the century's old ties to its Ottoman past.<sup>204</sup>

As known, Kemalist ideology pictured Mustafa Kemal and his followers as the sole legitimate power to bring reforms to the country. Kemalist discourse often ignored the contributions of reformism projects during the late Ottoman period, prior to the Kemalist rule.<sup>205</sup> In accordance with that, Kadro's writers also preferred to ignore contributions of former rulers of Turkey to the reforms. The foundation of the republic was described as a drastic break from the Ottoman past which changed everything by introducing totally new and modern concepts.<sup>206</sup> Kadro often compared the Kemalist Republic and Ottoman Empire (including CUP period) and emphasized the superiority of Kemalist rule.<sup>207</sup> Almost thirty years later than Kadro, Şevket Süreyya did similar comparisons in his articles he wrote for the Yön journal.<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>203</sup> "Milli Kurtuluş İnkılabının Cihanşümül Ehemmiyetini Anlıyan Anlıyana", Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 18, p. 38, June 1933

<sup>204</sup> "Kadro", Kadro, issue 35-36, December 1934, p. 7; "İnkılabımız ve Hilafet", Burhan Asaf, p. 39-41, January 1932; İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 3-4, 45

<sup>205</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 98-99

<sup>206</sup> "Fikirde İstiklal", Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 22, p. 30-32, October 1933

<sup>207</sup> "Türk İnkılabı Kürsüleşiyor", Tahir Hayrettin, Kadro, issue 19, p. 39, July 1933

<sup>208</sup> "Fikir Atatürkçülüğü ve Kelime Atatürkçülüğü", Şevket Süreyya, Yön, issue 6, p. 9, 24 January 1962



Nevertheless, as mentioned by Zürcher, Kemalists had quite common points with late Ottoman reformers. For example, the Young Turk generation was influenced by positivism via Gustave LeBon's ideas on the psychology of the masses. As a result, the possibility of upheavals by the people who were not led by intellectual elites was a deep-rooted fear among them. Kemalists carried the same features and always preferred an orderly transformation from above, and strictly suppressed upheavals from below. Kemalists never questioned the rights of the ruling elite to govern or landowners to own the land.<sup>209</sup>

Accordingly, Kadro's writers favored reformism to be realized under the strict control of the state and to be shaped by a group of ruling elite as well. In other words, Kadro preferred a reform process in order. The journal expressed its dislike towards spontaneous movements from below, especially about Kurdish upheavals. This can be taken as a strong indication of Kadro members' distance towards revolutionary ideas, at least in the 1930s. According to Şevket Süreyya, enthusiasm for reformism should have been subjected to conscious decisions, not to anarchism or alleged revolutionary upheavals which doomed to fail. A "real" reformation would never have occurred in the streets spontaneously. The best thing to do was to create it "in order" with the help of intellectuals and the discipline of their collective spirit.<sup>210</sup> Thus, it can be said that although they favored extensive reform projects, Kadro still preferred to preserve the existing order, rather than changing it fundamentally.

It seems, except for economic issues, Kadro writers were not in irreconcilable conflict with other Kemalists about the reform projects that were undertaken until 1930s. The writers often praised the success of reform projects and Kemalist attempts to change the society and customs via state, schools and several other establishments.<sup>211</sup> Kadro perceived Kemalist reforms as an outcome of the modernizing power of Kemalist ideology. In this sense, Kadro seems to apply rules of historical determinism to their interpretation of reformism, since according to Şevket Süreyya, transformation was a necessary step in the nature of development.<sup>212</sup>

Apparently, Kadro's writers were sincerely convinced about the necessity of Kemalist reforms and the way these reforms were implemented.<sup>213</sup> They took their conviction so seriously that sometimes they criticized the people who failed to come into terms with the reforms and even accused them

---

<sup>209</sup> "Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought", Zürcher, 2005, p. 21

<sup>210</sup> "İnkılâp Bitti mi (İnkılabın İdeolojisi)", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 3, p. 6-7, March 1932

<sup>211</sup> "Umumilikle Mücadele İçin Köy Kampları: Harf İnkılâbı", Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 1, p. 43-44, January 1932

<sup>212</sup> "Bergson Bahsi ve Hürriyet Telakkimiz", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 13, p. 43, January 1933

<sup>213</sup> "Kronik: İçtimai Zihniyet", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 31, p. 42, July 1934

with treachery. According to the very first article of Kadro, it was the right and duty of the republic to rule over the will of people who did not support the reform projects. Those who did not appreciate new reforms had to comply with the whole body of the nation who acknowledged and supported these reforms.<sup>214</sup> Şevket Süreyya claimed that those who did not understand the reforms should not have had the luxury of staying behind. They had to be forced to understand them.<sup>215</sup> As stated by Burhan Asaf, according to Turkish reformism, until the independence and freedom of the whole nation were secured in every possible way, what mattered most for the citizens was their “duty”, not their “rights”.<sup>216</sup>

In alignment with rest of the Kemalists, Kadro employed a discourse which praised religious-like devotion towards the six arrows of RPP and created an image as if those principles were part of a holy truth.<sup>217</sup> According to Şevket Süreyya, enthusiasm for reformism should have been turned into a religious-like devotion.<sup>218</sup>

Kadro’s writers aimed to bring new ideas and projects to awaken the dynamic spirit during the War of Independence. Kadro’s attempt to bring dynamism to reformism was connected to their interpretation of economy. According to Kadro, reform projects often lacked insight in economy,<sup>219</sup> therefore putting all the other reforms at risk. Turkey’s knowledge in economy was always rooted in liberal channels of Europe. If Turkey would have kept its relation with liberal economy close, Turkish nation was going to continue to be slave of liberalism.<sup>220</sup> Only way to create a free country was making new reforms in economy. Therefore, in order to believe in Turkish *inkılap*, one had to believe in the constructive power of the state in the area of the economy first.<sup>221</sup>

As seen here, Kadro saw etatism as the main part of the reform projects and gave a leading role above everything else.

---

<sup>214</sup> “Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 1, p. 3, January 1932

<sup>215</sup> *Inkılâp ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi*, Şevket Süreyya, 1932, p. 7

<sup>216</sup> “Hürriyet Mefhumi Etrafında”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 21, p. 29, September 1933

<sup>217</sup> “Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 21, p. 3-4, September 1933

<sup>218</sup> “İnkılap Heyecanı: Antuziazm”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 2, p. 8, February 1932

<sup>219</sup> “Ankara, Moskova, Roma VII”, Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 13, p. 30, January 1933; Atatürk’le Uç Ay, Ahmet Hamdi Başar, İstanbul, 1945, p.161 as cited in 100 Soruda Türkiye’de Devletçilik, Boratav, 1974, p. 140

<sup>220</sup> “Niçin ve Nasıl Sanayileşmemiz Lazım”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 6, p. 13-14, June 1932

<sup>221</sup> “Devletin Yapıcılık ve İdarecilik Faaliyetlerine İnanmak Gerekir”, Vedat Nedim, p. 15, March 1933

Still, Kadro's strong emphasis on the economy was not the only issue that Kadro caused disagreements. The journal caused debates within Kemalist ideology by advocating a different approach regarding "direction" and "continuity" of reforms as well.

Kemalist reformism was inspired by European-based ideologies. Kemalist discourse usually emphasized breaking off with Ottoman mentality and reaching European norms for modernity and progress. Contrary to this view, Kadro claimed that Europe had nothing to offer Turkey anymore, especially after the Great Depression. In fact Mustafa Kemal and many other Kemalists were also aware of this fact, but unlike them, the Kadro group carried strong anti-Western sentiments. Burhan Asaf wrote that "modern European culture" was not the outcome of European countries solely, because this culture was built on at the expense of exploitation, stolen labor and richness of underdeveloped countries.<sup>222</sup> According to Şevket Süreyya, the fate of Europe and Western culture was not going to determine the fate of the world anymore.<sup>223</sup> Yakup Kadri drew attention to the declining power of European culture and warned intellectuals in Turkey to change their route before it was too late.<sup>224</sup> According to Hakkı Mahir, Turkey should have stayed away from the establishments and norms that faltered the West. Turkey should have avoided copying Europe for its modernity and development.<sup>225</sup>

Here it should be noted that, although Kadro declared that the journal was against Western norms as well as Western-oriented economic models, Kadro's opposition towards the West seems to focus on economy, rather than Western culture. This also explains Kadro's devotion to Kemalism without any crucial problems, although the Kemalist model was heavily inspired by Western culture.

In parallel to their anti-Western sentiments, Kadro members categorized socialism and Marxism as European originated ideologies and rejected them along with capitalism and liberalism. Kadro's analyses were often quite systematic. Vedat Nedim's description of the "West" explicitly included Soviet Union, since it was a follower of socialist ideology that based on European-rooted Marxism. According to him, Turkey should not follow examples of Soviet Union or any European country; because Turkey's conditions were not suitable for formation of a bourgeoisie state or a proletarian dictatorship. Capitalism, fascism, socialism all belonged to Europe, which enslaved the other half of the world in one way or another. The emancipation of humankind might have only occurred

---

<sup>222</sup> "Makina Medeniyeti", Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 7, p. 29, July 1932

<sup>223</sup> "İnkılâp Bitti mi (İnkılabın İdeolojisi)", Şevket Süreyya, p. 7, March 1932

<sup>224</sup> "Eskiler Almayalım", Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 4, p. 44, April 1932

<sup>225</sup> "Avrupa Bize İdeal mi, Örnek Olabilir mi?" Hakkı Mahir, Kadro, issue 18, p. 61, June 1933

through the national liberation wars of the exploited countries. Thus, Turkey only should have lent technologies from Europe and its ideas should have stayed native.<sup>226</sup> Although it was not an easy task, Turkey should have created its own ideology which should have originated from Anatolia.<sup>227</sup>

As seen, some of the arguments of Kadro resembled Ziya Gökalp's ideas, regarding the journal's desire for Turkey taking Europe's technique solely while forming a native ideology. Here, it should be noted that Ziya Gökalp's ideas about this matter might have been influenced by Marxist critiques of liberalism, which influenced the anti-liberal discourse of corporatist-solidarist ideas of Europe. Gökalp might have adopted them via solidarism, which borrowed some of its anti-liberal rhetoric from Marxism. At this point, both Kadro and Gökalp might have built their ideas on similar anti-liberal arguments of Marxism.

Kadro writers were usually quite implicit in their criticisms towards the regime. Still, questioning Europe as a role model can be taken as a strong criticism towards leading Kemalists, who were inspired by European models. At this point, Kadro's writers must have taken advantage of the relatively anti-liberal climate of the world to express their ideas. Although they were part of the single-party regime and they were providing ideological support to justify its existence at many levels, compared to many of the Kemalists and to intellectuals of the 1930s in Turkey, Kadro writers had original ideas. They were capable enough to articulate influential ideas about development and reformation, alternative to European-oriented views. The difference between Kadro writers and more traditional elites of their time was probably Kadro members' education and broader horizon due to variety of their inspirational sources in Arabic, French, Russian, German, and English. This must have helped them to follow events from original sources and to be quick to respond to new developments. Besides, they had variety of connections, a ceaseless enthusiasm and ability to think systematically and comprehensively due to their extensive knowledge.

In addition to sources and objectives of the reforms, continuity of the reform projects was another important disagreement point for Kadro with some Kemalists including Mustafa Kemal himself, as well as deputies Recep Peker or Necip Ali. This was such an important matter for Kadro that the journal's first sentence was "*There has been a reform project in Turkey and this has not ended yet.*"<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>226</sup> "Devletin Yapıcılık ve Idarecilik Faaliyetlerine Inanmak Gerekir", Vedat Nedim, p. 13-15, March 1933

<sup>227</sup> "Kadro" (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 15, p. 4, March 1933

<sup>228</sup> "Kadro" (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 1, p. 3, January 1932; "Buhranlar ve İnkılaplar Telakkisi", Hakkı Mahir, Kadro, issue 21, p. 47-50, September 1933

Along with other Kadro members, Şevket Süreyya always referred to the Turkish revolution as a continuous process. According to him, Turkish *inkılap* was just a beginning rather than an end.<sup>229</sup> He saw it as the beginning of a new era, in which national struggle of the underdeveloped world was going to take the stage. Since this new kind of revolution was spreading throughout the world, Turkey must have been in touch with liberation struggle of underdeveloped countries. In this sense, revolution was definitely not ended in Turkey.<sup>230</sup> Countless articles were devoted to this subject, especially in the early issues. Kadro did not forget to use Mustafa Kemal's own words, "*Our revolution continues*", to make him remember this fact.

Contrary to what Kadro believed, Mustafa Kemal, along with main figures of the RPP, was reluctant for continuous and extensive reform projects in the way Kadro envisioned. For the Kemalist regime, the Turkish revolution succeeded from its war of national liberation by achieving nation-state status. There was no urgent need for solidarity with the liberation movements of other underdeveloped countries who engaged in similar activities. The Kemalist regime's choice was for the West, rather than the East. Besides, the regime was careful about not being seen as irredentist or expansionist.<sup>231</sup> However, Kadro interpreted this as a weariness of the regime and founding cadres. According to Şevket Süreyya, what the Turkish revolution needed was enthusiasm and dynamism; pessimism was unforgivable.<sup>232</sup> The weariness about change was an indication of national psychosis that should have been immediately cured.<sup>233</sup>

As seen, Kadro was devoted to Kemalist reformism and reflected as modernist but at the same time it held conservative features. However, the link between reformism and etatism was emphasized by Kadro group much stronger than the Mustafa Kemal did. However, especially by insisting to engage Turkey with the countries that were fighting for their freedom, Kadro brought a new anti-imperialist interpretation to Kemalist reformism.

Kadro's ideas about transformation and reform show Kadro's eagerness to complete Kemalist ideology. In this sense, the journal was similar to *Yön* journal of the 1960s, which also wished to redefine and complete the Kemalist ideology, but in a different context. Kadro's writers were well aware of ambiguities and contradictions of Kemalism as well as lack of structure in Kemalist

---

<sup>229</sup> "İnkılap Heyecanı: Antuziazm", Şevket Süreyya, p. 8, February 1932

<sup>230</sup> "İnkılâp Bitti mi (İnkılabın İdeolojisi)", Şevket Süreyya, p. 6, March 1932

<sup>231</sup> İnkılap Dersleri, Peker, 1936, p. 116-117

<sup>232</sup> "Pesimist (İnkılabın Psikolojisi)", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 1, p. 6, January 1932

<sup>233</sup> "İnkılap Heyecanı: Antuziazm", Şevket Süreyya, p. 8, February 1932

ideology. According to them, revolutions could not exist without an ideology; therefore, formation of a concrete ideology was crucially important.<sup>234</sup> In this sense, Kadro created a new current within Kemalist ideology, which was heavily inspired by European sources. Kadro's anti-Western sentiments, anti-imperialism and its insistence on continuity of reform projects helped next generations who wanted to connect Kemalism with their leftist inspirations, due to Kadro's contributions in the early 1930s. At this point, it can be said that Kadro members constituted a new group of intellectuals who thought differently than tradition of CUP as well as founding cadres of Kemalists regarding their ideas about Europe.

## 1.6 Laicism

Laicist arrow is one of the six arrows of the Kemalist ideology, and along with nationalism it became one of the most distinctive features to describe Kemalist ideology.

Due to their Westernized education in Ottoman military schools, Mustafa Kemal and his followers were mainly affected by positivism. They favored Westernization of Turkey and carried out a series of radical laicist reforms. In this manner, Kemalist laicism claimed to represent a break from a religious-oriented Ottoman mentality and an adoption of modern methods under the guidance of positive science. As Zürcher mentions, scientism and biological materialism, as well as social Darwinism, were characteristic of Kemalist ideology even more than they had been of that Unionists.<sup>235</sup> As a result, laicism was seen as a guarantor of transformation to a modern society.

However laicism efforts did not begin with the republic as Kemalists often claimed. As Zürcher points out, secularizing trends had been present in the Ottoman Empire for at least a century. The Tanzimat period and Hamidian era already witnessed transformation of administrative and educational institutions. The Young Turk reforms, particularly the ones in 1916-1917, excluded Şeyhülislam from the cabinet, although it represented the highest religious authority in the empire.<sup>236</sup> After the republic, laicism became one of the main tenets of the Kemalist ideology. In this sense, Kemalist laicism reforms can be seen as acceleration and radicalization of a preexisting process.<sup>237</sup>

---

<sup>234</sup> "Kadro" (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 1, p. 3, January 1932

<sup>235</sup> "From Empire to Republic - Problems of Transition, Continuity and Change", Erik-Jan Zürcher *in* Turkey in the Twentieth Century (La Turquie au vingtième siècle), ed. by Erik-Jan Zürcher, Vol. 3, Berlin : Schwarz, 2008. p. 29

<sup>236</sup> "Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought", Zürcher, 2005, p. 15

<sup>237</sup> "Origins of Kemalist Ideology", Dumont, 1984, p. 38

After the War of Independence, Muslim nationalism from the years of 1912–1922 was abandoned and Kemalists based the new republic on the idea of a “Turkish” nation.<sup>238</sup> In accordance with the needs of the new republic, Kemalists spent a great deal of effort at nation-building and they tried to replace the concept of Ottoman religious community of “*ümme*t” with “Turkish nation”. In this way, they also tried to replace role of Islam with nationalism and Turkish identity.

Kadro writers supported the main goals and principles of Kemalists laicism. Since the main issue about laicism (such as abolition of the caliphate and dervish orders, and laicization of education) was already handled by the regime in the 1920s, laicism was not an area of immediate importance for them. The journal’s primary issue was etatism. Due to this fact, discussions about laicism often appeared only in connection with the Kurdish upheavals of early the 1930s in Eastern provinces in the journal. In those articles, the writers usually tried to link laicism to etatist and reformist arrows.

Kemalist rhetoric about laicism continued in Kadro articles. According to Yakup Kadri, laicism was not present in the minds of any other Turkish-Ottoman politician until it was expressed by Mustafa Kemal. Like the sultanate, the caliphate was considered to be an exploiter-institution that worked in collaboration with imperialists by Kadro. Yakup Kadri claimed that a sheikh with a green flag, a revolutionist with a red flag or a liberal with a white banner were equally dangerous for the republic.

Burhan Asaf emphasized importance of being a nation. According to him, being “*ümme*t” meant being open to economic and political exploitations. Thanks to the abolition of the caliphate, religious authorities lost their power in Turkey. This brought an end to exploitation. Besides, as part of a modern nation, Muslims of Turkey did not need religious authorities.<sup>239</sup>

As seen, Burhan Asaf’s articulations based on Kemalist laicism which was rooted in positivism and did not tolerate any authority or power centre other than political authority. Mustafa Kemal already eliminated religious establishments at early stages of the power struggle;<sup>240</sup> since he expected progress to be realized in constant pace and under strict control of the political authority.

---

<sup>238</sup> “Ottoman Legacy of the Turkish Republic”, Zürcher, 2007, p. 108

<sup>239</sup> “İnkılabımız ve Hilafet”, Burhan Asaf, p. 39-40, January 1932

<sup>240</sup> Türkiye’de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP’nin Altı Oku, Parla, 1992, p. 288

Kadro writers were always open about their materialistic world-view and showed distance to metaphysical beliefs. As a result, progress was expected to be realized in the light of science.

Regarding the effects of positivism, Kadro writers' early education, which was not very different than Kemalist generation, can be held responsible for these views. Other than that, they may have been affected by positivism via left-oriented ideas such as Leninism. In any way, effects of positivism were present in Kadro's ideology and affected their interpretation of laicism.

Kadro's writers perceived laicism as a necessary element for progress, development and a basis for a modern nation-state. They emphasized the importance of leaving religious conservatism behind. According to them, *Turkish reformism* was part of materialist modern world; therefore it was situated opposite to mysticism of religion. According to Şevket Süreyya, Turkish reformism was there to give hope to people in the face of a dark mysticism of old times in which people were lost in desperation and false hopes.<sup>241</sup> He often discredited religion by connecting it to underdevelopment and labeled it as an out-dated order. He made comparisons between dynamism of modernity and passiveness of religion. In this manner, Şevket Süreyya also justified political authority of the Kemalist regime by presenting it as the sole representative authority for the nation, since the Kemalists could interpret the modern world in the light of science. *Ulama* or any other religious authorities would not have been qualified for such an engagement with their out-dated world-view.

As Parla states, the Kemalist regime did not entirely separate religious institutions and practices from the state. The regime preferred to maintain control over Islam through the office of Directorate of Religious Affairs. Kemalists removed religion in certain spheres of governance but they did not fully separate religious institutions and personnel from the state.<sup>242</sup> After all, Kemalists were not atheists, and their laicism was not thoroughly anti-religious. They had no argument with religion as an individual or social norm. Thus, it is better to describe their politics as laicist, rather secular, since the latter is commonly understood as non-religious or even anti-religious in its Anglophone meaning.<sup>243</sup>

In this context, Kadro can be taken as laicist rather than secular as well. The writers were explicit about negative sides of Islam, although they did not oppose it thoroughly. They objected religion's

---

<sup>241</sup> "Kadro" (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue, 13, p. 3, January 1933

<sup>242</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 104

<sup>243</sup> Ibid., p. 107-108



position in many areas and sometimes mentioned it negatively but they did not call for more secular regulations either.

Still, it is possible to encounter Kadro articles which attempted to question religion's role even in the individual sphere. For example, Şevket Süreyya claimed that individuals should not have been able to escape scope of society by turning into mysticism or religion by dreaming about an ideal life after death. Retiring from this world for sake of other world would have resulted in vain. Those ideas should have been replaced by realistic ideas about actual world and the individuals who seclude themselves should have been returned to the society by the authorities.<sup>244</sup> Şevket Süreyya's ideas were clear examples of Kadro's ideology which declared that the journal was against any form of individualism, since individualism was perceived as part of liberal-capitalist thought by Kadro.<sup>245</sup> This is also result of Kadro's tolerance for strict order of the state which went beyond limits of economy and spread into other areas in society.

As mentioned before, the society envisioned by Kadro was in parallel with the common Kemalist solidarist world-view: a society free of class struggles and in a top-down reform programs under control of the state. Under these circumstances Kadro was reluctant to give a broad autonomous space for individualism, even it was for people's faith on religion. As seen, Kadro writers often expected from individuals to devote all of their energies to the republic and for the good of the whole society. Doing the opposite was perceived as either egoism or opposition towards the regime. The strict single-party regime must have made it easier for Kadro to express their ideas on these issues.

As Parla states, in Mustafa Kemal's view, the laicization process also had the purpose of rescuing and purifying Islam,<sup>246</sup> because only then Islam could be in accordance with modernism and progress. As Zürcher mentions, Mustafa Kemal's speeches had an anticlerical rhetoric and they were often included warnings about the danger caused by reactionaries, who would use religion for political ends. "İrtica", religious reaction, a term which was used by Young Turks in April 1909, was referred quite often in his speeches. Mustafa Kemal's arguments about "pure" Islam as a rational and a progressive idea owed a lot to Young Turk predecessors of the Kemalists such as Ahmet Rıza and Abdullah Cevdet.<sup>247</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> "Kadro" (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 13, p. 3, January 1933

<sup>245</sup> "İnkılap Heyecanı: Antuziazm", Şevket Süreyya, p. 6-7, February 1932

<sup>246</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Parla & Davison, 2004, p.108

<sup>247</sup> "Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought", Zürcher, 2005, p. 15-16

Although Kadro was not interested in rescuing Islam, the writers mentioned the possibility of a *real Islam* or *pure Islam*, when they wrote about how people were exploited through their religious beliefs. According to Şevket Süreyya, the reality of Kurdish religious sanctuaries was a deep obscurity which had nothing to do with Islam. Without the religious authority of sheiks, feudality would have been defenseless. In order to eliminate the power of big land owners over the people, authority of religious centers should have been targeted in Eastern provinces.<sup>248</sup> At this point, Ismail Hüsrev called the position of religious leaders of the Eastern provinces as *spiritual feudalism*. He tried to prove that all of the religious orders and tekkes were reactionary centers and they were part of an out-dated economic-social system, rather than being spiritual centers as part of tradition and religion.<sup>249</sup> Although many of those centers were eliminated by the government righteously, the power of Kurdish feudalism was quite resilient.<sup>250</sup> As seen in the arguments, Kurdishness was usually linked to Islam and an economically and ideologically backward system.

Apparently, Kadro added a distinctive economic dimension to the subject and contributed to creation of a link between underdeveloped economies and corrupted forms of Islam. In this way, discussions about laicism and religion were brought up within the context of economy and the statist arrow. The writers assumed that economic development was the key to solve problems about religion gradually, since most of the problems about this issue related to economic backwardness of the East. Once economic development of Turkey improved, the authority of sheiks and big landowners was going to be diminished in the Eastern regions.

According to Parla, for Kemalists, guarding laicism was equal to guarding the Kemalist republic. Those who contested laicist institutions were considered not simply anti-Kemalist, but also anti-republican and anti-nationalist. Kemalists became adept at blurring these distinctions to their advantage.<sup>251</sup> As devoted Kemalists, Kadro writers had a similar tendency. According to Şevket Süreyya, in the places where Kurdish feudalism was still strong, tekkes and religious sheiks aimed at not only at the destruction of the pure form of Islam, but also the destruction of the Turkish population, Turkish language and free thought.<sup>252</sup>

---

<sup>248</sup> “Dersim ve Derebeyi”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 43, June 1932

<sup>249</sup> “Türkiye’de Derebeylik Rejimi I”, Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 7, p. 20-21, July 1932

<sup>250</sup> “Türkiye’de Derebeylik Rejimi II”, Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 8, p. 30, August 1932

<sup>251</sup> Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order, Parla & Davison, 2004, p. 115

<sup>252</sup> “Dersim ve Derebeyi”, Şevket Süreyya, p. 43, June 1932

Kadro's anti-laicist, anti-nationalist and anti-republican implications about heavily Kurdish populated regions might have helped the regime to justify the heavy measures taken in those regions. With the help of this rhetoric, Kurdish upheavals with implicit national sensitivities easily degraded into reactionary movements against the regime. Thus, in accordance with the official Kemalist discourse, Kadro classified those upheavals as a form of treason. In this way, Kadro not only approved policies on the Eastern provinces but also provided necessary ideological discourse for the regime, by equating Kurdish upheavals with reactionism and feudalism. This discourse turned out to be a persistent one, since reductionism about Kurds by equating Kurdishness with feudalism and backwardness continued in the following years, especially within Kemalist groups which combine nationalism and left oriented ideas.

Kadro's materialistic world view and its distance to Islam are also clear in journal's discourse about "struggle of exploited and exploiter countries". Although most of the underdeveloped countries which were engaged in anti-imperialist movements were Muslim countries, Kadro's emphasis on Islam was relatively weak, and often negative. The journal always focused on anti-imperialism and often avoided mentioning the possible role of Islam in this issue. Besides, although the writers focused on anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist utterances of Mustafa Kemal during the War of Independence, they ignored Mustafa Kemal's Muslim-nationalist discourse and his efforts to use Islam's unifying power in the same period.

Some of the studies drew attention to similarities between Kadro and Sultan Galiyev's ideas.<sup>253</sup> Apparently, Kadro's cynicism and criticisms towards Islam and idea of religion in general indicates the most significant difference between intellectuals of Kadro and Sultan Galiyev, since Kadro's ideology never intended to give Islam any crucial role. Kadro clearly mentioned that their members were against any kind of mysticism.<sup>254</sup>

In short, Kadro's writers supported Kemalist laicist policies in order to form a "nation" to take the place of Ottoman "ümmet". Kadro's laicism was in connection with the modern image of the republic, along with nationalist and reformist arrows. Kadro emphasized the insertion of economic dimensions to interpretation of the laicist arrow. In this way, Kadro provided Kemalist ideology with a powerful rhetoric to deal with Kurdish upheavals in Eastern provinces by categorizing them as reactionary movements and as enemies of the regime. In this sense, guarding laicism became

---

<sup>253</sup> See: Türk Siyasal Yaşamında Kadro Hareketi, Yanardağ, 2008

<sup>254</sup> "Bir Ruh Fantazisi Yahut Yerli Peygamber", Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 1, p. 37-38, January 1932

equal to guarding the republic and those who contested laicism were considered not only anti-laicist but also as anti-nationalist and anti-republican by all the Kemalists.

## 2 MARKOPAŞA

Markopaşa was first published on the 25th November 1946 as a political satire journal. The group consisted of the writers Sabahattin Ali (editorial writer), Aziz Nesin (writer), Rıfat Ilgaz (writer), Mustafa Mim Uykusuz (caricaturist) and Haluk Yetiş (administration).

Sabahattin Ali (1907-1948) was already a famous novelist by 1946. He was put on trial several times due to his leftist world-view. In 1932, he was imprisoned for one year and in 1944 he was targeted by the ultra-nationalists and he was accused of being a communist.<sup>255</sup> Aziz Nesin (1915-1995) was an ambitious young journalist at the beginning of the 1940s. He was writing for the famous “Tan” (Dawn) newspaper, which was published by the prominent socialist journalists Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel who worked with many of the important radical leftists of the 1930s and 1940s. “Tan” was a center of opposition to the single-party regime of the RPP; thus it became the primary target of the attacks to leftist movement. On the 1st December 1945, Tan and several left-leaning newspapers, such as “Yeni Dünya” of Sabahattin Ali, were attacked by agitated ultra-nationalist youth.<sup>256</sup>

After Tan was destroyed, most of the leftist writers and journalists were out of the job. In those days Aziz Nesin and Rıfat Ilgaz, who had also been imprisoned because of his book “Sınıf” (The Class) and had recently been released, had relations with the TSP (Turkish Socialist Party) for a short period.<sup>257</sup> When they decided to publish a journal, workers from TSP collected money for them.<sup>258</sup>

Markopaşa was the first political satire journal which openly criticized the government.<sup>259</sup> It quickly drew attention with its satiric style and harsh criticisms of the RPP. While the first issue sold just 6000 copies, the journal reached up to 70.000 by its 6<sup>th</sup> issue. The circulation of the most popular daily newspapers was around 20.000 at the time.<sup>260</sup> Markopaşa gained a lot of attention and sympathy of the people, who were fed up with the single-party regime. Just after the first issue, the journal became center of a major debate within the parliament. It was accused of “being rooted in

---

<sup>255</sup> Sabahattin Ali Dosyası, Kemal Sülker, Ant Yayınları, İstanbul, 1968, p. 18-24

<sup>256</sup> Türkiye'de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938 – 1945), Cemil Koçak, Yurt Yayınevi, Ankara, 1986, p. 60

<sup>257</sup> Marko Paşa Gerçeği, Mehmet Saydur, Çınar Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001, p. 9; Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi, Cantek, 2001, p. 23

<sup>258</sup> Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi, Cantek, 2001, p. 37

<sup>259</sup> In fact, there were two other political satire magazines, Kalem and Cem, from 1910s but they were not as efficient as Markopaşa.

<sup>260</sup> Markopaşa Gerçeği, Saydur, 2001, p. 19

the outside world, or: having foreign roots”, which implied a link to communism and to the Soviet Union.<sup>261</sup>

Although Markopaşa’s articles bear no signature, it is known that most of the leading political articles were written by Sabahattin Ali and satirical pieces full of humour by Aziz Nesin and Rifat Ilgaz. Mim Uykusuz contributed to the journal with caricatures and visual materials.<sup>262</sup> The articles were often about the misdeeds of the government, lives of ordinary people and the working classes, the dangers of a liberal economy and foreign capital.

Markopaşa was banned due to an article written by Aziz Nesin in its 4<sup>th</sup> issue.<sup>263</sup> Although the accusations about the article were not proven in court, Sabahattin Ali was found guilty of defaming deputy Cemil Sait Barlas and imprisoned for three months.<sup>264</sup> Markopaşa was repeatedly banned and had to change its name several times such as “Malum Paşa”, “Merhum Paşa”, “Ali Baba”, “Yedi Sekiz Paşa”, “Bizim Paşa” and “Medet”. When one of the writers was sent to jail, the others continued to write. Although printing offices refused to print the journal because of fear of the government or because of their difference in opinion, Markopaşa members always found a way to publish, nonetheless.

Finally in 1948, when the imprisonments and continuous pressure by the government and right-wing media became unbearable, Sabahattin Ali decided to stop publishing. He attempted to escape from Turkey but he was murdered in April 1948 on the Bulgarian border. His case became one of the notorious cases of the republican history. Other writers continued to publish similar journals, such as Hür Markopaşa, Nuhun Gemisi, and Başdan, but these publications never became as popular as Markopaşa.

---

<sup>261</sup> Negative claims of Cemal Barlas, Fuat Köprülü, and Fahri Ecevit about Markopaşa can be found in Tutanak Dergisi, Cilt 3, Dönem VIII, p. 17-18 as cited in “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Gülmeceye Baskı: Markopaşa Orneği”, Aziz Nesin in Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1984, p. 1435-1436

<sup>262</sup> Markopaşa Gerçeği, Saydur, 2001, p 22-23

<sup>263</sup> The article was “Hepinizin Köküne Kibrit Suyu” by Aziz Nesin and it was a harsh criticism against RPP deputy Cemil Sait Barlas. Since Sabahattin Ali was the editor-in-chief, he was arrested in 16<sup>th</sup> of December 1946. This followed by a prosecution wave towards the leftists and almost fifty high profile activists were arrested including Aziz Nesin, Şefik Hüsnü Değmer, and Esat Adil Müstecaplıoğlu. Two socialist parties, several journals and newspapers were banned by the government. For more information: Markopaşa Gerçeği, Saydur, 2001, p. 37-38

<sup>264</sup> Markopaşa Gerçeği, Saydur, 2001, p. 38

## 2.1 Nationalism

As Zürcher states, although a close relationship with the Soviet Union was a cornerstone of Turkish foreign policy throughout the 1920s and 1930s, it eventually soured due to Turkey's neutral stance during World War II. After the war, the United States emerged from the war as a powerful country as well as a symbol for democratic values. Turkey's political system, economic policies, and foreign relationships underwent a fundamental change within a few years after the end of World War II and Turkish governments gradually moved closer to the West, especially to the United States.<sup>265</sup>

The transition to a multi-party period for democratization was the main debate in this time. An opposition party, the Democrat Party, which mostly consisted of landowners and traders, was formed in 1946. The RPP government had to adopt a more liberal program and give more space to foreign capital in the country, especially between 1947-1953 period.<sup>266</sup> In the post-war era, the press used the relatively tolerant atmosphere that was brought about by the waves of democracy. The Markopaşa journal was the outcome of this transition period when its publication started at the end of 1946.

In 1946, not only DP but also leftist parties such as the Turkish Socialist Party (TSP) by Esat Adil Müstecablıoğlu and the Turkish Socialist Workers' and Peasants' Party (TSWPP) by Şefik Hüsnü Değmer were founded as well. However, martial law regulations were used and these parties were closed down only in December 1946. Following this, the years 1948 and 1949 saw a witch-hunt against the left.<sup>267</sup>

The Markopaşa's interpretations of Kemalist nationalism usually connected to pride of its writers over the success of the War of Independence and the writers' anti-imperialist attributions about it. Parallel to this idea and due to the political climate of the late 1940s, the journal's arguments usually focused on anti-imperialism and Turkey's relationship with the United States. Similar to other leftist publications, such as "Hür" and "Zincirli Hürriyet", which were published by Mehmet Ali Aybar, Markopaşa was very negative about the developing relationship between the United States and Turkey. As a result, a strong anti-Americanism rhetoric was quite apparent in the anti-imperialist discourse of the journal. Since the writers considered themselves as proud members of a nation

---

<sup>265</sup> Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 208-209

<sup>266</sup> As seen, liberal policies already started in RPP period and continued under the DP rule. see: Türkiye İktisat Tarihi: 1908-2002, Korkut Boratav, Imge Kitabevi, Ankara, 2003, p. 98; Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 224-225

<sup>267</sup> Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 213

whose independence was won through a national war against the imperialists, Markopaşa writers thought that Turkey's closeness to the US was a betrayal of the anti-imperialist principles of Kemalism. According to them, the nation was at risk of losing economic and even political independence.<sup>268</sup> In this light, Markopaşa writers attributed anti-imperialist features to Kemalism with the relative ease that Kadro members had in the 1930s.

With the rising strength of racism throughout Europe, some of the ultra-nationalists became quite outspoken about their ideas, especially in the early 1940s. Unlike traditional Turkish nationalists, many of these ultra-nationalists, such as Nihal Atsız, expelled Islam from their thinking by denouncing it as an "Arab religion". They embraced ancient Shamanistic and Turkic traditions, focused on the pre-Islamic period of Turkic tribes, and emphasized the importance of purity of the Turkish race. They started an active campaign against leftists, since according to them, leftist ideologies were foreign elements, and therefore, harmful to the Turkish race. In this way, leftists were pictured as the internal enemies of Turkey.<sup>269</sup>

Even before Markopaşa was published, Sabahattin Ali was involved in disputes with pan-Turkists and ultra-nationalists, who labeled all leftists as "traitor communists". The mid-1940s were marked by the conflicts between these groups. Just before Markopaşa was published, Sabahattin Ali - along with many other leftists such as Pertev Naili Boratav, Sadrettin Celal, Ahmet Cevat Emre, and Şefik Hüsnü Değmer - was the primary targets of ultra-nationalists.<sup>270</sup> Sabahattin Ali severely criticized them in his articles and books.<sup>271</sup> For example, one of the characters in his novel "The Devil Among Us" resembled Nihal Atsız, and triggered tensions between the two groups even more. Atsız published a leaflet, "The Devils Among Us", in response, in which he heavily criticized Sabahattin Ali. However, due to the negative outcome of racism in Europe, extremist Pan-Turkists and Pan-Turanists were brought to trial and some of them were sent to jail by the government.<sup>272</sup> Still, nationalist campaign against the leftists turned out to be a successful one, since it negatively influenced the general opinion, which was already conservative and prejudiced about leftists. Along with Sabahattin Ali, many of the prominent intellectuals were stigmatized and labeled as suspicious

---

<sup>268</sup> "İstiklal", Markopaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 25 November 1946; "Yabancı Sermaye", Markopaşa, issue 2, p. 1, 2 December 1946

<sup>269</sup> For further information: Türkiye'de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938-1945), Koçak, 1986, p.

<sup>270</sup> Türkiye'de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938-1945), Koçak, 1986, p. 297; Milli Şef Dönemi (1939-1945), Mahmut Goloğlu, Turhan Kitabevi, 1974, Ankara, p. 247

<sup>271</sup> "Milliyetçinin Tarifi", Tan, 11 February 1944 in Sabahattin Ali, Bütün Yapıtları: Markopaşa Yazıları ve Otekiler, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, Ankara, 2009

<sup>272</sup> Pan Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation, Jacob M. Landau, Indiana University Press, 1995, p. 117



citizens by the state. Consequently, all of these developments made nationalism a very sensitive subject for the Markopaşa series.

In that period, being a leftist was considered being a communist; and therefore a “non-nationalist”, “non-native” or a “traitor” by mainstream politicians. The people with leftist world-views needed to prove that they were patriots as much as anybody else in the country. Consequently, Markopaşa’s writers, just like any other leftist, had to defend themselves against accusations.<sup>273</sup> The writers emphasized their devotion to the country with a visible patriotic tone. Apparently, part of this patriotism came from writers’ sincere feelings and respect for the spirit of the national War of Independence and Mustafa Kemal’s leading role in it. Still, it can be argued that a part of their emphasis on national pride was connected to Markopaşa’s defense-reflex against accusations about communism. Here, it is important to bear in mind that expressing leftist ideas was hindered by the 141<sup>st</sup> and 142<sup>nd</sup> articles in the Constitution. Except for short periods, expressing socialist ideals was illegal. As a result, the leftists often tended to adopt a patriotic-populist discourse, as they had little choice and they were aware of the legitimizing effect of their discourse.

For example, Markopaşa stated the term “nationalist” should be used very carefully since it was adopted by several groups who had crucially different from each other regarding their political views. In many cases, the groups who called themselves nationalists, in fact, had racist, fascist or pan-Turanist and irredentist motives.<sup>274</sup>

In general, Markopaşa members separated their mild nationalism from ultra-nationalism. In fact, they opposed any nationalist idea based on race or ethnicity, and they rejected any classification that put one nation above another. They objected to the usage of “Turkishness” to downgrade the ones who were not ethnically Turkish.<sup>275</sup> Accordingly, the journal used “nation” and “Turkish nation” for defining all the people who lived in the borders of the Turkish Republic. In order to mark their ideological differences, the writers preferred to use other terms such as “halksever” (someone who loves the people) or “vatansever” (patriot) to describe themselves, rather than “nationalist”, which often referred to either traditional or ultra-nationalists with negative connotations. The writers

---

<sup>273</sup> “Ayıp”, Markopaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 18 December 1946; “Topunuzun Köküne Kibrit Suyu”, Markopaşa, issue 4, p.1, 16 December 1946; “Gutenberg Matbaası”, Markopaşa, issue 16, p. 1, 7 April 1947; “Fikir ve Küfür”, Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p.1, 1 November 1947; “Bir Gazete Çıktı”, Malumpaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 8 September 1947; “Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetsiz İktidarın Devamıdır”, Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, 5 February 1948

<sup>274</sup> “Korku Dağları Bekler”, Markopaşa, issue 15, p. 2, 17 March 1947; “Genç Arkadaş”, Merhumpaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 26 May 1947; “Açık Mektup”, Malumpaşa, issue 4, p.1, 29 September 1947

<sup>275</sup> “Açık Mektup”, Malumpaşa, 29 September 1947; “Vur Fakat Dinle”, Malumpaşa, issue 5, p. 1, 6 October 1947; “Bir Yerim Kaldı”, Ali Baba, issue 2, p. 3, 2 December 1947

sometimes used “real nationalism” and “real nationalist” to define their ideas, as well as to mark the journal’s difference from other types of nationalism.<sup>276</sup> These terms appeared particularly in the articles of Sabahattin Ali and Aziz Nesin in *Başdan* and *Zincirli Hürriyet* journals. In the 1960s, the *Yön* group also often used “real nationalism” to describe their difference from traditional nationalism.

The writers expressed their national pride on the grounds of being members of an independent nation. They were not opposed to the concept of “nation” categorically or reducing it to solely racial and ethnic connotations.<sup>277</sup> It seems that they had national pride with patriotic feelings combined with humanism and internationalist ideas like many of the prominent Turkish leftists of the time. In this sense, and compared to *Kadro*, *Markopaşa*’s nationalism was less stressed, even though intellectuals of both groups were patriots and they embraced the national pride of being Turkish. Nevertheless, they all must have been aware of the legitimizing effect of stressing patriotism in their ideology.

At this point, it is important to look at the relationship between Kemalism and *Markopaşa* in order to understand to what extent the writers identified the journal with Kemalist nationalism, since Kemalist nationalism was quite intolerant towards opposing ideas.

Kemalist regime often regarded leftists as unreliable and treacherous citizens who had suspicious connections abroad. As patriotic leftists, *Markopaşa* writers were furious about the RPP’s oppressive policies. Although they described themselves as “Kemalist patriots”, it was inevitable to come into conflict with the RPP, due to their leftist views. Unlike *Kadro*, *Markopaşa* writers did not approve of the regime’s strict policies and authoritarian tendencies, and they showed an explicit opposition towards the RPP governments. According to them, the nation proved its power and maturity by gaining independence against the imperialists and establishing the Republic. However, RPP’s ill-advised decisions in politics and economy put the nation’s independence at risk again. The RPP jeopardized the outstanding results of a hard-fought battle by denying its mistakes, insisting on oppressive policies and opening the doors to the US. In the end, due to RPP’s problematic perspective, the country was on the brink of losing its economic independence.<sup>278</sup>

---

<sup>276</sup> “Milliyetçilik”, *Başdan*, issue 12, p. 2, 26 October 1948; “Sabahattin Ali ve Milli His”, *Hür Markopaşa*, issue 9, p.1, 4 July 1949

<sup>277</sup> “İstiklal”, *Markopaşa*, 25 November 1946; “Görülmemiş Tiyatro”, *Markopaşa*, issue 13, p. 1, 3 March 1947

<sup>278</sup> “Yaşasın Millet”, *Markopaşa*, issue 21, p. 1, 12 May 1947; “Bir Alçak”, *Malumpaşa*, issue 4, p. 1, 29 September 1947

Although RPP was harshly criticized, the powerful and legitimizing role of Mustafa Kemal was emphasized continuously and was used to create a discourse against the 1940s' RPP government and İsmet İnönü. Instead of rejecting it, Markopaşa preferred to adopt the Kemalist legacy and bent the Kemalist ideology according to the journal's worldview. At this crucial point, similar to Kadro, Markopaşa members wanted to connect their journal to Kemalism via anti-imperialism by attributing an initial anti-imperialism quality to the Kemalist ideology.<sup>279</sup>

Markopaşa members were also proud of the victory of the War of Independence and the establishment of the nation-state. They interpreted the existence of the Turkish Republic as the achievement of national sovereignty as well as a victory against imperialists. Markopaşa's anti-imperialist interpretation was a fundamental element in their ideology as well as a necessity to connect their left-oriented ideas with Kemalism. In this light, they portrayed anti-imperialism as a dominant element in Kemalism to bring people together by connecting them to fight against imperialist enemies.<sup>280</sup>

According to Sabahattin Ali, the Turkish Republic was the outcome of people's war of independence against imperialism. However, the anti-imperialist and populist path of the early years of the Republic was gradually abandoned by the RPP. The republic, which used to be an ally of national independence struggles, became a supporter of the plunderer powers (US), which were the enemy of the people, in the name of democracy.<sup>281</sup>

Still, at this point, Markopaşa did not place all the blame on Mustafa Kemal and his period, but mainly on the governors who came after him. The main reason was that in the late 1940s, their primary target was the RPP under the leadership of İsmet İnönü rather than Mustafa Kemal. The writers were quite respectful of Mustafa Kemal's memory, in fact. Indeed, stressing the glorious victory over Western powers under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal and the developments in the early years of the republic was helpful for Markopaşa to criticize the RPP for the ill-handed policies in the following years.

---

<sup>279</sup> "Hangi Cepheden Gelirse Gelsin Emperyalizmin Aleyhindeyiz", Markopaşa, issue 19, p. 1, 28 April 1947; "Genç Arkadaş", Merhumpaşa, 26 May 1947; "Bir Alçak", Merhumpaşa, 22 September 1947

<sup>280</sup> "Yabancı Sermaye", Markopaşa, 2 December 1946

<sup>281</sup> "Bir Alçak", Malumpaşa, 29 September 1947; "Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetsiz İktidarın Devamıdır", Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, issue 1, p.1, 5 February 1948; "Ayıp", Markopaşa, 18 December 1946; "Yabancı Şahit, Yalancı Şahit", Markopaşa, issue 11, p.1, 17 February 1947

Markopaşa members were aware of the Mustafa Kemal and RPP's stance against the leftists and how Mustafa Kemal eliminated them and excluded them from politics. Nevertheless, like many of the leftists of their time, intellectuals of Markopaşa cordially believed that anti-imperialism had a leading role in the War of Independence. They brought up the anti-imperialist discourse of early stages of the war, and Mustafa Kemal's utterances about this matter quite often. They always mentioned anti-imperialism as if it was one of the main tenets of Kemalism.

Markopaşa's ideology included anti-imperialism with nationalist tones. Still, compared to Yön and especially to Kadro, national sensitivities were much less evident in Markopaşa.

When internationalism is considered, Markopaşa gives clues about the journal's view, which sought solutions for the incompatibility of nationalism and the internationalist character of anti-imperialism. This may not be very clear in the articles published in the series, but the writers' efforts can be traced to their articles which appeared in other journals, such as Başdan and Zincirli Hürriyet.<sup>282</sup>

Apparently, anti-imperialism was an indispensable element for almost all of the left-leaning groups who wanted to connect their ideology to Kemalism at some point. Although its attitude towards the regime was much different than Kadro, Markopaşa tried to create the same link as Kadro and Yön journal did. Kadro created this link in order to generate an ideology for Kemalism and to be effective in the decision-making process, while Yön did exactly the same thing in order to reconstruct Kemalism in their attempts to clear the way for Yön's politic targets. Although Markopaşa writers also tried to shape Kemalism according to their world-view, and were an elite group compared to the general population; they insisted on the opening of democratic channels for political diversity and inclusion of ordinary citizens to politics in a better way. In this sense, they were different than the Kadro and Yön groups which had more elitist tendencies than Markopaşa. Although the writers still needed Kemalism's legitimatizing power in order to take action towards the present government, connecting anti-imperialism and Kemalism was not their primary aim as it was for Kadro and Yön. Their primary objective was creating a strong opposition towards the regime and the state-elites by reaching the general population and gaining their support for the series.

---

<sup>282</sup> "Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetsiz İktidarın Devamıdır", Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, 5 February 1948; "Türkiye Sosyalist Partisi Genel Sekreteri Esat Adil Müstecaplı ile Ropörtaj", Başdan, issue 2, p. 2, 17 August 1948

Unlike Kadro, Markopaşa was also more careful about the exclusivist policies of Kemalist nationalism. The writers did not hesitate to criticize the politicians - including Mustafa Kemal<sup>283</sup> - for employing Turkish nationalism as an exclusion mechanism. For example, the government's suppressive policies towards Kurds in the Eastern provinces, as well as discriminatory laws such as Wealth Tax concerning non-Muslim minorities were openly criticized in the journal. In a short article in Malumpaşa, the writers clearly mentioned that the thousands of people were suffered due to the unjust Tunceli Law of 1934.<sup>284</sup> Although these issues were briefly mentioned, Markopaşa was one of the rare publications which openly criticized the government's actions in Kurdish provinces. In contrast to Kadro, it did not try to justify RPP's interventions in the area by reducing the problem to economic backwardness or reactionary powers. Particularly Sabahattin Ali treated the subject very carefully, and he added a new dimension, a human factor, to the existing problem. In this sense, he hinted that suppressive operations of RPP in the Eastern regions were politically and morally wrong.

In one of the articles, Sabahattin Ali mentioned that some Turkish people attempted to help some of the Balkan Turks who were considered to be in danger. Indeed, in order to help people, he believed that one should not seek a common religion or nation. Balkan Turks might have needed help, but this help should not have depended on their ethnic background. Therefore, the people who worried about the Balkan Turks also should have been interested in other people who had been living in Turkey and needed help, regardless of their nationality or religion.<sup>285</sup>

Regarding the Kurdish issue and other minorities, Markopaşa had divergent views which were in conflict with exclusivist policies of Kemalist nationalism. The journal's perspective was very different than Kadro's as well, since Kadro usually relied on explanations about economy and statistics on this issue. Besides, unlike Kadro, which criticized the regime very implicitly, Markopaşa criticized the government in a direct way. Nevertheless, it is obvious that both journals shared the same objective by ascribing a great importance to anti-imperialism and stressing the anti-imperialistic qualities of the independence struggle and Kemalist nationalism in every opportunity.

---

<sup>283</sup> "Geçmiş Zaman Olur ki Hayali Beş Para Etmez", Markopaşa, issue 9, p. 1, 3 February 1947

<sup>284</sup> "Vur Fakat Dinle", Malumpaşa, 6 October 1947; "Bir Yerim Kaldı", Ali Baba, 2 December 1947

<sup>285</sup> "18 Milyon Türk Ne Olacak," Sabahattin Ali, Markopaşa, issue 21, p. 1, 5 May 1947

## 2.2 Populism

In this chapter, Markopaşa's interpretations of Kemalist populism will be discussed concerning people, society and classes, elitism and authoritarian tendencies.

After the death of Mustafa Kemal in 1938, İsmet İnönü became the leader of the republic and the RPP. The country experienced a difficult period during the World War II and struggled economically and politically. However, in 1946, when Markopaşa was first published, Turkey was in a transition period that carried an aim of establishing a multi-party system. In the aftermath of WWII, when the demand for democratic regimes became more pressing than ever, İsmet İnönü and the RPP struggled with changes in politics after years of a single-party system.<sup>286</sup> Mainly due to the increasing effect of the United States, the Turkish government felt pressure to terminate its single-party system. In January 1946, the Democrat Party (DP) was formed by a group of RPP deputies such as Adnan Menderes, Celâl Bayar, Fuad Köprülü, and Refik Koraltan as an opposition party. The same year elections took place and four years later, in 1950, the DP won the elections and ended the RPP's rule.

In order to show Turkey's adaptability to democracy, and to prove Turkey's improvement in this regard, the RPP governments of the transition period showed an unprecedented tolerance towards the press and opponents for a period of time. Markopaşa was the result of this period. However, the tolerance of the RPP governments was short-lived. Constantly changing names of the Markopaşa journal due to court orders, lawsuits, as well as problems with press-houses indicate that the political pressure of the regime on the press was still strong. Still, compared to Kadro, this small-scale and four-pages-a-week journal made a great impact in minds of people. The journal became hugely popular since people were fed up with the strict rule of RPP. Its writers claimed that even the existence of this journal was a protest against one-party rule and its deeds. Populist rhetoric of the RPP and its contradictions were open targets of Markopaşa. Therefore, the populist arrow has appeared as the most important arrow to analyze Markopaşa's interpretations on Kemalism.

Here it should be noted that after the elimination of the leftist movement of Turkey by the regime with the 1925 and 1927 prosecutions, the leftist groups under the one-party system were already weakened and they failed to impress the people with their cause. Indeed, there was hardly any legal ground for them to express their ideas. Occasionally, only prominent figures, such as the poet Nazım

---

<sup>286</sup> There were Progressive Republican Party (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası) and Free Republican Party (Serbest Firka) experiments, but other than that the system was basically a single-party regime. Besides in 1945 Nuri Demirağ's National Development Party was formed. However, the real opposition against RPP started with the DP.

Hikmet, journalists Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel, and politician Esat Adil had the chance to draw some attention of the people via their books, poems or articles, which were featured in legal or illegal publications.

### **2.2.1 People**

Markopaşa put a great deal of emphasis on “the people”, which was often mentioned as “people” (halk), “nation” (millet) or “citizens” (vatandaş). The writers often used these words interchangeably. At first glance, the journal’s exalting of “the people” by presenting its supreme features might seem similar to Kadro members’ approach, which also praised “resilient” and “noble” features of the Turkish people several times. However, the arguments that followed these descriptions ensured that Markopaşa disagreed with Kadro journal as well as with the RPP’s view of populism in general, regarding how to define people and society.

The noble features of Turkish people and its ability to govern itself were often glorified by Mustafa Kemal and RPP members in their speeches. However, the Kemalist regime was quite reluctant in taking necessary steps for sharing power with the people, since it often considered them as a source of divisive or reactionary movements, and it did not trust them. The people often were regarded as a mass to be educated until modern ways of governing by the regime. By labeling every oppositional group within the GNA as either reactionary or divisive, the Kemalist leadership claimed all rights to represent the whole nation via the RPP. Although they tried to legitimize their assumed role ideologically, they caused a great deal of resentment within the people due to their strict regime and top-down policies. To this point, Kadro’s perception of people and society was not so different than Kemalist leadership.

Compared to Kadro and the ideas of Mustafa Kemal or Ismet İnönü, Markopaşa seemed to have a different approach towards society. According to the journal, the power holders had to be elected and supported by members of society as the expression of the will of all of society. The chosen power, as the representative of people’s sovereignty, should have a primary goal of working for the good of its citizens, rather than using the power for its own ends.<sup>287</sup> In order to achieve this form of governing, active public participation in politics was necessary. As stated by Sabahattin Ali, Mustafa Kemal and the RPP owed their early political power to their populist policies and public support for

---

<sup>287</sup> “Ne İstiyoruz”, Markopaşa, issue 10, p. 1, 10 February 1947; “Fikir ve Küfür”, Merhumpaşa, 1 November 1947; “Korkulu Rüya”, Markopaşa, issue 13, p. 3, 3 March 1947

the regime was secured by the success of the War of Independence. However, after securing power, the “People’s Party” ignored fundamental rights and needs of the people and, despite its name, claimed the power mainly for the leading-elites. Although Kemalist populism had a public sovereignty claim initially, this was never applied in practice.<sup>288</sup> The journal claimed that by abandoning populist policies and creating a self-righteous legitimacy rhetoric, the RPP betrayed its own people and put the party and state over citizens at the expense of freedom for twenty-five years, causing a great distance between the people and the government.<sup>289</sup>

As seen, although its writers defined themselves as Kemalists, by continuously stressing the gap between Kemalist discourse and its practices, Markopaşa showed that the journal was well aware of contradictions of Kemalist populism. As noted before, Kemalists used their view of “the people” to justify their sole position as rulers of the state. However, the writers created their own descriptions about “the people” in order to deal with legitimizing rhetoric of the leading Kemalists of the RPP, particularly in 1947 and 1948. Therefore, Markopaşa’s descriptions about society and people can be read as direct criticism towards Kemalist populism.

Compared to Kadro, Markopaşa had a profound interest in the people. Even the name of the journal can be linked to writers’ populist approach and interest in society.<sup>290</sup> The writers emphasized their trust in ordinary people’s will and judgment all the time. People’s humble wisdom was always praised. According to them, people were poor, people were oppressed, and people were neglected by the leaders but they were wise enough to understand real causes of their hardships.<sup>291</sup> They had the ability to endure difficulties under the rule of an oppressive regime.<sup>292</sup> People were honest, brave, and expert in recognizing their enemies; and they detested the hypocrisy of the governments.<sup>293</sup> Thus, the people deserved respect, especially when they were compared to the dishonorable power-holders.<sup>294</sup>

---

<sup>288</sup> “Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetsiz İktidarın Devamıdır”, Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, 5 February 1948

<sup>289</sup> “Ona Ne Şüphesiz”, Ali Baba, issue 2, p. 2, 2 December 1947; “Yem Borusu”, Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 1 November 1947

<sup>290</sup> The name of the journal refers to an expression, “Anlat Derdini Markopaşa’ya”, which is an attribution to an Ottoman doctor who was famous with his patience and he listened to his patients very carefully. Thus, name of the journal basically meant that Markopaşa writers would listen to the problems of the people who were neglected by the others, especially by state and the politicians.

<sup>291</sup> “Aczimiz”, Merhumpaşa, issue 2, p.1, 16 October 1947

<sup>292</sup> “Geçmişte Bugün”, Markopaşa - Secondary Series, issue 10, p.3, 31 December 1948

<sup>293</sup> “Uşak Ruhunu”, Ali Baba, issue 4, p. 1, 16 December 1947

<sup>294</sup> “Ne Zor Şeymiş”, Ali Baba, issue 1, p. 1, 25 November 1947



As seen, praises and descriptions concerning with “the people” were mostly followed by a bitter criticism towards the regime. Sometimes the well-known utterances of Mustafa Kemal, especially the ones from the first half of the 1920s with a populist tone, were employed to develop counter-arguments against the RPP and Ismet İnönü.<sup>295</sup> In these examples, Mustafa Kemal’s words were used with a satirical tone in order to show the contrast between utterances and practices of the RPP. Still, Markopaşa never ridiculed Mustafa Kemal himself, and the writers were usually very respectful to his memory.

### 2.2.2 Society and Classes

Markopaşa’s descriptions of “the people” indicate that the journal had a leftist and populist approach towards society. Instead of aiming for a well-controlled, united society like Kadro, Markopaşa opted for a dynamic and a politically more active society. Due to the waves of democratization in the world as well as to the left-leaning perspective and ideals of its writers, the journal attributed a great deal of importance to the active participation of ordinary citizens to politics. In every opportunity, the Markopaşa showed journal’s belief in people and their vast potential to create a better functioning system.<sup>296</sup>

The writers recognized the class differences explicitly; workers, peasants, artisans, craftsmen, and owners of small-scale independent business were all mentioned as coming from various classes.<sup>297</sup> The journal’s strong emphasis on working classes made its leftist attitude even more pronounced. In the series, the problems of workers and peasants were accentuated, while the rights of the workers, accidents in workplaces, news about wages, living conditions of working classes, working conditions of mineworkers and seasonal laborers, laws about insurance and strikes were all discussed continuously, usually with a humorous style.<sup>298</sup> The “Markopaşa Dert Dinliyor” section in the 4<sup>th</sup> page was used successfully for expressing different problems of poor people from various backgrounds in an ironic way. Policies and laws about working classes were a great concern for Markopaşa; therefore political discussions and implementations of these matters were carefully

---

<sup>295</sup> “Efendimiz Köylü”, Markopaşa (Secondary Series), issue 3, p. 1-2, 11 November 1948; “Köylü Bezgindir”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 2, 6 June 1949; “Genç Arkadaş”, Merhumpaşa, 26 May 1947

<sup>296</sup> “Biz Halka Inanıyoruz”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 10, p. 1, 11 July 1949; “İnsanlara İnanmak”, Ali Baba, issue 2, p. 1 and 4, 2 December 1947

<sup>297</sup> “Ucuz Hayat”, Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 2, 6 January 1946

<sup>298</sup> “Parmak”, Malumpaşa, issue 5, p. 3, 6 October 1947; A caricature by Mim Uykusuz about Kozlu Maden Kuyuları, Markopaşa, issue 23, p. 1, 10 October 1947; “Markopaşa Dert Dinliyor”, Markopaşa, issue 20, p. 4, 5 May 1947; “Maden İşçileri”, Markopaşa (Secondary Series), issue 1, p. 3, 29 October 1948, “Efendimiz Köylü”, Markopaşa (Secondary Series), 11 November 1948; “İşçi Sigortaları”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 15, p. 2, 15 August 1949

observed by the journal. Articles about workers increased gradually, especially after the journal drew great deal of attention from its readers.

The RPP's contradictory approach towards classes and its opposition towards class-based organizations, such as prohibitive laws about unions, were heavily criticized.<sup>299</sup> When the nationalization issue of the trade unions prompted a debate in the GNA, Markopaşa made a comparison between trade unions and corporations and argued that in Turkey -where strikes were prohibited, classes were often denied, and laws were in favor of employers- the structure of trade unions resembled fascist corporations rather than workers' unions which were supposed to protect workers' rights at least to a degree.<sup>300</sup> According to the journal, class-based organizations and their representation in GNA was crucial for freedom of speech and realization of a democratic political culture. Accordingly, in the last issue of *Ali Baba*, RPP's promises and failures about democracy and freedom of speech was shortly discussed.

According to Markopaşa's writers, if the RPP really intended to bring a democratic political atmosphere to the country, then the party should have proven this by removing the preventive laws about class-based organizations. Indeed, the regime should have left more space for people from different backgrounds and classes. The state was supposed to take care of citizens rather than forcing RPP leaders' ideas over the whole population. According to a short article in *Ali Baba*, the RPP pretended to be different after 1945 and made people believe in an opportunity of forming class-based parties with new regulations but in fact, the party never intended to let it happen. As a result, many people were disappointed bitterly at the end.<sup>301</sup>

As seen, the active participation of the people in politics and their representation in the GNA was paramount for the journal; therefore Markopaşa had a different interpretation of Turkey's social structure than RPP's formal view, which often denied the existence of classes or came up with a relatively solidaristic plan about it.

---

<sup>299</sup> "Halktan Yolsuzluk ve Yokluk Vergileri de Alınmalıdır", Markopaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 16 December 1946

<sup>300</sup> "O Zaman Gör Kepazeliği", Markopaşa, issue 13, p. 2, 3 March 1947

<sup>301</sup> "Kalkın Ey Ehli Vatan", *Ali Baba*, issue 4, p. 2, 16 December 1947

### 2.2.3 Elitism and Authoritarianism

Since from the beginning, Markopaşa writers identified themselves with the ordinary people and working classes. They claimed that Markopaşa writers were the voice of suppressed people who were betrayed by the regime.<sup>302</sup> In Markopaşa's vocabulary, "we" often meant ordinary citizens including Markopaşa intellectuals, while "you" and "they" mostly addressed the rulers as well as the politicians or groups that the journal opposed to, such as Nihal Atsız, Recep Peker, Falih Rıfkı Atay, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın or Cemil Sait Barlas. According to the journal, Markopaşa was the enemy of people's enemies.<sup>303</sup> In almost every issue, the writers made sure that the journal sided with ordinary people against the mentality of leading elites.<sup>304</sup>

In Markopaşa's view, one of the major flaws of the RPP regime was its centuries-old governing mentality. As a result, the journal continuously stressed the distance between ordinary citizens and the government in order to show the regime's failure of populist policies. According to Markopaşa, the RPP regime never trusted in its citizens,<sup>305</sup> and it needed to be reminded that the people were not a flock of sheep to be led towards any direction when it was needed.<sup>306</sup> Monotonous utterances of party members about the importance of the people made it clear that RPP neither knew its citizens nor cared to know them better. Besides, the party was only after maintaining its existence within current developments.<sup>307</sup> The RPP underestimated political consciousness and the maturity of the people and intentionally hindered their active participation in politics.<sup>308</sup> Therefore, RPP's claim on being the "people's party" was pretentious and its statute books, which were often incomprehensible for most of the population due to their vague style, were clear examples of this.<sup>309</sup> Thus, despite its name, the Republican People's Party, was in fact a "people-less" party.<sup>310</sup>

It seems Markopaşa's writers did not have any illusions about the Democrat Party either, since they did not distinguish DP leaders from RPP members in the long run. In the early days of the DP, some leftists were on relatively good terms with DP leaders; for example Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel welcomed them in their publications. However, their collaboration did not continue for a long time.

---

<sup>302</sup> "Dikkat Dikkat Dikkat", Malumpaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 8 September 1947; "Markopaşa Bir Hyde Parktır", Markopaşa, issue 14, p. 4, 10 March 1947

<sup>303</sup> "Kem Gözlere, Kem Sözlere", Markopaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 9 December 1946; "Neden Muvaffak Oluyoruz?", Yedi Sekiz Paşa, issue 1, p. 3, 29 April 1949

<sup>304</sup> "Aczimiz", Merhumpaşa, 16 October 1947; "Milletin Postunu Paylaşıyorlar", Merhumpaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 25 October 1947

<sup>305</sup> "Tatar Ağaları Yaya Kaldı", Markopaşa, issue 14, p. 1, 10 March 1947

<sup>306</sup> "Teslim Tesellüm İş'i", Markopaşa, issue 22, p. 3, 19 May 1947

<sup>307</sup> "Hâlâ Yalınayak", Hür Markopaşa, issue 6, p. 1, 13 June 1948

<sup>308</sup> "Yem Borusu", Merhumpaşa, 1 November 1947

<sup>309</sup> "Tüzük Müzük Hikayesi", Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 1 November 1947

<sup>310</sup> "Korkulu Rüya", Markopaşa, 3 March 1947

Once the DP gained more power, its leaders proved to be as intolerant as the RPP leaders towards the leftists. Thus, the series shows that the journal had no illusion about DP leaders and did not expect much from them, in terms of democracy.<sup>311</sup> However, they supported DP as part of democratization process as well as to form a united front against the RPP regime. Therefore, the journal's support was conditional, and it was not possible for its members to get along with DP's state-elites in other issues.

In 1946, there was already a great deal of resentment towards the RPP government due to abovementioned reasons. Markopaşa wanted to make use of this discontent by using the relatively less strict political atmosphere of the transition period. However, the writers did not expect to influence the state elites as the way Kadro and Yön did. Their main aim was to create pressure on the government by gaining the support of ordinary people by forming a simple but powerful opposition via the journal. In order to realize this objective, writers targeted government and politicians. Aziz Nesin and Sabahattin Ali criticized prime-ministers, RPP members and persons in key positions. Hitherto seemingly untouchable personalities suddenly became the target of constant teasing and satire of Markopaşa. The caricatures of Mim Uykusuz touched different aspects of political life and made fun of stern figures of the state officials mercilessly. In this way, the writers tried to show that the state and its officials were not untouchable; and if the people could overcome their fear, change was inevitable. In this sense, they can be considered vanguard intellectuals who dared to be an example to show how to object to an oppressive regime. Their effort was to activate the political consciousness of the people, at least the ones who could read their journals. While they were clearly aware of their “vanguard” role, they did not assume any privileged role or take the upper hand for themselves in this respect. Indeed, they did not try to claim any exclusive authority over the people via their assumed “intrinsic” qualities or intellectual potential. On the contrary, they bitterly criticized elitist attitude and privileged position of leaders and other power holders. Therefore, referring to these intellectuals as elitists in the same sense as the RPP deputies and Kadro members would not be right.

This approach was very clear in journal's style as well. In order to be understood by a wider audience, the writers avoided detailed analyses. They preferred striking expressions and visual material instead. Visual materials were important to reach people who could not read, but at least could identify the political figures in the caricatures. The journal's simplicity, therefore, was very intentional. The journal owed its successful style to its writers' ability to form a simple but well-

---

<sup>311</sup> “Markopaşa ve Demokrat Parti”, Markopaşa, issue 7, p. 3, 20 January 1947

structured language owing to the fact that Markopaşa writers were not only journalists but also successful writers. In 1946, Sabahattin Ali was already a very famous writer with his realistic approach and powerful language. His stories and novels were well known with their down-to-earth characters and social messages. He wrote poems which became lyrics for famous songs later. In the Markopaşa period, Rıfat Ilgaz and Aziz Nesin were relatively young and were at the beginning of their careers. Rıfat Ilgaz was a young poet who became a famous writer later. Aziz Nesin proved himself as a good writer as well as a leftist political activist in the following years. The life stories of the writers are a strong indication of their consistency about their ideas as well.

In this sense, their pioneer role was quite different than Kadro, since Markopaşa explicitly opposed the authority of the regime although they shared basic Kemalist principles. Markopaşa members' example also proved that opposing the government was not an easy task, since they were taking a great deal of risk by challenging the regime's authority. In many cases, their lives were in danger; indeed, they were getting death threats all the time, they were sued and jailed due to their articles several times. An open letter that was published in the journal also confirms that they were in danger and they were concerned about their safety but they were going to publish the journal as long as they could.<sup>312</sup>

Markopaşa writers, especially Sabahattin Ali, had good relationships with high profile leftists such as Esad Adil, Zekeriya and Sabiha Sertel, several other journalists and leftists.<sup>313</sup> However, this did not stop him from being in touch with some of the state elites occasionally.<sup>314</sup> Although his acquaintanceship with high profile people was criticized by leftists, he makes an impression of being an independent intellectual with a wide social web which could be applied to other Markopaşa members as well. Although all the writers shared similar ideals, they were relatively independent of the leftist organizations however.<sup>315</sup> Even though the journal started as a publication connected to the TSP (Turkish Socialist Party), it continued as an independent publication. The support for the writers from the left was probably occasional and was mostly depended on personal relationships and connections. The journal also claimed that Markopaşa members were not supporter of any particular party.<sup>316</sup>

---

<sup>312</sup> "Korkuyoruz", Markopaşa, issue 12, p. 1, 24 February 1947

<sup>313</sup> Marko Paşa Gerçeği, Saydur, 2001, p. 8-13

<sup>314</sup> Sabahattin Ali Olayı, Kemal Bayram Çukurkavaklı, Yenigün Yayınları, Ankara, 1978

<sup>315</sup> As cited in Cantek's book, Aziz Nesin and Ilgaz became member of TSP but it did not last long. Nesin remained as a member for two months and Rıfat Ilgaz for just a month. According to Cantek, MP writers never had any organic relationship with TKP as well. See Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi, Cantek, 2001, p. 23, 36

<sup>316</sup> "Bay Yaşar Emre Soruyor", Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 4, 6 January 1947

The writers, therefore, fought for their cause and had to deal with the consequences on their own. This is especially clear in Sabahattin Ali's case, since in 1948, when he was under constant pressure and he was a target for ultra-nationalists as well as the regime itself, he organized his escape from Turkey mainly by himself but he was killed on the border of Bulgaria by a radical ultra-nationalist in April of that year.<sup>317</sup>

Markopaşa writers' analysis and ideas on the social structure of Turkey were left-oriented and did not include solidarism as the way Kadro's ideas did. In fact, basic demands of Markopaşa and other leftist groups of the period were quite similar. Nevertheless, unlike others, the writers managed to attract the attention of a wider audience. It was unique in its success, since none of other leftist groups ever had such attention from people before via publication. The journals' natural and expressive style was very successful, and its timing was just right. In 1947, selling 70.00 copies was definitely a great success for a four-page satirical journal that was published by a couple of penniless writers. This high circulation rate reassured Markopaşa writers that people were responding to their journal and their language and it motivated them to continue. However, the very same attention disturbed the leaders of the regime and caused serious problems for the writers rather than easing the conditions for them. Still they continued to demand equality, freedom, honesty and transparency in political life as long as they could.

### **2.3 Republicanism and Democracy**

At the end of WWII, the defeat of the Axis Powers marked a decline of totalitarian regimes; democracy and liberal politics gained more ground with a strong position of the US in the post-war world. Until 1945, democracy was not an issue for the RPP. The regime was quite anti-democratic, especially during the single-party period. However, by November 1944, İsmet İnönü started to emphasize the democratic character of the Turkish political system.<sup>318</sup> In 1945, the National Development Party was founded but it was not very effective. In 1946, the Democrat Party was founded and it was at first welcomed by the RPP and its organs.<sup>319</sup> However, due to the widespread discontent towards RPP regime, DP became a strong rival to RPP in a short time.

---

<sup>317</sup> For further information: Sabahattin Ali Olayı, Çukurkavaklı, 1978

<sup>318</sup> Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 209

<sup>319</sup> Ibid., p. 212

Although DP was formed, the political system was still carrying features of a single-party regime and it was difficult to consider the existent system as a democratic regime. İnönü and RPP were introducing a multi-party system mostly due to internal and external pressure and in fact were not ready to share their power with any other group.

As Nur Betül Çelik points out, after 1945 the discourse of democracy appeared as an alternative to Kemalist discourse. It was an expression of widespread discontent towards strict rule of the RPP as well as a platform for the groups which were resentful of the RPP and ruling elites. It became a manifestation of the groups which felt left-out in the power struggles after the foundation of the republic and wanted to be included into the politics again.<sup>320</sup> Although most of its members belonged to the same bureaucratic class, DP became very popular with its populist discourse as rival of the RPP. Its slogan, “Yeter, Söz Milleti!” (Enough! The Nation Has the Say), became manifestation of DP’s wish for change and democracy, even though the policies of DP were not going to be crucially different than RPP, in terms of freedom of speech and political toleration.

In the beginning, democratic discourse was a common denominator for growing discontent towards RPP and it brought people with different world-views together to some degree. In the early periods of the DP, some of the liberal and leftist intellectuals and journalists who wanted to end RPP’s reign supported DP’s founders. In 1945, the *Tan* journal of leftist journalists Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel and *Vatan* journal of liberal Ahmet Emin Yalman supported the DP by giving its founders room in their columns to express their ideas.<sup>321</sup> Accordingly, Markopaşa’s early issues also showed a slight tolerance towards the DP.<sup>322</sup> However, Markopaşa writers thought that the DP leaders did not set a different example than other RPP members in terms of governing mentality. Thus, they were not expecting a significant change through the DP.<sup>323</sup> The journal made its stance clear with a small note in its 7<sup>th</sup> issue and clearly put that the journal supported the DP on the grounds of democracy. This explanation means that Markopaşa writers needed to clarify their view about the DP, since the tone of this small note is quite different than Markopaşa’s usual humorous style. In the note, the journal emphasized that the DP was the only opposition towards the RPP, therefore the journal was on the same side with the new party. However, Markopaşa writers claimed, they were aware of the fact that the DP was an exploiter of the general discontent towards RPP and the party was mostly consisted of

---

<sup>320</sup> “Kemalizm: Bir Hegemonik Söylem”, Nur Betül Çelik in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm*, volume II, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, p. 89

<sup>321</sup> *Turkey: A Modern History*, Zürcher, 2007, p. 211

<sup>322</sup> “Sıralarını Bekliyorlar”, *Markopaşa*, issue 4, p. 3, 16 December 1946

<sup>323</sup> “Gutenberg Matbaası”, *Markopaşa*, 7 April 1947; “Recepkrasi ve Celalkratik”, *Markopaşa*, issue 18, p. 1, 21 April 1947; “Her Şey Aslına Döner”, *Merhumpaşa*, issue 3, p. 2, 25 October 1947

people who were supposed to retire from the politics long ago. Due to its similar mentality to the RPP, the new party would not have brought anything new to the politics. Therefore, Markopaşa writers would not have had anything in common with DP's elitist politicians.<sup>324</sup>

In Markopaşa's vocabulary, democracy meant freedom. However, the journal was not advocating for liberal democracy. Markopaşa's interpretation of democracy was closely linked its writers' leftist world-view. Accordingly, the writers often expressed their desire for freedom of speech, political toleration, transparency and people's participation in politics, equality, and a multi-party system which includes class-based political parties.

The journal considered the republican regime as a requirement for being a modern society and mentioned democracy as a part of republican values.<sup>325</sup> Similar to the Kadro group, anti-monarchism, anti-theocraticism, along with anti-imperialist attributions to the republic were basic characteristics of Markopaşa's interpretation of the republican arrow. As a Kemalist left-leaning journal, these features were inseparable principles of their ideology. Turkey's war against imperialist powers and triumph over the Sultan and caliphate was very important for them. Exactly like the early, founding Kemalists and the Kadro group, the republic was seen by Markopaşa as manifestation of national sovereignty. However, unlike Kadro, Markopaşa used the link between the republic and national sovereignty in order to criticize RPP policies. According to the journal, the republic as a regime was suitable for Turkey; however the RPP hindered its correct execution under the one-party rule. Changing the governing model was not sufficient without ensuring freedom and progress in the country.<sup>326</sup> The journal claimed that RPP intended to maintain its reign and it was not sincere in its efforts for forming a democratic system.

Intellectuals of Markopaşa were socialists but they always stated that they were also devoted Kemalists.<sup>327</sup> They claimed that they were glad to live within the borders of republic and they were not leftists in relation with communist Russia.<sup>328</sup> Unlike the Kadro group, they were quite independent intellectuals; they did not receive directives from the government or any leftist organization.

---

<sup>324</sup> "Markopaşa ve Demokrat Parti", Markopaşa, 20 January 1947

<sup>325</sup> "Tam Demokrasi", Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 1, 6 January 1947

<sup>326</sup> "Hep Laf", Markopaşa, issue 8, p. 1, 27 January 1947

<sup>327</sup> "Yaşasın Millet", Markopaşa, 12 May 1947; "Ayıp", Markopaşa, 18 December 1946; "Hangi Cepheden Gelirse Gelsin Emperyalizmin Aleyhindeyiz", Markopaşa, 28 April 1947

<sup>328</sup> "Ne Zor Şeymiş", Ali Baba, 25 November 1947; "Bir Gazete Çıktı", Malumpaşa, 8 September 1947; "Topunuzun Köküne Kibrit Suyu", Markopaşa, 16 December 1946; the note at the end of "Geçmiş Zaman Olur ki Hayali Beş Para Etmez", Markopaşa, issue 19, p. 2, 28 April 1947



Although the journal easily attracted the attention of people and became a remarkable opponent against RPP, the writers did not mention or imply a desire for a socialist revolution. Although they were fed up with RPP's despotic governing style, they were content with the republican regime. According to them, RPP's policies caused the exclusion of individuals from politics, exhibited intolerance towards different ideas, created a mythical "national chief" figure quite unnecessarily and in this way undermined the original principles of republic, such as populism and anti-imperialism.<sup>329</sup>

Markopaşa made it very clear that this was not an easy task since writers were taking a great deal of risk by giving voice to discontent about the regime. Their lives were in constant danger.<sup>330</sup> Their houses and offices could be raided by the police anytime, and they were sued and jailed several times due to their publications. In this sense, Markopaşa's pioneer role was quite different from the Kadro group, since Markopaşa clearly opposed the authoritarian policies of the RPP in many ways rather than justifying and being part of it as Kadro did. Unlike Markopaşa, the Kadro writers' relations rendered them to be bureaucratic elites because they were part of the regime. Still, it should be kept in mind that these journals were outcome of different periods and in Kadro's period democracy was not an issue.

#### **2.4 Laicism**

In the post-war atmosphere of the second half of the 1940s, although religious matters were still under strict control of the RPP, the people were drawn towards the DP's populist and relatively more tolerant discourse about Islam. In order to deal with DP's popularity, RPP changed its policy and displayed more tolerance towards role of Islam. In order to prove this, RPP welcomed people with religious affiliations into the party, such as former theology professor Şemseddin Günaltay, who became prime minister in 1949 as a RPP deputy. However, RPP's handling of the new situation annoyed people who were deeply bonded with the laicist principals of the republic. Markopaşa writers were among them.

---

<sup>329</sup> "Demokrasi Terbiyesi", Hür Markopaşa, issue 17, p. 1, 29 August 1949; "Yedi Sekiz Paşa'nın Lügati", Yedi Sekiz Paşa, issue 1, p. 3, 29 April 1949; "Insandan Madutsun", Yedi Sekiz Paşa, issue 1, p. 4, 29 April 1949; "Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetlessiz İktidarın Devamıdır", Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, 5 February 1948

<sup>330</sup> "Korkuyoruz", Markopaşa, 24 February 1947

As seen, discussions on laicism in the Markopaşa series were a result of the political scene of the mid-1940s. As a result, discussions about laicism were quite different than the Kadro period.

Markopaşa writers described themselves as “Atatürkçü”<sup>331</sup> and they interpreted this term to include the laicist arrow explicitly. As leftists, they embraced Kemalist laicism and supported laicist reforms which aimed at secularizing and modernizing society. Laicism was perceived by them as a prerequisite condition to become a modern, progressive and free-thinking citizen.<sup>332</sup> Abolishment of the caliphate and becoming a nation rather than being religious based “ümme” was very important to them. They contended with the modern and laicist image of Turkish society which was constructed by Kemalists mainly by leaving out the religion’s role in the social structure. This is also clear in Markopaşa’s interpretation about the spirit of the independence movement. The writers often emphasized the anti-imperialist character of the movement and, like Kadro, did not mention Mustafa Kemal’s early efforts to bring people together by employing Islam’s unifying power in the War of Independence.

Compared to Kadro, discussions about laicism were more frequent and more oppositional in Markopaşa. Kadro adopted the laicist arrow and supported the regime by providing ideological discussions on the subject, especially by connecting the issue to Kurdish upheavals in Eastern provinces. Markopaşa supported basic laicist principals, but unlike Kadro, the journal also used laicism in order to criticize the regime.

According to Sabahattin Ali, RPP used religion in order to be popular, especially after DP’s popularity became visible. However this was a risky maneuver. The RPP let Islamists into the political arena and gave them opportunity to gain political credibility.<sup>333</sup> The writers criticized the opening of religious schools, especially when the Village Institutions, which were known for their devotion to republic and laicism, were closing down.<sup>334</sup> According to the journal, laicism helped Turkey to develop a modern and secular view; however religious conservatism was getting stronger again, because of the RPP’s mishandling of the situation and its newly adopted tolerance towards Islam. The existence of Islamist publications such as Sebiülreşat was proof of this decline.

---

<sup>331</sup> “Yaşasın Millet”, Markopaşa, 12 May 1947; “Ayıp”, Markopaşa, 18 December 1946; “Hangi Cepheden Gelirse Gelsin Emperyalizmin Aleyhindeyiz”, Markopaşa, 28 April 1947

<sup>332</sup> “Yeşil Sarık”, Markopaşa, issue 9, p. 1, 3 February 1947

<sup>333</sup> Ibid.

<sup>334</sup> “Ne İnkılapçılık”, Markopaşa, issue 12, p. 1, 24 February 1947; “Köy Medreselerinin Açılmasına Dair Fetva Çıktı”, Markopaşa, issue 7, p. 3, 20 February 1947

Improvements of the last twenty-five years were about to be ruined in a twenty-five months of time, due to misdirected RPP policies.<sup>335</sup>

In the series, Islamists were usually named “yobaz” (bigot) and their representation in politics was not welcomed by the writers. Due to the concessions about Islam, both RPP and DP were accused of betrayal to the Republic. Apparently, like Kadro, any threat towards laicist principles was interpreted as a threat towards the Republic by Markopaşa. Any kind of tolerance towards Islam in politics was described as a betrayal. In this sense, regarding laicism, Markopaşa writers were followers of early Kemalist policies which were stricter about Islam’s role in politics. They did not approve RPP’s line in the second half of the 1940s.<sup>336</sup>

Sabahattin Ali did not hesitate to criticize Mustafa Kemal’s period as well. According to him, laicism was employed as a powerful political tool by the RPP in order to control the parliament and eliminate the opponents in the 1920s. The RPP used the threat of reactionary movements towards its opponents as an excuse in order to rule over politics, and the RPP did not let anybody but itself into politics.<sup>337</sup> However, although he mentioned Mustafa Kemal, the main target of Sabahattin Ali was İsmet İnönü, since İnönü was held responsible for RPP’s decisions to use religion to the party’s advantage in the second half of the 1940s.<sup>338</sup>

Markopaşa writers showed a distance towards Islam, mainly due to their leftist and materialist world-view. According to Rasih Nuri İleri, Sabahattin Ali knew quite a lot about Marxist and Leninist theory<sup>339</sup> and he described himself as a Marxist.<sup>340</sup> Aziz Nesin was an atheist. Rıfat Ilgaz was also known for his leftist and laicist ideas. Consequently, in one way or another, they became the target of conservative groups and politicians throughout their lives.

However in the 1940s, leftists seemed to be targeted due to their affiliation with communism and their possible anti-nationalist motives, rather than their relationship with religion directly. In those years, communism was often equaled with non-Turkishness and non-nativity by conservatives and nationalists. Communism was perceived as a big threat towards Turkish nation, and people with leftist beliefs were often accused of treason. Markopaşa writers had their share of these accusations.

---

<sup>335</sup> “Ne İnkılapçılık”, Markopaşa, 24 February 1947

<sup>336</sup> “Altı Oktan Atılanlar”, Merhumpaşa, issue 2, p. 3, 16 October 1947

<sup>337</sup> “Yeşil Sarık”, Markopaşa, 3 February 1947

<sup>338</sup> “Yabancı Sermaye”, Markopaşa, 2 December, 1946; “Bekliyoruz”, Malumpaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 22 September 1947

<sup>339</sup> Sabahattin Ali Olayı, Çukurkavaklı, 1978, p. 412-413

<sup>340</sup> Ibid., p. 55

Of course, accusations about communism already included a stigma around religion. Still, the writers of Markopaşa were often insulted as communists, rather than atheist, infidel or non-religious.<sup>341</sup> When Markopaşa became the target of ultra-nationalists, especially of Nihal Atsız, the main accusation about Sabahattin Ali was his leftist beliefs, not his distance to Islam. After all, Nihal Atsız himself was also a non-Muslim. He refused Islam on the grounds that it was an Arab religion. He adopted shamanism as he perceived it as original religion of Turks. At this point, Markopaşa's responses to those accusations can be checked. None of them were about the writers' religious beliefs or Islam but often about nativity of their ideology and patriotism.<sup>342</sup>

Islam became a decisively important issue for Aziz Nesin long after the Markopaşa period, especially after he made his atheism public through his writings within the time. Nesin was a committed political activist. In 1984, he organized the intellectuals who signed the Petition of Intellectuals (Aydınlar Dilekçesi) as a protest towards oppression that was brought by the 1980 military coup led by Kenan Evren. He was also head of Turkish Writers' Union. In the 1990s, his confrontation with Islamists became more frequent, due to growing role of Islam in politics. When he started to translate Salman Rushdie's "Satanic Verses" in early 1990s, he attracted vehement criticism. In 1993, his presence in an Alevi-based cultural event in Sivas was used as an excuse by a mob organized by the fundamentalist Islamists. After hours of provocation and siege, the hotel he was staying, along with several other intellectuals and artists, was set on fire. Nesin survived but 37 people were killed. This event is known as Sivas Massacre. Due to these series of events and confrontations with Islamists, Aziz Nesin became known mainly through his atheism and his critics towards Islam. However, Sabahattin Ali, who was murdered in 1948, is remembered mainly by his leftist world-view, and his confrontations with ultra-nationalist Nihal Atsız due to the period he lived in.

In short, Markopaşa's articles did not target religion and Islam directly but people or institutions which used religion to their advantages. The main idea was that religion should have stayed at individual level, and representation of Islam in politics was not necessary. RPP and DP made a big mistake by making concessions about Islam. The writers were often content with early radical laicist policies, which were stricter over Islam. Still, Markopaşa did not hesitate to criticize Mustafa Kemal

---

<sup>341</sup> "Komünistler", Büyük Doğu, 13 December 1946 *as cited in* Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi, Cantek, 2001, p. 59-60

<sup>342</sup> "Ayıp", Markopaşa, 18 December 1946; "Topunuzun Köküne Kibrit Suyu", Markopaşa, 16 December 1946; "Bir Gazete Çıktı", Malumpaşa,, 8 Septembe 1947; "Korku Dağları Bekler", Markopaşa, 17 March 1947; "Kenan Döner'in Marifetleri", Markopaşa, issue 11, p. 1, 17 February 1947; "Jurnal", Markopaşa, issue 16, p. 2, 7 April 1947; "Büyük Ölüler Kongresi," Markopaşa, Issue 17, p. 1, 17 April 1947

and RPP's usage of laicist arrow to their advantage. According to the journal, laicism was one of the main tenets of the republic and those who would have contested laicism were not only anti-Kemalist but also anti-republican. However, unlike Kadro, Markopaşa did not try to make a direct connection between underdevelopment, Islam and the Eastern regions with Kurdish population.

## 2.5 Reformism

In 1935, Kemalists changed the term *reformism* (inkılapçılık) to *revolutionism* (devrim); but the term *revolution* was scarcely used in Markopaşa. Although the writers perceived the transition from the Ottoman Empire to Turkish Republic as a groundbreaking change in the sense of revolution, they preferred to mention it as *liberation* or *people's war*, rather than *revolution*. The term *inkılapçılık* often appeared to refer to the reform projects about education, units of measurement or alphabet etc which were taken care by the Kemalist government. Similar to Kadro, Markopaşa also criticized the regime because of the stagnant manner of reform projects but unlike Kadro, Markopaşa did this in a bolder and direct manner all the time.<sup>343</sup>

Unlike the Kadro journal, the Markopaşa series did not assume or claim that the transition from empire to republic changed everything. Markopaşa appreciated the gains of the republic such as the changing of the political system, the abolition of sultanate and caliphate, and changes in the education system etc.<sup>344</sup> Nevertheless, contrary to what the RPP claimed, Markopaşa series were insistent on the continuity of the Ottoman mentality in the Turkish Republic, regarding governing and power-sharing mechanisms.<sup>345</sup> The writers explicitly criticized the RPP governments, including Mustafa Kemal, and claimed that the practical impact of the reforms was in fact very limited. Indeed, the RPP failed to improve what mattered most for the country most: Governing styles, freedom of thought and democracy.<sup>346</sup> Sometimes these criticisms went one step further and the journal claimed that mentality of power holders did not really change, therefore the RPP's mentality was almost the same with the Ottomans' concerning with governing the state.<sup>347</sup> At this point,

---

<sup>343</sup> "Hep Laf", Markopaşa, 27 January 1947; "Ne İnkılapçılık", Markopaşa, 24 February 1947; "Mukaddes Zincirlerimiz", Markopaşa, issue 1 (Secondary Series), p. 1, 29 October 1948; "Asır Değil Hasır", Hür Markopaşa, issue 14, p. 3, 8 August 1949; "Türkiye'de İnkılap Başlamamıştır", Başdan, issue 7, p. 1, 21 September 1948; "Hava-yı Aşk Eser Serde, Efendim Nerde Ben Nerde", Markopaşa (Secondary Series), issue 1, p. 1, 29 October 1948

<sup>344</sup> "Ne İnkılapçılık", Markopaşa, 24 February 1947

<sup>345</sup> "Eski ile Yeninin Farkı", Merhumpaşa, issue 3, p. 2, 25 October 1947

<sup>346</sup> "Kraldan Fazla Kral Taraftarı", Markopaşa, issue 8, p. 3, 27 January 1947; "Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetsiz İktidarın Devamıdır", Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, 5 February 1948; "25 Senede", Markopaşa (Secondary Series), issue 2, p. 3, 3 November 1948

<sup>347</sup> "Görülmemiş Tiyatro", Markopaşa, 3 March 1947; "Milletin Postunu Paylaşıyorlar", Merhumpaşa, 25 September 1947

Markopaşa's writers can be taken as a group of intellectuals who rejected the formal ideology to some extent and even opposed to it by employing satire and humor very effectively in order to connect with people instead.

According to Sabahattin Ali, Kemalism had an anti-imperialist and populist core, especially in the early stages of the national liberation war. The reforms that were made under those notions were sincere and successful. However in the later periods, that essence was neglected and the RPP became the center of stagnancy and political corruption.<sup>348</sup> In this sense, Kemalism was perceived by Sabahattin Ali as a progressive and modern ideology which was eroded by the wrong decisions of the RPP governments.

As seen, in the Markopaşa series, Kemalism does not appear as an already conservative ideology. Inconsistencies within Kemalism and Kemalist reformism were usually explained by wrong-doings of the RPP cadres, not through short-comings or defects of the Kemalist ideology itself. Although the governing mentality of the RPP was criticized by the journal all the time, Kemalism was usually acquitted by referrals to its constructive, unifying essence by the end.<sup>349</sup>

This can be explained by the success and positive effect of the War of Independence on Markopaşa writers who were impressed by Mustafa Kemal's role and achievements in the war as much as other leftist intellectual of their time. Thus, Markopaşa writers wanted to connect their ideology to Kemalism to some extent. Still, as leftist intellectuals, they were aware of how far Kemalists could go to eliminate their opponents, regarding the prosecutions of 1925 and 1927. Particularly between 1947 and 1949 they also experienced this first hand. Although their journal appeared during a relatively democratic climate, the writers were heavily penalized due to their opposition in the witch-hunt towards the leftists in 1948 -1949 period. Sabahattin Ali knew this via his personal experience prior to the Markopaşa series, since he was already jailed in 1931 because of a degrading poem about Mustafa Kemal he allegedly read in a meeting.<sup>350</sup> After a short sentence in jail, he was pardoned by Mustafa Kemal. In the Markopaşa period, Sabahattin Ali and Aziz Nesin were sentenced and jailed, and Rıfat Ilgaz was thrown out from the sanatorium where he was being treated for tuberculosis. Still, all of them declared that they were Kemalists (*Atatürkçü*). This means that they wanted to connect their ideology to Kemalism. It seems the writers used *Atatürkçülük* as an

---

<sup>348</sup> "Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetsiz İktidarın Devamıdır", Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, 5 February 1948; "Ne İnkılapçılık", Markopaşa, 24 February 1947; "Yaşasın Millet", Markopaşa, 17 May 1947; "Yeşil Sarık", Markopaşa, 3 February 1947

<sup>349</sup> "İstiklal", Markopaşa, 25 November 1946

<sup>350</sup> Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi, Cantek, 2001, p. 29

umbrella term to include anti-imperialist, republican, laicist, reformist features which would bring modernism and progress. As it also happened in Kadro and Yön's case, "Atatürkçülük" as a term must have helped Markopaşa writers to define themselves as patriots with a native ideology.

In a way, Markopaşa was possibly similar to other left-leaning groups of Turkey in the 1940s, which criticized Kemalists but stayed connected to it one way or another.<sup>351</sup> In the 1960s, a similar interpretation of Kemalism was adopted by leftist and left-leaning groups such as Yön, TIP, and MDD as well. This left-leaning interpretation often took examples from early years of the War of Independence and stressed Mustafa Kemal's early anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist discourses and used them to criticize contemporary developments. These leftist groups often interpreted early the 1920s as a golden age, and they tried to create an ideal form of *real* Kemalism, according to their need.

Similar to Kadro, Markopaşa's writers did not see the West as the only source of development and modernity. In the Markopaşa series, Western powers, especially the US, appeared as symbols of capitalism and exploitation.<sup>352</sup> According to Markopaşa, the late-Ottomans trusted the West and ended up being an occupied country; and in the 1940s, RPP governments were making the same mistake by trusting the US.<sup>353</sup> Closeness with the US would have brought nothing but dependency. Besides, this change of direction was a betrayal to Mustafa Kemal's legacy and was a serious threat towards gains of the Republic.<sup>354</sup>

As seen, the Markopaşa series stands out with their anti-imperialist, anti-Western attitude as Kadro did. Here, the main difference of Markopaşa from Kadro was Markopaşa's anti-American stance which was triggered by improving relations of Turkey with the US in the aftermath of WWII. Another factor that might have worried Markopaşa was Turkey's changing relations with Russia, since the relations were quite close until Turkey's stance in the WWII.<sup>355</sup> Turkey's change of direction in favor of the US and the liberal world was not favorable to them.

---

<sup>351</sup> In order to see similarities Zincirli Hürriyet of Mehmet Ali Aybar can be checked, since it welcomed many leftist at the time, including Sabahattin Ali.

<sup>352</sup> "Uşak Ruhü", Ali Baba, 16 December 1947; "Yabancı Şahit, Yalancı Şahit", Markopaşa, 17 February 1947; "Görülmemiş Tiyatro", Markopaşa, 3 March, 1947; "Ne Zor Şeymiş", Ali Baba, 25 November 1947; "Çok Yaşayın", Malumpaşa, issue 2, p. 1, 15 September 1947; "Milleti Aldatmasınlar", Markopaşa, issue 23, p. 1, 10 October 1947

<sup>353</sup> "Yabancı Sermaye", Markopaşa, 2 December 1946; "Hangi Cepheden Gelirse Gelsin Emperyalizmin Aleyhindeyiz", Markopaşa, 28 April 1947

<sup>354</sup> "İstiklal", Markopaşa, 25 November 1946; "Bir Alçak", Malumpaşa, 29 September 1947

<sup>355</sup> For detailed information: Turkey: A Modern History, Zürcher, 2007, p. 208-209

Indeed, compared to Kadro's sharp opposition towards the Western Europe, Markopaşa's discourse towards Europe was not as negative as Kadro's. Markopaşa's arguments about the West usually focused on the US, and it often appeared when foreign investments and the US' involvement with economy and politics were mentioned. In many articles, Europe was mentioned in a negative way but this was always in connection with imperialism and economic matters. Other than that, Markopaşa did not easily discard European culture in its discourse. With this approach, Markopaşa seems to be in parallel with the Yön journal, since Yön also presented a dichotomy when the West and Europe were discussed.

Kadro's writers categorized socialism and Marxism as European-originated ideas and claimed to reject them along with capitalism and liberalism. Although Markopaşa writers put emphasis on importance of nativity of their ideology,<sup>356</sup> contrary to Kadro, Markopaşa did not reject socialism. They protested being condemned as communists due to the negative connotations of communism but they did not reject socialism categorically.<sup>357</sup> It seems, according to them, Kemalism was qualified as an original and native ideology, but only with its "real" content that was formulized by the journal. Thus, the primary task of intellectuals and the people was bringing the *original* principles of Kemalism back and strengthening them through democratic, reformist, laicist, egalitarian and progressive features. Years later, the Yön journal claimed similar arguments.

Markopaşa's most obvious difference from Kadro was the journal's approach to the regime. Although both groups associated themselves with Kemalism, being from different periods and having different mentalities, Markopaşa and Kadro's stance towards the regime was quite different. Markopaşa's reformism was directly connected to its anti-imperialistic discourse which became obvious in its anti-American manifestations. Unlike Kadro, Markopaşa connected itself to Kemalism by emphasizing pluralist and populist features of early stages of Independence War. As a leftist publication, Markopaşa did not hesitate to expose shortcomings of Kemalist reform projects. The authoritarian tendencies of the regime and its implementation of reforms in a top-down fashion with a "for the people, despite the people" understanding were the main targets for the Markopaşa series.

Markopaşa series left a legacy behind with their style of opposition. In 2013, when the anti-government Gezi Protests took place in Turkey, Birgün newspaper published a Markopaşa issue in memory of the original Markopaşa. Many of the well-known leftist and progressive intellectuals

---

<sup>356</sup> "Ne İstiyoruz", Markopaşa, 10 February 1947

<sup>357</sup> The writers' leftist ideas can be followed in Hür Markopaşa, Başdan and Zincirli Hürriyet more clearly.



wrote in this issue. This also shows that the intellectuals of Markopaşa left a blueprint for the opponents of the strict governments to follow in Turkey.

## 2.6 Etatism

Unlike the Kadro and Yön journals, the Markopaşa series did not provide detailed information about etatism. Still, there is enough material to draw conclusions about the writers' ideas about Kemalist etatism and economic policies in general.

The limited number of articles devoted to etatism shows Markopaşa writers were positive about etatism and found it very necessary. Although Kadro and Markopaşa writers displayed dissimilarities about their ideas concerning other arrows, etatism seems to be the one that brought them together, and which they both attributed a great deal of importance.

Markopaşa was published in the post-war era when Turkey's relationship with the US was improving, and the country was more open to liberal economic policies compared to the early 1930s. This issue also deeply disturbed Markopaşa's intellectuals. According to them, instead of opening the country to the USA's intervention and liberalism, Turkey's independence should have been backed by etatist economic policies in order to achieve financial independence.<sup>358</sup>

Apparently, the writers' leftist ideas and their devotion to anti-imperialism were major reasons for their emphasis on etatism. Exactly like Kadro, they were worried about liberal advances in the country. They believed that a country which fought a War of Independence against imperialist countries should not have let liberal and capitalist advances in the country. This would have been a betrayal of the Kemalist principles.<sup>359</sup>

Markopaşa always mentioned etatism in connection with anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism. The journal favored a planned economy as well as land reform projects. In this sense, the journal was very much in line with Kadro journal and its efforts to insert a left-oriented discourse to Kemalist etatism projects. However, their interpretation of etatism did not seem to give a priority for connecting Turkey to the international web of anti-imperialist countries, in the way Kadro journal did. This may be due to Markopaşa's style which used satire and humour and did not devote much

---

<sup>358</sup> "İstiklal", Markopaşa, 26 November 1946; "Gazetemize İçerlemişler", Malumpaşa, issue 3, p. 2, 22 September 1947

<sup>359</sup> "Yabancı Sermaye", Markopaşa, 2 December 1946; "İstiklal", 26 November 1946; "Bir Alçak", Malumpaşa, 29 September 1947

space to ideological discussions as the way Kadro did. In this sense, Markopaşa was very different than Kadro and Yön, since it had quite an informal approach and it did not focus on the subjects in a detailed way. However, the writers continued to write about these issues in other publications. For example, Aziz Nesin was brought to trial just after the 17<sup>th</sup> issue of Markopaşa, due to a leaflet he published himself against Truman Doctrine. He was jailed on the 30<sup>th</sup> of April 1948 for ten months.<sup>360</sup>

It should also be noted that the writers did not explicitly mention the etatist arrow very often. The journal often mentioned issues about etatism through arguments about foreign investments, 7 September Decisions, the Truman Doctrine, and US economic aid.

Markopaşa writers were quite worried about the 7 September Decisions of 1946, which was mainly about the devaluation of the Turkish Lira by the Recep Peker government. Here, it should be noted that a Five-Year Plan of Turkey was also completed in 1946 with a great deal of contribution by the former Kadro members Ismail Hüsrev and Şevket Süreyya. However, the power balance changed in favor of liberal policies within a short time and 7 September Decisions were implemented as an attempt of the government to adjust itself to the liberal developments in the world. Following this, the government formed a new group which established the Turkish Development Plan, one that was more in line with liberal policies and favored private sectors compared to the previous five-year plan.<sup>361</sup>

According to Markopaşa, the outcome of the 7 September Decisions and the formation of a new committee about the economy were quite negative for the nation.<sup>362</sup> This was such an important topic that the 7 September Decisions, Prime Minister Recep Peker and the Minister of Economy Atıf İnan were all criticized at every opportunity in articles, in satirical poems, jokes and caricatures. Although the journal did not bring any extensive explanation, the writers routinely demonstrated their concern and opposition against the 7 September Decisions.<sup>363</sup> In their view, the 7 September Decisions were a milestone for the intervention of liberal policies. According to the journal, prior to 1945 the RPP governments were full of former or active military officers who considered etatism as part of communist ideology. After 1945, the country enjoyed a civil government for the first time

---

<sup>360</sup> Bir Sürgünün Anıları, Aziz Nesin, Nesin Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2005, p.7; Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi, Cantek, 2001, p. 90

<sup>361</sup> Türkiye İktisat Tarihi: 1908-2002, Boratav, 2003, p. 97-99

<sup>362</sup> “Bu Bir Rezalettir”, Merhumpaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 25 October 1947

<sup>363</sup> “Malumpaşa Ansiklopedisi”, Malumpaşa, issue 1, p. 2, 8 September 1947

but the government devoted itself to liberalism and American aid.<sup>364</sup> Thus, the journal claimed, the RPP government was not an appropriate legal political body to represent all citizens, groups, and institutions. Twenty-five years of the RPP period proved that, as a political body, RPP failed to act in the best interests of its own citizens.<sup>365</sup>

Markopaşa's interpretation of etatism was closely attached to the journal's view about populism. Unlike Kadro, which focused on rapid development and Turkey's stance within anti-imperialist movements around the world, Markopaşa tried to focus on negative effects of liberalism, what etatism would have brought to people and how etatism or land distribution policies would have had a positive impact on people's lives.<sup>366</sup> Turkey's economic independence was very important for Markopaşa. However, rather than focusing on rapid development like Kadro, the journal added "the people" to the picture and tried to explain the ways in which liberalism would have harmed Turkey's independence, especially the lives of the working classes.<sup>367</sup> According to the journal, if the economy had been managed within an etatist program, people's lives could have been improved in many ways, since etatism would have provided more of an equal share and less exploitation.<sup>368</sup> In this picture, Markopaşa writers identified themselves with the people. For example, one of the many titles of the Markopaşa journal was "Ali Baba", as the writers referred to the "Ali Baba and Forty Thieves" and claimed the role of Ali Baba against "bandit" and "thief" politicians.<sup>369</sup> In this sense, especially compared to Kadro, Markopaşa's etatism had a more direct connection to populism.

In short, Markopaşa often used arguments of etatism in order to criticize the RPP as well as DP for their tolerance of the US and its liberal policies. Its main arguments often focused on discussions about foreign investments and the 7 September Decisions of the Recep Peker government. The journal equated national independence with economic independence, and its writers were worried about Turkey's possible dependence on the US due to the liberal policies of the RPP government. For the journal, etatist economic policies and land reform could provide more equality for ordinary people and would have kept Turkey's independence intact.

---

<sup>364</sup> "Yeni Kabine Hakkında Bizim Fikrimiz", *Malumpaşa*, issue 5, p. 4, 6 October 1947

<sup>365</sup> "Ona Ne Şüphesi", *Ali Baba*, 2 December 1947; "Yem Borusu", *Merhumpaşa*, 1 November 1947; "Geçmiş Zaman Olur ki Hayali Beş Para Etmez", *Markopaşa*, 3 February 1947; "Siyaset Panoraması", *Markopaşa*, issue 20, p. 1, 5 May 1947; "Tatar Ağaları Yaya Kaldı", *Markopaşa*, 10 March 1947; "Teslim Tesellüm İşleri", *Markopaşa*, 19 May 1947

<sup>366</sup> "Baltalık Sakini Arkadaşlar", *Markopaşa*, issue 18, p. 2, 21 April 1947; "Milleti Aldatmasınlar", *Markopaşa*, 10 October 1947; "İşçi Meskenleri İçin Ameli Yollar Aranıyor", *Malumpaşa*, issue 1, p. 2, 8 September 1947

<sup>367</sup> "Ucuz Hayat", *Markopaşa*, 6 January 1947; "Baltalık Sakini Arkadaşlar", *Markopaşa*, 21 April 1947; "Markopaşa Dert Dinliyor", *Markopaşa*, issue 21, p. 4, 17 May 1947

<sup>368</sup> "Hudut", *Merhumpaşa*, issue 4, p. 1, 1 November 1947

<sup>369</sup> "Millet Haramilerin Elinde", *Ali Baba*, issue 1, p. 1, 25 November 1947; "Babafingo", *Ali Baba*, issue 2, p. 2, 2 December 1947

### 3 YÖN

Yön (Direction) was published between 1961 and 1967 by a group of influential intellectuals who were interested in political and socio-economic issues. Originally, the movement started within the opposition block within the RPP, as a criticism against the rule of the DP in the 1950s. Eventually however, it became an independent publication.<sup>370</sup>

According to Atılın, the movement was founded by two young academics, Dođan Avcıođlu and Mümtaz Soysal, who met at the end of 1957.<sup>371</sup> Although several intellectuals contributed to Yön, the core of the movement consisted of Dođan Avcıođlu, İlhan Selçuk, Mümtaz Soysal, İlhami Soysal, and Cemal Reşit Eyübođlu. The writers were usually leftist or at least had a left-leaning world-view, although they did not always share the same views on every matter. The difference of opinion between the writers was one of the strengths of the journal,<sup>372</sup> although they all thought that the right “direction” for Turkey was socialism. Thus, the name “Direction” was chosen because these intellectuals wished to show Turkey which direction to go. Along with their emphasis on socialism, they were also determined not to discard Kemalism.<sup>373</sup>

The journal was first published six months after the coup, which targeted the right-wing and liberal Democrat Party government and its strict policies. After the coup, Turkey witnessed the emergence of the Turkish left in 1961, and the TIP (Workers Party of Turkey) was formed by a group of trade unions in 13 February 1961.<sup>374</sup> As such, the journal was a result of the relatively free atmosphere after the coup d’état of May 27<sup>th</sup> 1960, which was led by the Kemalist military officials.

Yön began its publication with a declaration of “Aydınların Ortak Bildirisi” (The Declaration of Intellectuals), which was signed by the many prominent public figures and intellectuals. Some of the Kadro and Markopaşa writers, such as Aziz Nesin, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir and Rıfat İlgaz also signed it. In this declaration,<sup>375</sup> the journal explained its objectives and expressed its wish to

---

<sup>370</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Gökhan Atılın, Yordam Kitap, İstanbul, 2008, p. 33

<sup>371</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılın, 2008, p. 36

<sup>372</sup> The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism, Özgür Mutlu Ulus, I.B.Tauris: London, 2011, p. 20

<sup>373</sup> “Bildiri” (Aydınların Ortak Bildirisi), Yön, issue 1, 20 December 1961; “İnanç Buhranı”, Dođan Avcıođlu, Yön, issue 11, p. 3, 28 February 1962

<sup>374</sup> The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism, Ulus, 2011, p. 65

<sup>375</sup> Although Aziz Nesin and Rıfat İlgaz showed their support for the Yön by signing the declaration, later they joined TIP, probably due to their more leftist line compared to Yön.

reach the level of modernity and development of civilized Western countries, which had also been a goal of Mustafa Kemal.

The writers claimed that the original goals of Kemalism had not been achieved, and the national liberation movement that was initiated by Mustafa Kemal was not yet complete.<sup>376</sup> They argued that the former RPP governments had not been able to grasp the importance of etatism to fulfil its original principles. Due to different opinions within the RPP, early etatist attempts had been interrupted,<sup>377</sup> and the power of the dominant classes had continued.<sup>378</sup> In addition, the constant instability of politics was directly related to Turkey's underdeveloped economy and the journal believed this was the most significant problem for Turkey.<sup>379</sup> As such, *Yön* journal intended to be a platform to find ways of solving Turkey's issues, since it could bring "active forces" of society together - which included progressive military members and civil intellectuals - to form a "National Front" (*Milli Cephe*).

At this point, *Yön*'s solution was formulating a non-capitalist development plan - a "new etatism" - to recover and strengthen the economy. The new etatism was not going to be limited solely to economy. Once it was well planned and carefully implemented, it was going to be a transformative force for society as a whole and carry it to a socialist order. This was perceived by the journal as a model of development "within social justice".<sup>380</sup> Indeed, the intellectuals of *Yön* thought that if Kemalism could be reconstructed with the help of socialism, it could be the "saviour" of Turkey. According to them, Kemalism was not fundamentally different from socialism. After all, Mustafa Kemal's thought displayed anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist features; thus it could have functioned as a native "Turkish socialism".<sup>381</sup>

As a result, the journal always tried to connect Kemalism and socialism via the leftist attributions of Kemalism. In their attempt, they heavily emphasized the populist and the etatist arrows, the former for its claim of social justice and the latter for its possibility to enable a development plan.

---

<sup>376</sup> "Bildiri" (Aydınlara Ortak Bildirisi), *Yön*, 20 December 1961

<sup>377</sup> "Biz Ne İstiyoruz", Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Yön*, issue 198, p. 3, 11 January 1967; *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın*, volume I, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara, 1971, p.294, 299

<sup>378</sup> *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın* Doğan Avcıoğlu, volume II, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara, 1971, p. 676

<sup>379</sup> "Bildiri" (Aydınlara Ortak Bildirisi), *Yön*, 20 December 1961

<sup>380</sup> "Efendilerimiz", Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Yön*, issue 3, p. 3, 3 January 1962

<sup>381</sup> "Sosyalizme Giden Yollar: Sosyalizmden Önce Atatürkçülük", Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Yön*, issue 69, p. 8-9, 10 April 1963; "Sosyalist Kültür Dernekleri Açıldı" (Notes from a panel discussion), *Yön*, issue 75, p.8-11, 25 May 1963; "Atatürkçülük Emperyalizme Karşı Savaş Demektir", İlhami Soysal, *Yön*, issue 137, p. 5, 12 November 1965; "Emperyalizm ve Kapitalizme Karşı Atatürk" (the writer is not mentioned), *Yön*, issue 74, p. 8, 7 October 1962

In the 1960s, socialism was a taboo word in Turkey and Yön was determined to change this, although it was not the only taboo that the journal targeted. The other taboo subjects, such as the predicament of communist poet Nazım Hikmet - who was deprived of his Turkish citizenship and died in diaspora in the Soviet Union - as well as Kurdish issue, were addressed by the journal as well.<sup>382</sup> As a result, similar to Markopaşa, Yön also had its share of reactions and attacks from the ultra-nationalists. In January 1962, copies of the Yön journal were set on fire by nationalist youth in Taksim Square, along with Cumhuriyet, Milliyet, Akşam and Dünya newspapers.<sup>383</sup>

In its early days, and similar to Kadro, the journal tried to convince the RPP to implement their ideas. Later on, the members tried to collaborate with the TIP to achieve their goals via the parliamentary system. When their expectations were not met in the 1965 elections, the journal gradually turned towards the military and started to articulate the army's power to change the system. Here, the positive image of the coup d'état of May 27<sup>th</sup> in the leftist and progressive groups of Turkey should be kept in mind. Since this coup was mainly directed at the right-wing DP government and Turkey's set back in Kemalist ideals, it created a positive image for many leftists.<sup>384</sup> It was described as the "27 May Revolution" or "27 May Movement" by many and it was considered as a restoration of Kemalist ideals by the army. This fact applies to the Yön intellectuals as well. Although not everybody in the journal shared the exact same view, the positive image of the coup affected them and possibly made it easier for the journal to change its direction.

After Yön, the movement continued writing with "Devrim" (Revolution) journal between 1969 and 1971. Devrim was published by some of the leading members of Yön, such as Doğan Avcıoğlu, İlhan Selçuk, Cemal Reşit Eyüboğlu, and İlhami Soysal. It articulated the ways of military intervention, and it was in touch with prominent military commanders, such as General Cemal Madanoğlu.<sup>385</sup> Eventually, the Devrim circle established a close relationship with the military junta planners of March 9<sup>th</sup> 1971 and were involved in a military conspiracy directed by Madanoğlu. Indeed, the future program of the movement was prepared based on Avcıoğlu's theories published in Yön and "Türkiye'nin Düzeni" (The Social Order of Turkey).<sup>386</sup> However, this junta attempt failed due to the problems within the group.

---

<sup>382</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 254; "Yön Bir Demagojiyi Daha Yıkıyor: Nazım Hikmet", Yön, issue 83, p. 15, 30 October 1964

<sup>383</sup> "Sosyalist Milliyetçilik Söylemi (Türkiye, 1961-1968): Temeller, Ayrılıklar", Gökhan Atılğan, Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 2009, volume 64, issue 3, p. 9

<sup>384</sup> Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism, Ulus, 2011, p. 13-14

<sup>385</sup> Ibid., p. 51

<sup>386</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 233

Devrim seemed optimistic about the March 12<sup>th</sup> 1971 military intervention, since the journal still regarded it as the army's reaction against the anti-Kemalist course and continued to believe in the army's progressive role.<sup>387</sup> However, the March 12<sup>th</sup> intervention was quite different than what people expected from a "leftist" coup and it suppressed the leftists instead. As such, the journal was closed down on 27 April by the "operation sledgehammer" (Balyoz Harekatı), which was brought about by the Martial Law declared in eleven cities. Although the members were cleared of all charges in court, the March 12<sup>th</sup> intervention marked the end of the Yön-Devrim movement.<sup>388</sup>

Nonetheless, similar to Kadro and Markopaşa journals, Yön also surpassed being a journal, created a movement and left a legacy behind. It played a major role in the political life of Turkey and became a driving force to give more space to the leftists in the press and the politics. It refreshed the connection between Kemalism, nationalism and leftist ideas, which had already been made by the early Turkish socialists and systematized by the Kadro movement. However, Yön went one step further from its predecessors by claiming to target a socialist order and paved the way for radical interpretations of Kemalism. Its major difference from Kadro and Markopaşa was to take practical action in order to seize power.

### **3.1 Nationalism**

Since the early 1920s, Turkish leftists interpreted the national War of Independence as an anti-imperialist movement. In the 1930s, Kadro described it as an anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, national democratic war, and was the earliest example of its kind. In this way, Kadro systematized leftist attributions between anti-imperialism, nationalism and Kemalism. In the following years, the association between these ideas continued; and the people who needed to make a connection followed this pattern. In the 1960s, the anti-imperialist independence movements of the third-world such as Cuba, Vietnam, Egypt, and China set different examples for the countries with similar issues. Even though Turkey gained its independence in the early 1920s, the attributions between Kemalism, anti-imperialism, and nationalism became important once again due to the new developments.

---

<sup>387</sup> "Parlamentoculuğun Takkesi Düştü", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 74, 23 March 1971; "Teşhis ve Tedavi", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 73, 16 March 1971

<sup>388</sup> The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism, Ulus, 2011, p. 63

The Yön group described itself as a Kemalist movement and the writers often embraced its nationalist arrow.<sup>389</sup> Nevertheless, Yön made it clear that the journal was against any sort of nationalist classification based on ethnicity or race.<sup>390</sup> The writers made a distinction between “nation” (millet) and “people” (halk), and they put the main emphasis on the second one.<sup>391</sup> Still, they intentionally mentioned “nationalism” as part of their development program, because nationalism was not a property of any particular group.<sup>392</sup> At this point, they tried to use it in a different context and limited its meaning to patriotism. According to them, nationalism simply meant love of the people, and it required working for the best interest of Turkey; therefore Yön writers were the best nationalists.<sup>393</sup> In this way, they connected nationalism and populism and they tried to undertake the nationalist image which was usually owned by the right wing politicians.

Yön’s possible definition of the “nation” did not seem very different than Mustafa Kemal’s version, which referred the nation as a group of people who share a common language, history, and culture. However, due to its left-oriented ideology, the journal always perceived the economy as a crucial factor for Turkey and regarded it as a decisive element in nation-building process like Kadro and Markopaşa.

Yön seemed to perceive nationalism as a social project and associated it with progressive and modernizing elements.<sup>394</sup> According to Avcıoğlu, Kemalist nationalism was incomplete due to its lack of understanding of the economic field. He stated that socialism was the best method for rapid development within social justice, therefore, socialism was the best form of nationalism.<sup>395</sup> In this way, he declared that the journal’s intention was challenging and reconstructing Kemalism by connecting it to socialism.

Yön members often described themselves as Kemalist, nationalist, and socialist intellectuals at the same time.<sup>396</sup> Nonetheless, they claimed that their nationalism was different than traditional

---

<sup>389</sup> “Bildiri” (Aydınlara Ortak Bildirisi), Yön, 20 December 1961

<sup>390</sup> “İrkçı Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye”, İdris Küçükömer, Yön, issue 52, p. 11, 12 December 1962; “Kürt Meselesi”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 194, p. 3, 16 December 1966; “Gericiler Azınlıktadır”, Erdoğan Alkan, Yön, issue 49, p. 14, 21 November 1962

<sup>391</sup> “Milliyetçilik”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 3, p. 11, 3 January 1972; “Kürt Meselesi”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 16 December 1966

<sup>392</sup> “Sosyalist Kültür Dernekleri Açıldı”, Yön, 25 May 1963; “İrkçilik Nedir” (Speech of deputy Recai Iskenderoğlu), Yön, issue 41, p. 8, 26 September 1962

<sup>393</sup> “Milliyetçilik”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, 3 January 1962

<sup>394</sup> “Gericiler Azınlıktadır”, Erdoğan Alkan, 21 November 1962

<sup>395</sup> “Yapıcı Milliyetçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 4, p. 3, 10 January 1962

<sup>396</sup> “Gericiler Azınlıktadır”, Erdoğan Alkan, Yön, 21 November 1962; “Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 36, p. 3, 22 August 1962



nationalist views because it directly connected to modernity, development, and progress.<sup>397</sup> Exactly like Markopaşa intellectuals, they called themselves as “real” nationalists in order to mark their difference. According to Avcıoğlu, leftists, Kemalists and modernist intellectuals were the genuine nationalists; not the traditional exploiter groups who claimed nationalism and accused all progressive people with communism.<sup>398</sup>

Yön made a distinction between the progressive nationalism of oppressed countries and reactionary nationalism of oppressors as well.<sup>399</sup> However, similar to Kadro, Yön interpreted Lenin’s work in a selective manner and underestimated his temporary and conditional tolerance for nationalism. By making a direct connection between nationalism and socialism via assumed anti-imperialist features of nationalism, the journal justified its nationalist interpretation within a socialist context. Here, Yön’s interpretations look similar to Third World nationalisms of the 1960s with its anti-imperialist outlook.

According to Yön, co-existence of socialism and nationalism was not contradictory. On the contrary, to be a “real” nationalist, one had to be a socialist.<sup>400</sup> According to the writers, as the War of Independence proved, nationalism could have revolutionary content to bring people together to fight against imperialism.<sup>401</sup> A real nationalist was always against capitalism and imperialism, at least in the underdeveloped countries.<sup>402</sup> In the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, nationalism meant rapid development within a populist, etatist and revolutionist program.<sup>403</sup> Thus, due to nationalism’s anti-imperialist features, a combination of nationalism and socialism was always possible.<sup>404</sup>

Yön criticized the TIP for creating confusion by depicting internationalism and nationalism as opposing ideas.<sup>405</sup> Contrary to what TIP expressed, Avcıoğlu claimed that being an internationalist and nationalist at the same time was possible, and the merging of these ideas did not create a conflict. The nationalism Yön supported was a nationalism of third-world countries, in other words “socialist nationalism”. As Atılğan also stresses, Avcıoğlu claimed that Yön’s “socialist

---

<sup>397</sup> “1962’de Türk Milliyetçiliği”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 25, p. 7, 6 January 1962

<sup>398</sup> “Yapıcı Milliyetçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 10 January 1962

<sup>399</sup> “Milliyetçilik”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, 3 January 1962; “Gericiler Azınlıktadır”, Erdoğan Alkan, Yön, 21 November 1962

<sup>400</sup> “Sınıf Mücadelesi, Sosyalizm ve Milliyetçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, issue 182, p. 3, 23 September 1966; “Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 22 August 1962

<sup>401</sup> “Medrese Atatürkçülüğünden Gerçek Atatürkçülüğe”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 85, p. 3, 13 November 1964

<sup>402</sup> “Bizim Milliyetçiliğimiz”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 3, p. 7, 3 January 1962; “Milliyetçilere Sesleniş”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 77, p. 3, 25 September 1964

<sup>403</sup> “1962’de Türk Milliyetçiliği”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, 6 January 1962

<sup>404</sup> “Yapıcı Milliyetçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 10 January 1962; “Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, 22 August 1962

<sup>405</sup> “Açık Seçik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 199, p. 7, 20 January 1967; “Büyük Oyun”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 197, p. 3, 6 January 1967

nationalism” was not opposite of internationalism because it was the result of a profound internationalism.<sup>406</sup>

It seems Yön believed in the possibility of independent nations within a socialist world order. At the beginning of the 1930s, Kadro members advocated similar ideas. Although Kadro rejected internationalism as a concept due to its leftist connotations, the journal’s descriptions were quite similar to Yön’s model. The combination of anti-imperialism and nationalism was essential to Kadro’s ideology as well. Compared to Yön however, Kadro’s nationalism was more distinct and it did not seek a socialist objective, while the relationship between nationalism and socialism was more crucial for Yön. Another interesting point here is Şevket Süreyya’s support for Yön. His articles in the journal served to make left-oriented attributions to Kemalism again. As in the Kadro period, he wrote about etatism as well as anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist features of Turkish War of Independence. In the 1960s, he added a populist touch to his previous ideas and he argued for the possibilities of creating a “Turkish socialism”.<sup>407</sup> However, he still argued that “Turkish socialism” was a form of reformism and it did not include an option for a revolution in a Marxist sense.<sup>408</sup>

Like Yön, the anti-imperialist feature of nationalism was put forward in Markopaşa as well. The intellectuals of this journal linked themselves to socialism primarily via anti-imperialism. However, connecting nationalism and anti-imperialism was not a decisive element in Markopaşa’s ideology. Its main focus was primarily on populism and creating an opposition towards the system backed by the ordinary citizens.

Indeed, by attributing anti-imperialist features to nationalism, Yön tried to connect socialism and Kemalist ideology, since Kemalism is heavily defined with nationalism. Yön’s interpretation of nationalism was almost the same with ideas of the MDD group (National Democratic Revolution Group) of the 1960s. Both groups believed in the possibility of a connection between Kemalism and socialism via anti-imperialism within a strong nationalist context.<sup>409</sup> TIP also made similar attributions but with less stress on nationalism. Still, almost all of the TIP members, including

---

<sup>406</sup> “Kapitalist Gözüyle Marksizm”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, issue 203, p. 2, 17 February 1967 *as cited in* Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılınan, 2008, p. 106

<sup>407</sup> “Fikir Atatürkçülüğü ve Kelime Atatürkçülüğü”, Şevket Süreyya, Yön, issue 6, p. 9, 24 January 1962; “Türk Sosyalizmi ve Fikir Atatürkçülüğü”, Şevket Süreyya, Yön, issue 7, p. 7, 31 January 1962; “Kemalizm Orta Malı Değildir”, Şevket Süreyya, Yön, issue 17, p. 9, 11 April 1962; “Garip Bir Devletçilik”, Şevket Süreyya, Yön, issue 19, p. 9, 18 April 1962

<sup>408</sup> “Sosyal Devlet ve Türk Sosyalizmi”, Şevket Süreyya, Yön, issue 40, p. 9, 19 May 1962

<sup>409</sup> The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism, Ulus, 2011, p. 99-100

Behice Boran who had a more Marxist line, accepted anti-imperialism as an essential feature of Kemalism.<sup>410</sup>

At this point, Lenin and Stalin's work seem to provide a necessary base for Yön to insist on the combination of the two ideas. As mentioned in the Kadro chapter, Lenin and Stalin's differentiation between the "progressive" nationalism of independence movements in underdeveloped countries and "reactionary" nationalism of imperialist exploiter countries already opened the way for this sort of combination. As a result, Lenin's "Rights of Nations for Self-Determination" and Stalin's "Marxism and the National Question" became a widespread point of reference for the leftists of Turkey, who already carried nationalist tendencies from the beginning.

Another important point that separated the Yön movement from Kadro's and brought it closer to the Markopaşa was Yön's handling of the Kurdish issue. Kurdish issue drew the attention of the leftist groups in the 1960s. For example, TIP organized Eastern Rallies in order to make connections with the people from those regions. Regarding the Kurds, Yön did not share the official Kemalist view. Doğan Avcıoğlu believed in the necessity of challenging the official view about this issue to break the taboo about it.<sup>411</sup> As mentioned by Atılğan, he became the first one to name the issue as the "Eastern Problem" (Doğu Sorunu).<sup>412</sup> When Yön members wrote about Kurds in other countries, they usually separated it from the "Eastern Problem" and mentioned the subject as "Kurdish issue".<sup>413</sup>

Yön became a vanguard publication in the republican history which voluntarily tried to make a contribution to solve this issue. The writers mentioned this subject by recognizing the problems of not only Turkish side but also of the Kurds. By daring to write about the problems of Kurds and the Eastern regions, the writers tried to normalize, and discuss this issue as well as to establish an objective ground to talk about it.

Similar to Kadro, at first, the journal approached this subject with discussions about the economy and why the Eastern regions were underdeveloped and how those conditions contributed to the problems in the area.<sup>414</sup> Nevertheless, the journal improved its discourse and in time it managed to bring up valuable discussions. The writers translated interviews of Kurdish leaders, such as

---

<sup>410</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 133, 135

<sup>411</sup> "Kürt Meselesi", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 16 December 1966

<sup>412</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 109

<sup>413</sup> "Kürt Meselesinde Son Gelişmeler", Yön, issue 158, p. 1, 8 April, 1966

<sup>414</sup> "Doğu", Yön, issue 3, p. 5, 3 January 1962

Barzani, from other sources and published in the journal.<sup>415</sup> More importantly, the journal opened its pages to young Kurdish and Turkish writers who had constructive ideas about this matter. In this way, different people with liberal or leftist ideas expressed their thoughts about the problems. For example, the consequences of not recognizing the existence of the Kurdish people and language, and positive and negative sides of a possible native-language education for the people who primarily speak Kurdish were discussed in *Yön*.<sup>416</sup>

Despite the journal's positive and constructive approach towards the Kurds, some of the writers were not totally immune to the common prejudices towards non-Turkish, non-Muslim minorities. Although the journal was quite careful about ethno-racial discrimination and racism, the writers sometimes did not hesitate to employ an exclusivist language about sensitive issues, such as minority schools or conflicts between Greece and Turkey about Cyprus.

According to Niyazi Berkes, religion-based schools, especially Orthodox ones should have been strictly controlled by the Directorate of Religious Affairs.<sup>417</sup> *Yön* blamed the mentality of those schools for their relatively independent spirit, the vague content of their programs and their tendency for engaging in treasonous activities in favor of their own establishments. According to the journal, *"In the minority schools, the students often do not speak Turkish and their Turkish language teachers do not speak any minority language. They can not communicate with each other. Besides, due to their obscure programs, nobody really can inspect those schools efficiently. It is a mystery what they teach to the students. Those schools teach the students everything about their religion and native language but they do nothing about teaching them Turkish."*<sup>418</sup> The tone and ideas about this subject resemble Kadro writers' ideas about minorities, especially the ideas of Burhan Asaf, who was furious at minorities due to their negligence about Turkish.

As seen, the journal was sceptical about the non-Muslim minorities and their religious establishments. According to Berkes, the nationalism of the Anatolian Greeks was nothing but a tool for the imperialists. He claimed the religious leaders of the Anatolian Greeks were not only Greek nationalists but also US agents who were sent Turkey to fight against the leftists and the communists. The clergy of those religious establishments was supported not only by their community but also by the whole Greek nation and the US. Those establishments were harmful to

---

<sup>415</sup> "Barzani'yi Tanıtıyoruz", *Yön*, issue 41, p. 12-13, 26 September 1962

<sup>416</sup> "Doğu Davamız", *Yön*, issue 26, p. 12-13, 13 June 1962; "Şemdinli Röportajı 16", Muzaffer Erdost, *Yön*, issue 188, p. 12-13, 4 November 1966; "Türkiye'de Kürtçülük" (the writer is not mentioned), *Yön*, issue 72, p. 8-10, 1 May 1963

<sup>417</sup> "Atatürk Türkiyesinde Ekümenlik, Patriklik", Niyazi Berkes, *Yön*, issue 84, p. 10-11, 6 November 1964

<sup>418</sup> "Azınlık Okulları" (the writer is not mentioned), *Yön*, issue 34, p. 6, 8 August 1962

Turkey, because they were deliberately triggering nationalism of the minorities and working against the Turkish nation's independence.<sup>419</sup>

In another article, Yön stated that the "Armenian issue" did not exist for Turkey. The journal criticized the Armenians who still lived in Turkey but dreamt of an independent Armenia. According to the journal, problems about Armenians should not have been in Turkey's agenda anymore, since all the issues about them were yesterday's matter.<sup>420</sup>

As seen, the expressions of the journal sometimes included an exclusivist tone and carried same nationalist defensive reflex which can be observed in Mustafa Kemal's utterances as well as in Kadro and partially in Markopaşa journals.

Apparently, not only Kadro and Markopaşa but also Yön attributed left-leaning ideas to Kemalism, mainly via anti-imperialism. This approach was a common tendency within almost all the leftist or left-leaning groups of the republic like TKP, TIP or MDD. Whether they adopted socialism or not, all of these groups seemed to use anti-imperialism as a mediator in order to connect their leftist ideology to Kemalism. Depending on the degree of their nationalism, some of them, like Yön and MDD, tried to connect nationalism and socialism as well. This link often meant proof of their nativity; since they were often accused of being communist. Thus, embracing Kemalism and its nationalist side was bringing them nativity and legitimacy within its established and respected nature. Except for Markopaşa, Yön and especially Kadro shared the exclusivist tone of the Kemalist nationalism to different degrees, even though the journals openly rejected any racist or ethno-racial discrimination. In Kadro, exclusivist features were more common and general. However, in Yön, they were less frequent and were limited to the certain subjects which were highlighted due to the political developments at the time.

### 3.2 Populism

"People" (*halk*) and "nation" (*millet*) were used interchangeably by Mustafa Kemal, the RPP and the Kadro group. Neither of the groups made any definite distinction between two concepts, since there was an overlap between two words for them. In the 1940s, Markopaşa also used the same

---

<sup>419</sup> "Atatürk Türkiyesinde Ekümenlik, Patriklik", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, 6 November 1964

<sup>420</sup> "Bir de Ermeniler Çıktı" (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 47, p. 5, 7 November 1962

words interchangeably. Still, due to its leftist connotations made by many of the Turkish leftists at the time, the journal attributed more meaning to “people”.

Unlike the early RPP members and Kadro, Yön made a clear distinction between the two words. The writers deliberately preferred “people” rather than “nation” due to its populist meaning. Besides, “people” gave a hint about the classes. According to them, this was also what Mustafa Kemal meant with populism.<sup>421</sup>

Compared to Kadro, Yön writers had a different interpretation of the concept of “people”. According to them, “the people” mostly consisted of working classes and progressive military and civil intellectuals. They excluded the members of the bourgeoisie, upper classes, and rich landlords from their description of “the people”, because they were “the exploiters of the working classes”. They made an exception for members of the military by claiming that they usually originated from middle-class families, therefore the Kemalist army was part of the people.<sup>422</sup> Like Yön, Kadro writers also mentioned exploiter classes when they referred feudal relations in the Eastern provinces, but they never articulated the meaning of “the people” clearly. Markopaşa’s usage of this term was more similar to Yön, since it displayed the journal’s class consciousness with its stance in favor of the working classes all the time. Still, it never gave any priority to the intellectuals or military like Yön.

According to Yön, Mustafa Kemal was a populist leader and the Kemalists handled many things quite successfully. Nonetheless, they failed to bring long-lasting solutions, especially for working classes.<sup>423</sup> This created one of the main problems with Kemalist populism which was never resolved the distance between the governors and the citizens.<sup>424</sup> The journal declared that in order to solve this problem Yön was going to complement Kemalist ideology with “social justice”, because development could only have been achieved in that way.<sup>425</sup>

Yön’s interpretation of populism had a socialist outlook, and their left-oriented ideas can easily be traced in the discourse of the writers. According to Mümtaz Soysal, *“If democracy means ‘governance of the people by the people’, then there should not be any incompatibility between democracy and socialism. (...) Within all economic systems, socialism is the only one which*

<sup>421</sup> “Halkçılık İlkesi ve Sosyalizm”, Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 47, p. 5, 7 November 1962

<sup>422</sup> “Sosyalist Gerçekçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 39, p. 3, 12 September 1962

<sup>423</sup> “Kaynağa Dönüş”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 47, p. 3, 7 November 1962

<sup>424</sup> “AP’nin Öğrettikleri”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 51, p. 3, 5 December 1962

<sup>425</sup> “Efendilerimiz”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 3 January 1962

*attributes lots of value to the people and ordinary citizens. After all, socialism is the system of believers of people.*<sup>426</sup>

As Fahrettin Altun points out, when Yön writers put socialism and Kemalism together, they focused on the concept of “populism”. They equated populism with socialism and this generally meant an opposition against the hegemony of rich and feudal classes as well as against capitalism.<sup>427</sup>

According to the journal, socialism was just another name for Kemalist populism.<sup>428</sup> Avcıoğlu argued that the populism of the early 1920s was similar to Yön’s interpretation of socialism in the 1960s. He claimed that *“The first assembly, which carried the spirit of Kuvayi Milliye (national forces of the liberation movement), was constituted of members of the middle class, such as military officers, merchants from small towns, and religious leaders. There wasn’t any group there to represent big-trade and industry. There, Atatürk declared that they were populists, because national forces regarded populism as an essential part of liberation. Populism meant to them being against notables and wealthy landlords of the towns and cities and supporting governance of working classes. Today we call this outlook socialism. We might call it populism as well.”*<sup>429</sup> Nevertheless, he also mentioned that the first assembly was still conservative rather than a progressive establishment. It adopted populism but did not push the reforms further to realize the populist ideals.<sup>430</sup>

Yön writers emphasized certain aspects of Kemalism, such as anti-imperialism, anti-capitalism, and the aim of a classless society to demonstrate the compatibility of Kemalist ideology and socialism. They often referred to the early years of the War of Independence, when the populist discourse of Mustafa Kemal was evident. The writers often revisited speeches and utterances of Mustafa Kemal to show socialist elements in them. In their descriptions, Mustafa Kemal appeared as a leader whose ideas were in agreement with socialism. In this process, some of the characteristics of Mustafa Kemal’s ideas which would have caused contradictions with Yön’s ideology were ignored. It can be

---

<sup>426</sup> “Demokrasi Anlayışımız”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 30, p. 3, 11 July 1962

<sup>427</sup> “Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967”, Fahrettin Altun, Middle East Critique, Vol 19, No. 2, Summer 2010, p. 142

<sup>428</sup> “Halkçılık İlkesi ve Sosyalizm”, Sadun Aren, Yön, 10 October 1962; “Kaynağa Dönüş”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 7 November 1962

<sup>429</sup> “Kaynağa Dönüş”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 7 November 1962

<sup>430</sup> Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi II, Doğan Avcıoğlu, İstanbul Matbaası, İstanbul, 1974, p. 475-476

said that very much like Kadro and Markopaşa, Yön interpreted the motives of Mustafa Kemal and early Kemalists according to its agenda and ideological preferences.

These attempts became quite obvious in Avcıoğlu's book, "Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi" (The History of National Liberation), which he wrote just after the Yön-Devrim period. He argued that many of the Turkish nationalists of the 1910s and 1920s were in fact follower of leftist ideas. According to him, even Ziya Gökalp became a leftist in time, regarding his progressive ideas on populism, social justice and social classes. Avcıoğlu intentionally overlooked solidarist core of Gökalp's ideology and insisted that Gökalp's thinking swiftly shifted towards a leftist ideology, because like Yön, he was also a nationalist, anti-liberal, anti-Marxist and a supporter of a classless society, which was based on a mutual collaboration of social classes rather than a clash between them. Avcıoğlu claimed that even the former Unionist and later the liberal DP politician Celal Bayar had a leftist phase, and this was obvious in Bayar's being one of the founders of Green Army of famous Çerkes Ethem, which aimed realizing a Muslim communism in Turkey.<sup>431</sup>

As seen, Yön usually regarded Kemalist ideology as competent with left-oriented ideas. The writers perceived the War of Independence as a "national revolution" and the early Kemalists as the "nationalist revolutionaries". According to them, those early attempts were interrupted due to the failure of the early RPP cadres. They left liberal and conservative exploiter powers intact, and at the end, collaboration of those groups stopped Kemalist reforms and Turkey departed from populist ideals. Still, the people who wanted to change Turkey's fate in the 1960s needn't have felt hopeless. Kemalism was not an end but a beginning. Kemalist populism could have resumed from the point where Mustafa Kemal left it and be a guideline for the restoration of Turkey again.<sup>432</sup>

Since their interpretation of socialism was in the context of populism, Yön's writers directed their attention to the social classes and classless society. Nevertheless, they were not always consistent with their arguments over the Kemalist interpretation of classes. Sometimes they criticized early Kemalist cadres for refusing to admit to the existence of classes, but other times they praised them for their Kemalist ideals of a classless society, even though Mustafa Kemal's version carried a solidaristic outlook rather than a socialist one. Avcıoğlu claimed that Mustafa Kemal tried to create a classless society with the populist arrow in the beginning.<sup>433</sup> According to Sadun Aren, Mustafa Kemal longed for creating a classless society; he even named his political party the "People's

---

<sup>431</sup> Ibid., p. 464-467

<sup>432</sup> "Devrimciliğin Halkçılığı", Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 47, p. 4, 7 October 1962

<sup>433</sup> "Sınıf Mücadelesini Kim Körüklüyor", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 57, p. 3, 16 January 1963



Party” accordingly. Therefore, socialism can be taken as an intrinsic element in Kemalism and the Kemalists of the 1960s should have been working to reach this original Kemalist objective, which could only be possible by the formation of a socialist society in the way Mustafa Kemal envisioned from the early 1920s.<sup>434</sup> However, in another article, Aren criticized Mustafa Kemal by arguing that he knew socialism, and he intended to form a classless society with the help of populist arrow, but he abandoned this aim later. After this alteration, Mustafa Kemal changed the terminology about classes and he neglected the necessary entities which were a prerequisite for a classless society, such as etatism and land distribution.<sup>435</sup>

The Kadro writers were aware of the existence of different social classes like Yön and they idealized a classless society. However, there was a difference between the discourses of the two groups regarding socialism. Contrary to Yön’s frequent referral to socialism, Kadro was openly against a classless society in a socialist - Marxist context, even though the writers were influenced by Marxist thought to some extent. Regarding classes, they often preferred the Kemalist solidaristic option over socialism. Here, it should be noted that Yön’s ideas about classless society were not indispensable ideological elements, since the journal’s emphasis on socialism changed within the years, as well as its idealization about classless society.

Yön’s arguments about classes often belonged to the journal’s early years. Similar to Kadro, the writers did not embrace classic Marxist understanding of classes. In spite of their idealization of a classless society, they also claimed that the Yön movement was against a classless society in a Marxist sense, because that option would have involved class conflicts and the dictatorship of proletarian classes. Again very much like Kadro, Yön criticized Marxist theory due to its failure for not bringing a solution for underdeveloped, non-European countries. Avcıoğlu argued that bloody class wars would not have helped Turkey to reach a classless society as the way Atatürk imagined. The only way to achieve this goal was implementing a non-capitalist development strategy, in other words, a “new etatism”. In this way, Turkey would have reached a classless structure without dealing with the Marxist model. Turkish socialists who grasped the *real* meaning of Kemalist theory were to follow this road.<sup>436</sup> Here, it is possible to see the power and persistence of Kadro’s arguments from the early 1930s, since Avcıoğlu built on the same arguments.

---

<sup>434</sup> “Halkçılık İlkesi ve Sosyalizm”, Sadun Aren, Yön, 10 October 1962

<sup>435</sup> “Atatürk’ün Ozlediği Türkiye’yi Kurabildik mi?”, Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 47, p. 12-14, 7 October 1962

<sup>436</sup> “Sınıf Mücadelesini Kim Körüklüyor”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 16 January 1963

The issues of the populist arrow were usually explained in connection to the etatist arrow. According to Avcıoğlu, failure of the populist arrow was caused by the mistakes of the nationalist revolutionaries, who claimed to protect the people against the tyranny of capitalism but failed by adopting liberal policies in Izmir Economy Congress as early as 1923. Following this, the Constitution of 1924 hindered the possibility of land distribution. The leaders of the RPP tolerated liberal economy policies, and they let big business get involved in politics. As a result, a proper merging of populist arrow and etatist policies never took place.”<sup>437</sup>

However, like early Kemalist cadres, Yön’s populist discourse seemed to deteriorate over the years, especially after Yön’s disappointment with changing the system via the parliamentary system. Indeed, unlike the TIP, which was led by Mehmet Ali Aybar and aimed to be in contact with working classes and peasants with its more populist strategy, Yön’s intellectuals always opted for military officials to collaborate from the beginning. Although they declared that the second step of etatism was a transformation process towards socialism, they did not intend to attract the attention of working classes since the journal was not after a revolution in the Marxist sense but a gradual change in a national context.

As Altun mentions, Yön writers did not believe in transformative characteristics of social forces like the proletariat. According to them, the “active forces” (the dynamic sections of the public which included army officers and intelligentsia) were to be trusted to work with.<sup>438</sup> According to İlhan Selçuk, military forces had always been the executor of all the reforms since the Tanzimat period. Since the army always had a crucial role in the Westernisation and modernisation of Turkey, it was likely to be a more powerful ally for progressive forces rather than working classes.<sup>439</sup> İlhami Soysal described the army as “the light in the midst of despair” and “the source of hope”.<sup>440</sup>

As explained by Atılğan, Avcıoğlu was aware of the fact that the army or state officials would have been reluctant to support a movement which would be based on the leadership of proletarian classes. He thought that a military officer would not have followed the leadership of the workers.<sup>441</sup> Thus, Yön eventually envisioned a political movement to be directed by the “active forces”. Once

---

<sup>437</sup> “Kaynağa Dönüş”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 7 November 1962

<sup>438</sup> “Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967”, Altun, 2010, p. 150

<sup>439</sup> “Türkiye’de Ordu”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 5, p. 10, 17 January 1962

<sup>440</sup> “Çıkmazlar İçinde Bir Işık: Ordu”, İlhami Soysal, Yön, issue 37, p. 7, 10 October 1967

<sup>441</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 169

the working classes and ordinary citizens saw tangible results by the active forces, they would support Yön's choices.

Yön believed that the army officials and intellectuals could be objective and could behave differently in order to work for reforms Yön targeted.<sup>442</sup> Therefore, instead of persuading working classes, Yön members tended to connect with military and civilian elites to seize political power from above for quick results.

The journal's inspirational sources seemed to be nationalist and progressive regimes which were prone to coup d'états for seizing power, rather than the movements that organized from below. As the first country to gain its independence in Africa, Egypt became an idol for the journal due to its eclectic socialist discourse.

According to its 1964 constitution, Egypt was a nationalist, anti-communist, anti-Marxist, anti-imperialist cooperative-socialism which introduced a land reform project.<sup>443</sup> Nasser came to power with a military coup d'état which was led by the members of pro-independence "Association of Free Officers". Despite its eclectic populist discourse, active participation of the working classes in politics was not possible.<sup>444</sup> As seen, it is possible to find similarities between Yön's ideology and Nasser's example in Egypt, especially when the journal's admiration for Nasser's success was well documented starting from the first issue.<sup>445</sup>

The journal's attitude towards the state was quite similar to Kadro, which claimed that the state was above all the classes, and could operate as an unbiased, objective institution in the hands of a *right* intellectual cadre. While Kadro insisted that a state model that had no ill-effects of any social class was possible, Yön believed in the objectivity of the military forces, elevating them above the other classes and relying on their help for socialist development. However, Yön's methods and ideology became an issue of discussion within leftist circles. Yön was criticized on this matter by the TIP

---

<sup>442</sup> "200 Yıldır Neden Bocalıyoruz VII: Atatürkçülük Nedir Ne Değildir", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 63, p. 8-9, 28 February 1963

<sup>443</sup> "Mısır: Nâsır Sosyalizmi," Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, İletişim Yayınları, 1988, volume 4, p. 1297

<sup>444</sup> Ibid., p. 1304

<sup>445</sup> "Nasır'ın Sosyalizmi", Yön, issue 1, p. 21-22, 20 December 1961; "Nasır Mısır Sosyalizmini Anlatıyor", Yön, issue 7, p. 19, 31 January 1962; "Arap Sosyalizminin Kaynakları", Yön, issue 26, p. 15, 13 June 1962; "Nasır'ın Hedefleri", Yön, issue 29, p.16, 4 July 1962

and Hikmet Kıvılcımlı just as Kadro was criticized for a similar reason by liberal Ahmet Ağaoğlu and TKP members like Şefik Hüsnü and Nazım Hikmet.<sup>446</sup>

After the 1965 elections, when discussions about a parliament-centered political regime intensified and ideological differences between leftist groups became more apparent, Yön was criticized by the TIP for its choice of the target group with whom to collaborate.<sup>447</sup> As stated by Atılğan, according to the TIP and Behice Boran, army officials and state-elites were already a part of certain social classes, and they were indispensable for the existing system. This fact should have been enough for classifying them as unqualified allies. They were already playing a functional part within the system, and it was not possible for those classes to think independently, let alone lead crucial reforms against the benefit of their own social classes. Thus, those military and state officials who were relied on by Yön lacked any possibility of creating a radical transformation. They would not have risked their privileges. Thus, rather than embarking upon that risky choice, reaching out to the proletarians and peasants would have been a more logical decision.<sup>448</sup>

Hikmet Kıvılcımlı, a prominent figure in radical left in Turkey, directed severe criticisms at the Yön movement as well. In 1970, he wrote about Yön in a book, “May 27 and A Denominational Critique of the Yön Movement”, where he criticized the movement for confusing the meaning of “nüfus” (population) with “nüfuz” (influence of authority). He claimed that Yön’s real aim was to strengthen the influence of the state rather than the influence of people. According to him, Yön postponed socialism to an unknown future, precisely like Mustafa Kemal postponed the *Program of Populism* in the 1920s and he never brought it into the agenda. As he turned his back to populism, Yön turned its back to socialism, because the journal was not genuine about its socialist goals. The journal’s vague ideas about the people were a clear indication of this. Despite its socialist discourse, Yön’s concept of the people was not different than traditional state elites, but it managed to disguise this by employing a modern terminology.<sup>449</sup>

Regarding its wish for immediate action to realize its objectives rather than convincing the public, Yön’s understanding of organizing a political movement seems similar to Unionists and Kemalist cadres under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal. Indeed, the journal followed a similar pattern to Unionists, Ziya Gökalp, Kemalists and Kadro members when it comes determining the groups to

---

<sup>446</sup> 27 Mayıs ve Yön - Devrim Hareketinin Sınıfsal Eleştirisi, Kıvılcımlı, 2008, p. 93; “Siyasi Notlar: Aybar ve Milli Cephe Çağrısı”, İlhami Soysal, issue 199, p. 6, 20 January 1967

<sup>447</sup> “Büyük Oyun”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 6 January 1967; “Açık Seçik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 20 January 1967

<sup>448</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 133

<sup>449</sup> 27 Mayıs ve Yön - Devrim Hareketinin Sınıfsal Eleştirisi, Kıvılcımlı, 2008, p. 94 - 111

collaborate with and regarding the role of the masses in political action. However, Yön differed from them by referring to “the people” as a more active element, especially in its early years. Due to this fact, Yön was different than Kadro, which had even more elitist outlook and lacked a populist as well as a socialist discourse. Therefore, in their attempt to connect socialism and Kemalism via the populist arrow, and particularly in equating populism with socialism, Yön was more similar to the Markopaşa journal.

Still, compared to Markopaşa and TIP, Yön’s ideology was more elitist. TIP insisted on giving more space to working classes in political life, as Markopaşa did in the late 1940s, and it objected relying on the power of the military. As Ulus emphasizes, the party was against transition to a socialist regime through an authoritarian solution and opposed to any top-down intervention by either the civil or military elites. According to Behice Boran, there could be “no short-cut” to socialism.<sup>450</sup> Especially under the leadership of Aybar, the TIP’s regulation-book did not give any privilege to the intellectuals and even tried to hinder hegemony of their power.<sup>451</sup>

In short, like Kadro and Markopaşa, Yön intentionally revived populist discourses of early years of the War of Independence and referred to anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist speeches of Mustafa Kemal quite often. These three journals, especially Kadro and Yön, were prone to shift the axis of socialism and Kemalism in order to use them according to their needs. In this process, ambiguity and the relatively ill-defined content of Kemalism must have helped them.

### **3.3 Etatism**

In this chapter, Yön’s ideas on etatism and socialism will be discussed, since it regarded both as major tools for development.

Yön regarded the economy as a substructure for society and political life. Since its writers perceived instability in the economy as a fundamental cause for the inconsistencies in the society and in politics, economic development had an utmost priority for them. In this sense, etatism can be taken as one of the core ideas of Yön’s ideology, as it was of Kadro’s.

---

<sup>450</sup> The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism, Ulus, 2011, 67-68

<sup>451</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılın, 2008, p.168

According to the journal, Turkey's biggest problem was economic development and Turkey needed to create an anti-imperialist, non-capitalist development plan immediately.<sup>452</sup> Here, Yön was forming its own solution, "new etatism",<sup>453</sup> and the journal was attempting to bring a new interpretation to the third-way etatism practices, which were already expressed in several ways until then. Similar to Kadro, Yön members tried to restore the weak points of Kemalism by stressing the importance of etatist economic policies in order to break free from the capitalist system.

Economic development was an important topic for the Turkish Republic since the 1930s. However, Yön differed from the existing interpretations with its emphasis on socialism.<sup>454</sup> Accordingly, once it was adapted to Turkey's conditions, socialism could be the best way for rapid development.<sup>455</sup> Yön's new etatism was going to be an alternative anti-capitalist third-way, which was originally developed by Mustafa Kemal.<sup>456</sup>

As emphasized by Altun, Yön claimed that basic principles of Kemalist theory reflected the basic formula of Turkish etatism and Turkish socialism.<sup>457</sup> According to Avcıoğlu, socialism could be taken as one of the arrows of Kemalism, since it was a continuation of Kemalist ideals.<sup>458</sup>

Yön always connected etatist and populist arrows. According to its ideological leader Avcıoğlu, socialism was the only system that could enable the country to develop rapidly within social justice.<sup>459</sup> The new etatism was not a project that ignores populist principles.<sup>460</sup> The primary objective of etatism was giving preference to needs of people; therefore etatism and populism were inseparable.<sup>461</sup>

Avcıoğlu argued that an independent economy could be achieved in two ways without causing class struggles. It could either be done by developing state capitalism in the country as the way Soviet

---

<sup>452</sup> "Bildiri" (Aydınların Ortak Bildirisi), Yön, 20 December 1961; "Devletçilik: Ne İstedığımızı Biliyor muyuz?", Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 1, p. 18, 20 December 1961

<sup>453</sup> "Yapıcı Milliyetçilik", Doğan Avcıoğlu, 10 January 1962; "Yön Cevap Veriyor (Bildiri)", Yön, issue 12, p. 11, 7 March 1962; "Kalkınma Programı 1: Arayış", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 12, p. 9, 7 March 1962

<sup>454</sup> "Sınıf Mücadelesini Kim Körüklüyor", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 16 January 1963; "Demokrasi ve Sosyalizm", Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 34, p. 3, 8 August 1962; "Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 22 August 1962

<sup>455</sup> "Niçin Sosyalizm", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 7, p. 3, 31 January 1962; "Cepheler Beliriyor", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 44, p. 3, 17 October 1962

<sup>456</sup> "Sosyalizme Giden Yollar: Sosyalizmden Önce Atatürkçülük", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 10 April 1963; "Sosyalist Kültür Dernekleri Açıldı", Yön, 25 May 1963

<sup>457</sup> "Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967", Altun, 2010, p. 141

<sup>458</sup> "Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 22 August 1962

<sup>459</sup> "Niçin Sosyalizm", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 31 January 1962; "İşçiler ve Devletçilik", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 29, p. 4, 4 July 1962

<sup>460</sup> "Yön Cevap Veriyor", Yön, 7 March 1962

<sup>461</sup> "Kalkınma Programı: Devletçilik", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue, 26, p. 7, 13 June 1962

Russia did or by a transition to a “domestic” socialism outside of the capitalist circle with the help of new etatism. Yön advocated the second solution and insisted that this was an attainable possibility for Turkey.

As Atılgan points out, the origin of this model was inspired by dependency theory, which appeared after World War II as a reaction to modernism theory and attempted to bring solutions of development to underdeveloped, third-world countries which engaged in an independence struggle.<sup>462</sup>

Yön’s new etatism favored labor, but it was not against private enterprise. It had an anti-capitalist motive but the journal was against class conflicts and proletarian dictatorship in the Marxist sense and sought support of the “active forces” to realize a new model for etatism.<sup>463</sup>

Similar to Ismail Hüsrev’s ideas in the 1930s, Avcıoğlu claimed that there were three ways for development. The first one was Asian Socialism and it was quite an efficient way for rapid growth. However, it was bound to result in totalitarian regimes. Besides, Turkey lacked a strong proletarian class and conscious peasantry that this system required. The second one was Western Socialism, but this system required capital accumulation which Turkey already lacked. The final one was “Third-World Socialism” or, as it was sometimes mentioned in the journal, “Socialism of Underdeveloped Countries”. He insisted that the third model was the only option for underdeveloped countries, which neither had necessary social classes nor capital accumulation in order to develop a socialist system. Thus, this model was peculiar to third-world countries.<sup>464</sup>

Avcıoğlu further argued that Third-World Socialism was a transition period in essence, and it had two inner stages. The first step was an anti-imperialist “national democratic revolution”, which was already achieved by Turkey in 1923. This stage was going to be followed by a second step, which was basically a struggle for economic independence against the capitalist economy. Turkey lacked economic independence, therefore it had yet to reach this second step. The transition to socialism would have been much easier, once society had achieved an independent economy.

---

<sup>462</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılgan, 2008, p. 92

<sup>463</sup> Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın, volume II, Avcıoğlu, 1971, p. 677-717

<sup>464</sup> Ibid., p. 670-677; “Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 22 August 1962

Similar to Kadro, Yön's suggestions for the new etatism required a strict and broad etatist plan in order to create a sufficient accumulation of capital. According to this plan, an extensive land reform was necessary as well as spreading of organizations like syndicates and cooperatives.

However, while explaining their economic program, very much like Kadro journal, Yön encountered an important obstacle to overcome. This was providing clear explanations to questions about the new etatism: How was Turkey going to stay outside of the capitalist economy? Why was the new etatism unique and in which ways was it going to be an alternative to the capitalist economy? Since Yön's main arguments were based on this issue, the journal's explanations about it are quite important. Despite its importance, this point was left rather ambiguous in the journal. Like Kadro members, Yön intellectuals wrote about etatism extensively but they deliberately omitted explaining how exactly new etatism was going to outside of the capitalist system. After the Yön journal, Doğan Avcıoğlu wrote on the same issues extensively in his book, "Türkiye'nin Düzeni", but the book did not bring a satisfying answer as well.

The problem originated over the claims about the uniqueness of the New Etatism. It seems that Yön was, in fact, advocating for an economic model which was based on a mutual collaboration of state and private enterprise. Apparently, this was a mixed model, including state capitalism. Therefore, in spite of Yön's claims, "new etatism" was still within the capitalist economy, rather than a break from it. Here, Fahrettin Altun mentions an important point about development model of Yön. According to him, *"All economic models of development refer to a 'Western level of development'; even though Yön's writers have identified the capitalist development model with imperialism and the dominance of the private sector, they still considered the Western process of development as a historical model and a path to follow. There is no radical difference between these development models in practice. All these models are considered essential industrialization for non-Western societies and are based on top-down intervention policy regardless of a society's authentic historical, cultural, geographical, social and economic conditions. In this sense, whether such models favor state capitalism or stem from liberal sources, they basically adopt similar policies."*<sup>465</sup>

Yön was probably aware of this fact from early on, and members opposed liberals and right-wing conservative politicians, as their motive to avoid being associated with capitalism could be understood. This sort of association would have undermined the credibility of their discourse. The writers must have needed to follow a discourse of uniqueness in order to hold their ground.

---

<sup>465</sup> "Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967", Altun, 2010, p. 154



Therefore, Yön explained how to apply new etatism clearly but avoided to explain its nature. Unlike Kadro, Yön had clearer explanations and resisted employing a prophetic, complex language. However, there were still ambiguous points in Yön's new etatism exactly like in Kadro journal.

Yön members seemed to be sincere about their anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist motives. However, they were trying to collaborate with army officials and state elites. Under those circumstances, they might have avoided expressions such as "state capitalism", which would have been easily linked to Soviets and communism. As such, they did everything to prevent any association between the journal and the negative image of communism, due to powerful anti-communist propaganda in Turkey and the world at the time.<sup>466</sup> Moreover, socialism had a high prestige within the military due to the success of the national cooperative socialism experiments which were initiated by the military officers, and the writers were probably aware of the fact that communism would not have been a relatable ideology for progressive army members.<sup>467</sup> According to Avcioğlu, supporting Nasser meant supporting the Arab world, which changed its direction towards socialism.<sup>468</sup> In this sense, except for the emphasis on Islam, Yön's socialism model resembled socialism experiments in the non-Western world with strong national tones, especially the ones in Arabic and African countries.

While having influential arguments over the economy was quite important for Kadro members in the early 1930s, Yön was in a similar situation in the 1960s, when non-Western national movements emerged from their strong anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist discourse and the writers were impressed by their rise and success.<sup>469</sup> As a result, Yön highlighted revolutionary and innovative assertions about Kemalism, and claimed to complete Kemalism with the help of the socialist ideology. Being associated with Kemalism was crucial for Yön in order to demonstrate its nativity and originality. A modernized version of Kemalism was going to be a domestic version of socialism for the journal. This point became more important in the later periods of Yön, especially when the journal needed to secure its collaboration with army officers and other intellectual elites. Apparently, Kemalism was the common point to bring Yön and those circles together.

Both Kadro writers and the RPP declared that their solution was a "third way" between capitalism and socialism. Nevertheless, they did not utter anything about changing the system towards

---

<sup>466</sup> "Kökü Dışarıda Bir Dernek", İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 125, p. 5, 20 August 1965

<sup>467</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 54, 223

<sup>468</sup> "Amerika ve Arap Sosyalizmi", Doğan Avcioğlu, Yön, p. 3, issue 61, 13 February 1963

<sup>469</sup> "Sosyalist Cezayir", Doğan Avcioğlu, Yön, issue 15, p. 3, 28 March 1962

socialism and they never described socialism as an ultimate goal. Unlike Yön, Kadro's third-way interpretation was an alternative to socialism as well as to capitalism.

Indeed, Yön's objective to realize socialism and its nature deserve a thorough examination. However, the body of this work is not enough for such lengthy arguments; therefore only some essential points will be mentioned.

In his book, Atılgan refers to Yalçın Küçük's comparison between Kadro and Yön, which indicates that Kadro's etatism aimed at using leftist ideas for the Kemalist ideology to strengthen it but Yön's interpretation of etatism helped the revival of socialist movements and spreading of socialist ideas instead.<sup>470</sup> In a way, Atılgan displays Yön's difference from Kadro with its stress on socialism and socialist movements. Nevertheless, despite its arguments about the connection between Kemalism and socialism, Yön was against a classless society in a Marxist sense, and it criticized Marxist theory for lacking a solution for non-European, underdeveloped countries.<sup>471</sup> Besides, by not being against private property or private equity, and while rejecting class struggle and proletarian dictatorship, Yön showed its distance towards Marxism. The journal was particularly against the socialist line of the Soviet Russia.<sup>472</sup> Although its writers did not think in the same direction all the time,<sup>473</sup> the Soviet example of socialism was criticized in several ways by the journal and this made Yön's anti-communist discourse quite apparent.<sup>474</sup>

According to the journal, socialism was completely different than communism. First of all, socialism was not a destructive ideology like communism. It did not pose any threat to Turkey because it was a system to achieve a steady development within social justice. It was also the opposite to communism due to its national character. In order to stop the threat of communism, Yön's interpretation of socialism should have been supported.<sup>475</sup>

Similar to RPP and Kadro members, many of Yön's writers shared an aversion towards upheavals and the idea of a revolution. Until 1965 they tried to support other leftists such as TIP, since they

---

<sup>470</sup> As cited in *Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar*, Atılgan, 2008, p. 96

<sup>471</sup> "Sosyalizme Giden Yollar: Sosyalizmden Önce Atatürkçülük", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 10 April 1963; "Sosyalizm Komünizmin Zehiri mi Panzehiri mi" Abdi Ipekçi, Yön, issue 5, p. 7, 17 January 1962

<sup>472</sup> "Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967", Altun, 2010, p. 154

<sup>473</sup> There were pro-Soviet intellectuals like Sadun Aren who contributed to the journal, but later joined the TIP.

<sup>474</sup> "Sınıf Mücadelesini Kim Körüklüyor", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 16 January 1963; "Türkiye Komünist Partisi", İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 157, p. 5, 1 April 1966; "Milliyetçi Komünistler", İlhami Soysal, Yön, issue 148, p. 8, 21 January 1966

<sup>475</sup> "Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 22 August 1962; "Devletçilik: Ne İstedığımızı Biliyor muyuz?", Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 1, p. 18, 20 December 1961

believed that changing the system through democratic channels was possible.<sup>476</sup> Although the writers appreciated the success of Cuba and Vietnam,<sup>477</sup> they did not intend to follow the revolutionary pattern of those countries.

In the first half of the 1960s, the TIP was also trying to bring socialism to Turkey but Yön's writers did not join this party. The main reason was the ideological difference between the two groups, since the TIP also advocated a gradual transformation to socialism with democratic means but the party was clearly aiming a Marxism-oriented socialism.<sup>478</sup> Yön criticized the TIP for dividing nationalist-socialist powers unnecessarily by neglecting nationalist features and emphasizing socialism more than necessary as if the TIP was the only socialist group in Turkey.<sup>479</sup> Yön never intended to turn away from its connection with deep-rooted and well-respected establishments like army and state. Yön members were reluctant to abandon the Kemalist ideology since it would have brought an instant authority to Yön members once they seized the power.

Although many Yön members proved the cordiality of their socialist ideas, compared to TIP, their motive to reach a socialist order seemed weaker. Rather than having a genuine socialist goal, Yön seemed to employ it in the restoration of Kemalism. In this way, Kemalism was going to be saved from being a backward ideology and was going to continue to be Yön's main ideological reference point as well as its source of political legitimacy.

Yön's stress on the state was not solely limited to the economic field, and it considerably went beyond the limits of economic etatism. Consequently, the journal tolerated the state's dominant power over politics and society in many levels just as Kadro did. According to Altun, Yön's writers depicted Kemalism as an unquestionably sacred path to follow and they approved of many of Kemalists policies, along with several aspects of the political culture of the 1930's.<sup>480</sup>

Hikmet Kıvılcımlı severely criticized Yön for its wide tolerance for state's authority. He argued that its members regarded state intervention as the only solution for social and financial issues. They

---

<sup>476</sup> "İnönü'den Beklediğimiz", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 9, p. 3, 14 February 1962; "Rejim Buhranı", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 10, p. 3, 21 February 1962

<sup>477</sup> "Küba", Türkkaya Ataöv, Yön, issue 2, p. 22, 27 December 1961; "Asya Tipi Üretim Nedir", Selahattin Hilav, Yön, issue 151, p. 4, 18 February 1966

<sup>478</sup> In the ideology of many TIP members Stalinism was more pronounced and the party consistently refused Leninism. see: *The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism*, Ulus, 2011, p. 64, 75

<sup>479</sup> "TIP'e Dair", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 168, p. 3, 17 June 1966; "Büyük Oyun", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 6 January 1967; "Açık Seçik", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 20 January 1967

<sup>480</sup> "Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967," Altun, 2010, p. 154

simply perceived everything within the limits of the state by relying on the effectiveness of state too much. They wanted every single thing about Turkey to be under state control, because they assumed that everything belonged to the state. He further claimed that Yön's socialist understanding was a "timid socialism," because socialism was always "tomorrow's matter" for Yön and it was always going to be postponed due to the urgency of other pressing matters. He accused Yön of bringing a seasoning of socialism to an already authoritarian state model, and presenting it as if it was a new alternative.<sup>481</sup>

In short, Yön writers aspired to develop a unique theory, a "domestic socialism" for Turkey and they perceived it as a tool for rapid development. They were also aware of the power of connecting socialism with a respected and native ideology of Kemalism. Yön needed to acquire legitimacy for the journal's view of socialism, therefore the journal tried to redefine Kemalism by attributing an essence which could suit the world-view of left-leaning intellectuals. A socialism with strong national tendencies would also secure their hand towards traditional nationalists, once it was backed up with Kemalism.

### **3.4 Reformism**

Yön's understanding of reformism was closely attached to its writers' interpretation of development and etatism.

As Altun points out, the issue of development was integral to the post-1945 foreign policy of the US and it was considered as a supra-ideology objective in Turkey in the same period. The development discourse eventually spread from central government to all ideological groups.<sup>482</sup> The importance of the development discourse continued in the following years. Accordingly, Yön declared that the goals of modernization and Westernization of Kemalism could only be achieved with economic development. Hence, future developments in education or culture depended on etatist plans.<sup>483</sup>

The transition from empire to the republic preceded by the War of Independence was considered a *national democratic revolution (Milli Demokratik Devrim)* by the writers. This transition was often

---

<sup>481</sup> 27 Mayıs ve Yön Hareketinin Sınıfsal Eleştirisi, Kıvılcımlı, 2008, p. 94 -101

<sup>482</sup> "Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967", Altun, 2010, p. 152-153

<sup>483</sup> "Bildiri" (Aydınların Ortak Bildirisi), Yön, 20 December 1961

referred to as the biggest reform project that ever took place in Turkey, since it fundamentally changed the form of the state.<sup>484</sup>

Naming the transition as a *national democratic revolution* urged Yön writers to explain their interpretation of Kemalist reformism. Similar to Kadro and Markopaşa, Yön supported basic features of the official Kemalist version of the War of Independence and Mustafa Kemal's indispensable role in it. Similar to those journals, Mustafa Kemal's being anti-imperialist and his wish to found a republic was accentuated.<sup>485</sup> This view often overlooked deeds of Mustafa Kemal which would have contradicted the journal's claims over Kemalism.

Like Markopaşa, Yön partially adopted the Kemalist discourse of the reformist arrow and tried to insert left-oriented concepts to Kemalism as if these concepts would have been the initial motives of the Kemalist movement. As Altun also mentions, Yön writers often appeared to deliver their messages via Mustafa Kemal and they claimed what Turkey confronted in the 1960s was similar to the situation in the 1920s, and the revolutionists of the 1960s needed to overcome obstacles by embracing Mustafa Kemal's original principles.<sup>486</sup> As a result, when Yön called its readers for *returning to the original*, the journal presented its objectives as if they were the primal purposes of Mustafa Kemal and his supporters in the early 1920s.

In Yön, the implementation method of the reforms was an important issue which was subject to long discussions. According to Avcıoğlu, the revolutionary action program of the 1960s should have been in favor of people, because all the other options failed before. The gap between power-holders and citizens should have been overcome, since this gap caused an alienation between people and early revolutionary forces. It was possible to seize power in spite of the people's will but that sort of tyranny would not have lasted long.<sup>487</sup> As former experiences proved, by working against the people's will and without convincing them of the reforms and securing their voluntary collaboration, any realistic change would not have taken place, even though all the efforts were for the benefit of those people.<sup>488</sup> As seen, these arguments are very much in the same line with the Markopaşa journal.

---

<sup>484</sup> "Devrimciliğin Halkçılığı", Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, 7 October 1962

<sup>485</sup> Ibid.

<sup>486</sup> "Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal: Yön, 1961-1967", Altun, 2010, p. 141; "Sosyalizme Giden Yollar: Sosyalizmden Önce Atatürkçülük", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 10 April 1963

<sup>487</sup> "Cepheler Beliriyor", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 44, 17 October 1962

<sup>488</sup> "Kaynağa Dönüş", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 7 November 1962

In this way, Yön connected the populist and the reformist arrows. However, in the course of time, the populist discourse of the early issues gradually toned down, and the writers started to justify top-down reform methods more often. For example, Niyazi Berkes claimed that some of the necessary reforms should have been implemented, even though the people would not have understood them thoroughly. That was what prestigious leaders like Mustafa Kemal did previously.<sup>489</sup>

Although Yön criticized the “for people, despite people” mentality of Kemalists, in the long run, the journal’s ideology proved to follow a similar pattern, especially when the methods of reformism were concerned. Yön came after the relative success of the May 27<sup>th</sup> coup d’état and believed in a top-down reform process. Although the writers used the term “revolution” quite often, they expected to realize the progress in order and stayed away from revolutionary ideas of Marxism.

Regarding this issue, Atılgan argued Yön was a continuation of a traditional mentality, because like the Young Turks, Unionists, and Kemalists, intellectuals of the Yön movement believed in a transformation in a top-down fashion, not the other way around. Years later, in an interview with Hikmet Özdemir, Doğan Avcıoğlu also acknowledged this similarity.<sup>490</sup> Indeed, according to Fahretin Altun, all the development models which considered industrialization essential for non-Western societies were based on top-down intervention policies, regardless of society’s background and conditions.<sup>491</sup> Yön was no exception to this fact.

Yön’s interpretation about the essence of Kemalist reformism was an issue that caused a contradiction about the West and Westernization. Gökhan Atılgan argues that there was a dichotomy about Westernization in the Yön movement.<sup>492</sup> This seems quite right because it was possible to come across articles which contradicted with each other due to their pro or anti-Western sentiments. After all, Yön consisted of a broad group of intellectuals who did not necessarily think in the same direction. This can be understood as one of the main reasons behind the dichotomy about the West and Westernization.

Still, a gradual change in the overall view towards Westernisation can be observed in the journal. In the early issues, anti-Western sentiments were relatively weaker and the journal’s discourse was

---

<sup>489</sup> “Batıcılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler V: Niyazi Berkes Türk Aydınlarını Anlatıyor”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 103, p. 8-9, 19 March 1965

<sup>490</sup> Yön - Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marxizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılgan, 2008, p. 27

<sup>491</sup> “Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967”, Altun, 2010, p. 154

<sup>492</sup> Yön - Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marxizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılgan, 2008, p. 136

more parallel with official Kemalist discourse.<sup>493</sup> As early as 1962, ideas about development outside of Western practices appeared in the journal. Although criticism towards the West was not as strong and extensive as it was in Kadro journal, the journal's anti-imperialist stand was quite clear. It seems that by 1964 anti-American sensitivities became more obvious. By 1965, in the articles of Niyazi Berkes about westernization and modernity, Yön's criticism towards the West became clearer.<sup>494</sup> This change was also a result of political developments as well as Yön's constant search for alternatives for modernity and development.

Here it should be kept in mind that compared to the Kadro and Markopaşa journals, Yön was published for a longer period, and it was affected by various changes between 1961 and 1967, especially by the success of non-Western examples of third-world countries. The writers had the chance to observe the circumstances of underdeveloped countries from Latin America to the Middle East, and from Asia to Africa for a longer period. In the course of time, they might have elaborated on their ideas better and reached the idea that the West was responsible for the underdevelopment of the third-world, therefore Westernisation should not have been taken as an ideal model.

Yön's anti-Western sentiments made it easy for the journal to insist on the *unprecedented nature* of the Turkish national democratic revolution, which was mentioned by Kadro thirty years ago. According to Berkes, the Kemalist notion of revolutionism was different from both Western and Bolshevik models and it was a unique example for the world.<sup>495</sup> These are the exact ideas that were expressed in Kadro in the 1930s. However, unlike Kadro, Berkes avoided discarding socialism as a Western ideology.

Regarding modernism and westernization, Yön interpreted Kemalism as a break from the traditional mentality of Turkish-Ottoman elites. In refusing the traditional inclination to follow Western examples and turning to non-Western alternatives instead, Yön can be seen as a successor of Kadro journal.

However, Yön's criticism of the West does not directly place the journal in parallel with the ideas of Marxist wing of Dependency theory. As Nasser's movement in Egypt, Yön was distant to

---

<sup>493</sup> "Bildiri" (Aydınlarm Ortak Bildirisi), Yön, 20 December 1961; "Devrimcilik Nedir", Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 48, p. 6, 14 October 1962

<sup>494</sup> "Baticılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler II: Batı Emperyalizmi ve Batı Uygarlığı", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 98, p. 12, 19 February 1965

<sup>495</sup> "Baticılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler VIII: Milli Kurtuluş Savaşı", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 105, p. 10-11, 2 April 1965

Marxism in many ways, even though it was inspired by it and employed some of its core concepts to develop its socialist discourse. It should also be kept in mind that Yön always made changes about the core ideas of Marxism and did not share its revolutionary spirit or its reliance on the proletariat. This issue became very obvious in the ideological differences between Yön and the TIP groups. As mentioned before, the TIP, and especially Behice Boran, criticized Yön's ideas about socialism from the beginning, particularly about the nature of the desired socialist regime and how to organize it. Still, due to the necessary alliance between two groups for the 1965 elections, both groups ceased criticism towards each other. However, after they were disillusioned with the elections, both turned against each other again and brought up the issues which showed their different approach to socialism.<sup>496</sup>

For Yön, leaning on the proletariat would not have worked in Turkey since this class was not strong enough to end the feudal system of powerful notables and landlords of small towns and cities. Instead of using TIP's suggestions for organizing a movement from below with the support of workers and peasants, Yön chose to collaborate with the already strong classes, like progressive military officers and intellectuals to make a sudden change in the system with a top-down movement. Yön's arguments about these issues clearly show the journal's distance to Marxism. Avcıoğlu emphasized that Turkey's structure was not suitable for revolutions, therefore socialism should be brought about step by step. Further, since Turkey already had Kemalism as a domestic and anti-imperialist ideology, the socialists should have started using Kemalism as a development plan and improve it with socialist ideas. Only after some improvements in Turkey's structure, could socialism be brought about through reformist policies.

The journal was inspired by Soviet Russia's "non-capitalist development" arguments, since some of the third-world countries followed an anti-imperialist and nationalist course and reached a certain level of development.<sup>497</sup> For Yön, the main inspiration for this model was clearly Egypt. The journal connected anti-imperialism, development and Kemalism and, exactly like Nasser's movement, came up with an anti-imperialist, nationalist, reformist, anti-liberal discourse which gave working classes a secondary position. While the TIP was clearly more anti-capitalist in its discourse, Yön's relationship with capitalism was sometimes contradictory like Nasser and not anti-capitalist.<sup>498</sup>

---

<sup>496</sup> "Türkiye Sosyalist Hareketinde Anti-Emperyalizm ve Bağımsızlıkçılık (1920-1971)", Gökhan Atılğan, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Sol*, volume 8, p.685

<sup>497</sup> *ibid.*, p. 598-599

<sup>498</sup> *ibid.*, p. 692-694



As pointed out by Atılgan, with the effects of 1968, leftist youth in Turkey were more receptive to revolutionary ideas and this marked a break from the methods of Yön and TIP movements. Groups like THKP-C and THKO were affected by the examples from China and Cuba and the ideas of THKP-C specifically followed the revolutionary ideas of Latin America, Soviet Russia, Vietnam and especially Cuba to a great extent and developed a new revolutionary action program in the late 1960s and early 1970s.<sup>499</sup> Contrary to the younger generation's revolutionary efforts, the core group of Yön followed a more traditional example and decided to seize power from above via the support of the military - like Nasser had in Egypt in the early 1950s. Yön became a unique group by bringing non-Western development ideas to the agenda and staying loyal to a heavily emphasized anti-imperialist discourse, although it stayed away from the revolutionary aspects of Third-World movements. Indeed, it preferred seeing development result from top-down reform projects which did not fundamentally change the system of property relations.

Although they elaborated on criticism towards West, Yön writers hardly made a connection between the conservative and authoritarian nature of Kemalism and its possible European sources. Instead, they tried to reformulate Kemalism within a socialist context. This eventually created some inconsistencies and contradictions in their ideology. As Altun states, they often idealized Kemalism in the form of “*real*” Kemalism and presented it as an unquestionably sacred path. In this manner, Yön contributed to the formation of a conservative political language and political philosophy in the name of modernization. Although the journal gave new interpretations to Kemalism, Yön contributed to the formation of a political conservatism of Turkish political culture, even though it defined itself as a socialist movement.<sup>500</sup>

### **3.5 Laicism**

Yön perceived laicism in connection with the reformist arrow and part of a major reform project that took place in Turkey.

According to Yön, the modern world required modern systems like socialism, which could set people free from the restrictions of religion and tradition. The journal pointed out that socialism

---

<sup>499</sup> *ibid*, p.697

<sup>500</sup> “Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967”, Altun, 2010, p. 154

was an endeavor to create a new type of people.<sup>501</sup> According to Mümtaz Soysal, this objective completely depended on laicist and rational education, especially in rural areas.<sup>502</sup>

Ilhan Selçuk argued that when the worn and torn barricades of religion were demolished in the 1920s, the country became a better place. The abolition of religious establishments carried Turkey further and made Turkish people more Turkish, more human, more nation-like, more civilized, and more free.<sup>503</sup> Berkes stated that development could only be achieved within laicist establishments, where Kemalist laicism was strong, since when mistakes and concessions were made about laicism, the system deteriorated.<sup>504</sup> As seen, Yön writers were thinking in the same direction with Mustafa Kemal, Kadro and Markopaşa members who also referred to laicism as one of the main traits of Turkish nation as well as of the basic and progressive principles of the modern world.

Berkes and Mümtaz Soysal often mentioned discussions about enlightenment and Islam, regarding the discussions about training “enlightened” clerks through state schools like the Imam Hatip Schools.<sup>505</sup> According to Berkes, enlightenment within religion was a highly contradictory issue due to opposing natures of enlightenment and religion. One should not have expected fruitful outcomes from procuring “enlightened” clerks through the religious schools, because it would have ended with nothing but more concessions about laicism.<sup>506</sup>

In parallel to Kadro and Markopaşa, Yön followed the Kemalist rhetoric about laicism and how religious establishments and groups exploited people’s beliefs and how they helped the imperialist, occupying powers during the War of Independence.<sup>507</sup> In the articles, religion, exploitation, and imperialism are often connected to each other. Niyazi Berkes mentioned the ties between the caliphate and occupying powers of the War of Independence and he reminded everyone of the reasons for the abolishment of the caliphate and several other religious establishments by Mustafa Kemal.<sup>508</sup> The writers perceived traditionally conservative groups such as big landowners, big businessmen, and religious leaders as anti-laicist and comprador classes which collaborated with imperialists. According to Yön, those groups were not different than the caliph and his supporters in

---

<sup>501</sup> “Kalkınma Programı 1: Arayış”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 7 March 1962

<sup>502</sup> “Köyde Sosyalizm”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 38, p. 20, 5 September 1962

<sup>503</sup> “Mukaddesat Tezgahtarları”, Ilhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 8, p. 7, 7 February 1962

<sup>504</sup> “Batıcılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler X: Tarih Tezi’nin Temel Kavramları”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 107, p. 11-12, 16 April 1965

<sup>505</sup> “Köyde Sosyalizm”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, 5 September 1962

<sup>506</sup> “Batıcılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler X: Tarih Tezi’nin Temel Kavramları”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, 16 April 1965; “Aydın Din Adamları” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 36, p. 4, 22 August 1962

<sup>507</sup> “Türkiye’de Laiklik Uzerine”, Gülten Kazgan, Yön, issue 33, p. 8, 1 August 1962

<sup>508</sup> “Batıcılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler VIII: Milli Kurtuluş Savaşı”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, 2 April 1965

the 1920s who subjected the country to exploitation. However, East was still East, and nothing had really changed there. Thus, it was impossible for Turkish intellectuals not to oppose those tyrants.<sup>509</sup> As seen, the laicist arrow was another way for Yön to connect Kemalism and anti-imperialism.

As Atılğan points out, in the 1960s, when socialism was on the rise and was finding legal channels for representation in the parliament, anti-communist propaganda was getting also stronger. The Association for the Struggle Against Communism (Komünizmle Mücadele Derneği), The Society for Dissemination of Science (İlim Yayma Cemiyeti) as well as the newspapers like Sabah and Bugün were leading this propaganda and were calling for a jihad against communism in their meetings and rallies.<sup>510</sup> Under these circumstances, Yön needed a new description for socialism, which could show people socialism did not necessarily mean an exclusion of religion and it could be in accord with Islam.<sup>511</sup>

Here, Arab and African anti-imperialist movements were guidelines for Yön with their efforts to link Muslim citizens to their causes. Yön's choice of articles makes this quite obvious, especially the frequency of the articles that belonged to intellectuals from those countries and the articles devoted to the relationship between socialism and Islam are considered.<sup>512</sup> In one of those, Algerian politician and writer Beshir Ali Hacı argued that the real enemy of third-world was imperialism; therefore collaboration between socialism and Islam against imperialism was the best solution. Indeed, being a Muslim was not an obstacle for being a revolutionist, since being a revolutionist was about one's stance towards the classes, rather than one's position towards Islam solely.<sup>513</sup>

These discussions indicate that the journal was aware of the political importance of Islam in Turkey and was trying to develop fruitful discussions. By believing in the consolidation of power of religion to some extent, Yön came close to the Mustafa Kemal's ideas about Muslim nationalism in the War of Independence. However, being laicist left-leaning intellectuals, Yön's writers ignored this parallelism. Although they referred to the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist utterances of

---

<sup>509</sup> "Ağaları Tanıyor musunuz?", Yön, issue 4, p. 11-12, 10 January 1962

<sup>510</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 147

<sup>511</sup> "Komünizm Nedir", Yön, issue 54, p. 6-7, 26 December 1962; "Dinde Sola Açılış", Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 45, p. 17, 14 October 1962; "Sosyalizm Aileye Karşı Değildir" (the writer is not mentioned) Yön, issue 46, p. 7, 31 October 1962

<sup>512</sup> "Müslümanlık ve Sosyalizm", Muhammed Uda (Egypt), Yön, issue 82, p. 12, 23 October 1964; "İslamın Cenneti Sosyalizmdir", Cahit Tanyol, Yön, issue 130, p. 7, 24 September 1965; "Sosyalizm ve İslamiyet Tartışmaları", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 151, p. 12, 18 February 1966 ; "Arap Dünyası Uyanıyor mu: Nasır, İslam ve Sosyalizm", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 159, p. 10-11, 15 April 1966, "Bilim Açısından Din", Selahattin Hilav, Yön, issue 149, p. 14, 4 February 1966

<sup>513</sup> "Sosyalizm ve Din", Beşir Hacı Ali, Yön 81, p. 12, 16 October 1964

Mustafa Kemal from the same period all the time, they avoided referring to his Muslim-nationalism period to make their point.

The abovementioned discussions were also in parallel with Yön's anti-Western sensitivities. Yön emphasized that the real culprit of underdevelopment and exploitation of those countries was imperialism, rather than Islam. However, as Atılgan points out, Yön never intended to give a central role to Islam.<sup>514</sup>

According to Atılgan, Yön differed from other leftist groups with the journal's relatively tolerant attitude about the role of religion since it resisted negative categorisations of nationalism and religion, which was quite common within leftist circles at the time. Atılgan explains this with Yön's efforts to bring an end to the reactionary attributions of religion.<sup>515</sup>

It is correct that in many articles Yön referred to religion in a positive way. Similar to Mustafa Kemal, Kadro and Markopaşa, Yön also claimed that religion should not be equated with reactionism and fundamentalism directly, since a pure form of Islam existed for believers.<sup>516</sup> However, it is not possible to discredit the existence of the articles which indicated the opposite and addressed Islam as a source of obscurantism and reactionary movements. As it can be observed in the articles of Niyazi Berkes and İlhan Selçuk, the writers made negative comments about Islam and they connected religion, exploitation, and imperialism quite often.<sup>517</sup> Thus, it can be said that similar to the dichotomy over Westernisation, there was a dichotomy about reactionary nature of Islam and religion in the journal as well. Nevertheless, it would not be correct to categorize Yön as an anti-Islamist or anti-religious publication.

Yön's laisicet line was also obvious in the journal's call for state control over religious minorities. According to Berkes, Orthodox churches and schools should have been under the strict control of Directorate of Religious Affairs. It was normal for Orthodox Christians to have their churches in Turkey. However, the existence of an Orthodox church which claimed ecumenism rights over a big part of the Orthodox Christians was absurd in a country like Turkey, which abolished the caliphate

---

<sup>514</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılgan, 2008, p. 147

<sup>515</sup> Ibid., p. 148

<sup>516</sup> "Türkiye'de Ordu", İlhan Selçuk, Yön, 17 January 1962; "İslamda Halk Hareketleri," Hilmi Ozgen, Yön, issue 37, p.9, 29 August 1962

<sup>517</sup> "Atatürk Türkiyesinde Ekümenlik, Patriklik", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, 6 November 1964; "Azınlık Okulları", Yön, 8 August 1962; "Batıcılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler VIII: Milli Kurtuluş Savaşı", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, 2 April 1965; "Mukaddesat Tezgahtarları", İlhan Selçuk, Yön, 7 February 1962

itself.<sup>518</sup> Therefore, there should have been a strict control over those churches and minority schools, since they had a tendency for engaging in activities in favor of their own establishments, rather than Turkish Republic.<sup>519</sup>

As seen, like Mustafa Kemal, Yön writers advocated for state control over religion rather than entirely asking for a separation between religious institutions and the state. They were often not against religion but its exploitation by certain groups for anti-republican and reactionary purposes. In this sense, it is better to call them laicist, rather than secular intellectuals.

Like Kadro and Markopaşa, Yön regarded the concessions over laicism as a threat towards the republic. The writers perceived laicism as one of the tenets of the republic and those who contested laicist reforms were accused of treason. Nevertheless, the army was the guarantor of the republic and would not let those “so-called” nationalists and reactionaries to ruin the country. The army was going to defend Turkey and was going to defeat reactionists as it did in the period of Atatürk.<sup>520</sup>

### **3.6 Republicanism**

As mentioned before, Mustafa Kemal’s interpretation of the republican arrow was deeply connected to the nationalist and populist arrows. As devoted Kemalists, Yön writers stayed loyal to his interpretation to a great extent. However, the 1960’s were the times when leftist ideas had more chance to be expressed in Turkey compared to previous decades. Consequently, the Yön journal’s interpretation of republican arrow carried hints of socialism. In their attempts, the writers seemed to connect the populist arrow and republican arrow, since the journal often equated populism with socialism.

According to them, the foundation of the republic was a very important event. The journal considered the War of Independence as a “national revolution”. As mentioned, Kadro and Markopaşa also put great deal of stress on this issue; however they often avoided using “revolution” due to its negative connotations. Still, all three journals glorified the gaining of political independence following the anti-imperialist struggle, and the vulnerability of independence unless it was strengthened and secured by an etatist economy program. In this way, all these journals connected republicanism with nationalism (the nation’s sovereignty), populism (the people’s

---

<sup>518</sup> “Atatürk Türkiyesinde Ekümenlik, Patriklik”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, 6 November 1964

<sup>519</sup> “Azınlık Okulları”, Yön, 8 August 1962

<sup>520</sup> “Rejim Buhranı”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 21 February 1962; “Türkiye’de Ordu” İlhan Selçuk, Yön, 17 January 1962

government), etatism (the national economy to secure political independence), laicism (the abolition of absolutist and religious authority of Ottoman Empire), and reformism (the greatest reform that took place in the country) together. By making this connection, and without sacrificing any of the six arrows, they proved that they were followers of Kemalist ideology, although with different interpretations.

Yön differed from the other two journals by connecting all the arrows to socialism more clearly. According to the all three journals, the foundation of the republic was a proof of the anti-imperialist character of the Turkish people. Although it did not change the economic structure profoundly, the new Turkish state was based on republican ideas and replaced the imperialist and monarchical structures of Ottoman Empire; therefore it brought modernity to the country.<sup>521</sup> However, according to Yön, the foundation of the republic was not an end, it was part of a continuous process, and it was eventually going to evolve into a socialist regime.

The journal did not bring clear explanations about this second stage and how exactly this transition was going to take place. Still, they hinted that they considered the republican regime as a tool, which was helpful for a certain time but it had to change to gain better results. According to Mümtaz Soysal, their socialist ideas were a continuation of their republican ideas. The transition to the republic was the first step. After achieving economic development, Turkey was going to go through a *gradual* transition in order to found a socialist regime.<sup>522</sup> Accordingly, Avcıoğlu emphasized that the form of the regime, he meant republicanism here, was not an ideal but a tool. The important thing was reaching the level of Western Europe development as the way Mustafa Kemal had envisioned.<sup>523</sup>

Yön seemed to have an indecisive relation to parliamentary democracy since the beginning. In the early years of the journal, democracy was mentioned quite positively and the writers made comparisons between Kemalism, democracy, and socialism more often. The early issues show that the journal was open to the possibilities which could be brought by the parliamentary system. At this point, the journal was different than Kadro, which consistently rejected parliamentary democracy as a part of the liberal capitalist system. Yön, on the other hand, intended to consider possibilities of democracy and did not completely discard it from its discourse. The changing meaning and role of democracy between the 1930s and 1960s might have a role in Yön's choices.

---

<sup>521</sup> "200 Yıldır Neden Bocalıyoruz VII: Atatürkçülük Nedir, Ne Değildir", Niyazi Berkes, Yön, 28 February 1963

<sup>522</sup> "Demokrasi Anlayışımız", Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, 11 July 1962

<sup>523</sup> "İnanç Buhranı", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 28 February 1962

In the 1960s, discarding democracy would not be easy due to the equations between democracy and freedom by people.

For Mümtaz Soysal, democracy meant “people’s rule”, therefore it would not have been in contradiction with socialism, because socialism was a populist system in essence. He claimed that since both aimed at a system for the people’s benefit, democracy and socialism were basically the same thing.<sup>524</sup> According to Avcıoğlu, *“Democracy is twin brother of socialism and it is a natural result of democracy as much as it is of Kemalism. It is possible to reach socialism by either revolution or democracy. We prefer the second one, since we believe in the possibility of a ‘real’ freedom of speech and right for organisation in this country.”*<sup>525</sup>

Still, regarding democracy, the journal was not exactly in the same line with Markopaşa either. Although the writers mentioned democracy in a positive way, they did not directly equate it with freedom as much as Markopaşa did. As early as 1962, Avcıoğlu was questioning the weak points of democratic regimes. He claimed that *“Seventeen years ago (in 1945) multi-party system appeared as a progressive step but it also turned out to be a destroyer of the revolutionist spirit. (...) It marked the end of etatist policies and beginning of concessions about laicism. It is also responsible for hindering the leftist movement, while supporting and strengthening the right-wing. In this sense, it can be taken as a reaction against the Kemalist reforms.”*<sup>526</sup>

He also stressed the possible difficulties of establishing a real change via parliament since it was heavily dominated by conservative right-wing politicians.<sup>527</sup> Consequently, Yön writers thought that a strong leadership could make a difference, as it happened in Mustafa Kemal or Nehru’s cases.<sup>528</sup> When doing this, similar to Kadro, Yön brought up Mustafa Kemal’s “special qualities”; his intuition and farsightedness as well as his ability that enabled him to shape the events and occurrences beforehand.<sup>529</sup> In those expressions, it is possible to follow traces of the leadership myth about Mustafa Kemal very clearly.

---

<sup>524</sup> “Demokrasi Anlayışımız”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, 11 July 1962

<sup>525</sup> “Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 22 August 1962

<sup>526</sup> “İnönü’nün Konuşmaları: Rejim ve Atatürkçülük”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 6, p. 3, 24 January 1962

<sup>527</sup> “Efendilerimiz”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 3 January 1962

<sup>528</sup> “Nehru Sosyalizmi”, Fatma Kansu, Yön, issue 12, p. 17, 7 March 1962; “İnönü’nün Konuşmaları: Rejim ve Atatürkçülük”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, 24 January 1962

<sup>529</sup> “Sosyalist Kültür Dernekleri Açıldı”, Yön, 25 May 1963

Regarding Yön's reservations about the parliamentary system and democracy, the journal never went too far to reach a point to oppose the state and to say that the real struggle was between an oppressive state and the people. This interpretation came from a younger generation, which matured into the Federation of Debating Societies (Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonu) which formed in the mid-1960s. These young radical leftists decided to oppose to the state and its armed forces, and they organized within armed guerrilla groups in the 1970s. However, Yön intellectuals never considered themselves as opponents of the state or armed forces. According to them, a crucial part of the military already sided with them and they could help the Yön movement to correct the course of events. This can also be seen in the journal's first closing-down in 1963. The journal was accused of supporting an attempted military intervention by Talat Aydemir and its publication was banned for 14 months.<sup>530</sup>

Despite this fact and their disappointment over closing down of the State Planning Organisation (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı), Yön supported TIP with the 1965 elections between September 1964 and October 1965. The main goal was to achieve a strong anti-imperialist front within government in order to achieve radical reforms. The members were also hoping to direct RPP's axis towards the left to a degree.<sup>531</sup> Nevertheless, their expectations were not met in the elections. The TIP managed to enter the parliament with fifteen deputies but the results marked a big victory for the right-wing Justice Party (Adalet Partisi) of Demirel which symbolized the continuation of DP and the Menderes line, which had 52.9% of the votes.<sup>532</sup> This was a huge disappointment for Yön, and the writers started to articulate other means in which to be efficient in politics.

The journal's reservations about the parliamentary system can easily be followed in Avcıoğlu's book "Türkiye'nin Düzeni" (The Social Order of Turkey) as well as in his articles in the Devrim journal. In Devrim's early issues, he explicitly discussed the abovementioned issues as the reasons for disillusionment with parliamentary democracy and hinted that armed forces were not content with the current developments and were ready to get involved in the process.<sup>533</sup> Still, he warned against the possible harmful results of the military dicta that didn't act with the people's support. According to him, any kind of intervention would fail without closing the gap between its leaders and the people.<sup>534</sup> Therefore, any intervention by the active forces should have targeted the people's

---

<sup>530</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 175

<sup>531</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2008, p. 176, 191

<sup>532</sup> Ibid., p. 194

<sup>533</sup> "Takke Düştü", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 1, 21 October 1969; "Çelişme", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 2, 28 October 1969

<sup>534</sup> "Dikta", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 12, 6 January 1970



government at the end.<sup>535</sup> His ideas bear a great deal of importance, since he was very popular in military, especially with the officers who sought a progressive intervention to change the system.<sup>536</sup>

As mentioned before, Kemalist republicanism does not solely consist of modern and progressive features. Some of its characteristics, such as the idea of charismatic leadership, hierarchical structuring and authoritarian tendencies do not meet with the modernist progressive ideas. Therefore, it was not democratic at all, in a liberal-democratic sense. Along with Kadro, Yön's interpretation of the republican arrow carried some of these contradictory features. Yön put much less emphasis on democracy than the Markopaşa journal did due to the different meanings attached to the notion of democracy at their time. And when necessary, they didn't hesitate to attribute a democratic side to Kemalist ideology.

---

<sup>535</sup> "27 Mayıs Uzerine Düşünceler", Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 32, 26 May 1970

<sup>536</sup> Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılın, 2008, p. 221

## CONCLUSION

In this study, I examined the ideological connections between the left-leaning Kadro, Markopaşa, and Yön journals and Kemalism. This research attempted to discover what the exact relation of the writers with the Kemalist regime of their time was, whether these journals contributed to Kemalist ideology by using their intellectual influence and how they attributed left-oriented concepts to Kemalism. Further, it explored how they coped with contradictions of combining left-oriented ideas with Kemalism and what the similarities and differences were in terms of expressing the views of the left-leaning intellectuals in the mid-1930s, the late 1940s and in the early 1960s. Moreover, this study sheds light on how the journals coped with the intolerant stance of Kemalism towards leftist ideologies. Finally, the answers to these questions were discussed in connection to the six tenets of Kemalist ideology.

The first one was *nationalism*, which includes policies of nationalization, especially during the 1920s and 1930s. Like Mustafa Kemal, all three journals seemed to perceive nationalism as a social project and associate it with progressive and modernizing elements. Inspired by leftist ideologies, the journals regarded the economy as a decisive element in nation-building process, and their interpretations of Kemalist nationalism usually connected to the pride of the writers over the success of the War of Independence and their anti-imperialist attributions to it. This approach was a common tendency within almost all the leftist or left-leaning groups of the republic like TKP, TIP or MDD and became the common point to bring them together.

Kadro, Markopaşa and Yön used anti-imperialism as a mediator in order to connect their leftist or left-oriented ideas to Kemalism. This link was often interpreted as proof of their nativity, since they were often accused of being communists. Embracing Kemalism and its nationalist side brought them nativity and legitimacy within its established and respected nature. As a result, they pointed out anti-imperialist qualities of the War of Independence and interpreted the early 1920s as a golden age, when Kemalism displayed its “real” nature and potential. All three journals defined themselves as “real” nationalists, adopted a patriotic discourse and put effort to distinguish themselves from traditional-conservative nationalism.

Connecting anti-imperialism and Kemalism was more crucial for Kadro and Yön than for Markopaşa, which clearly displayed more distance towards nationalism. Although Kadro writers

were inspired by Leninist theories, they reformulated a theory of anti-imperialism by rejecting its Leninist core and limiting its meaning solely to the solidarity of underdeveloped nations which engage in anti-imperialist independence movements. On the other hand, Yön claimed that the co-existence between socialism and nationalism was not contradictory and the combination of the two ideologies was possible. At root, their ideas were based on the articulations of Lenin and Stalin on nationalism and the journal regarded this way of nationalism as progressive.

The anti-imperialist attributions about Kemalism, which were made by the early leftists of the 1920s, and were theorized and improved by Kadro became a strong tendency within the leftist movement. Kadro made a significant contribution to associate leftist ideas with nationalism and left a blueprint behind to be followed by many who wanted to combine Kemalism with leftist ideas in the following years. In the 1960s, Yön refreshed this connection and went one step further by claiming to target a socialist order and paved the way for radical interpretations of Kemalism.

Yön and especially Kadro shared the exclusivist tone of Kemalist nationalism to different degrees, even though the journals openly rejected any racist or ethno-racial discrimination. However, Markopaşa criticized the RPP, including Mustafa Kemal, for employing Turkish nationalism as an exclusion mechanism.

The *populist arrow* was not a crucial issue for Kadro, since it focused on economic conditions of the republic, rather than bringing a social program for the people. The populist arrow has appeared as the most important arrow for Markopaşa, while it was equated with socialism by Yön. Both journals referred to the early years of the War of Independence, when the populist discourse of Mustafa Kemal was evident and they interpreted Mustafa Kemal's actions according to their own ideological preferences.

Although they were all inspired by Marxism and Leninism, Kadro's interpretation of class and society seemed most compatible with the Kemalist solidarist alternative, which aimed at achieving a united and well-controlled society in harmony, without strong class divisions. Unlike Kadro, Markopaşa opted for a dynamic and more politically active society. By continuously stressing the gap between Kemalist discourse and its practices, Markopaşa revealed the contradictions and conundrums of Kemalist populism. As a result, the journal became hugely popular for the people who were fed up with the strict rule of the RPP.

Kadro aimed at forming an elite cadre which would create an ideological framework for the regime. Markopaşa writers were clearly aware of their “vanguard” role, but unlike Kadro, they did not assume any privileged role for themselves. Being independent intellectuals, they explicitly opposed the authority of the regime and aimed to put pressure on the government through the support of ordinary people. Compared to Markopaşa, Yön’s ideology was more elitist, since Markopaşa insisted on giving more space to working classes in political life. Yön believed in the objectivity of the military forces and, elevated them above the other classes, relying on their help for socialist development. In this sense, Yön’s attitude towards the state was quite similar to Kadro, since the latter claimed that the state was above all other classes and could operate as an objective institution.

The romantic idealization of the concept of “the people”, along with a distrust of the masses, authoritarian tendencies, elitism, intolerance for upheavals, anti-liberal and anti-socialist attitudes, and a solidarist view of a united and well-controlled society were the features shared by Kadro and Mustafa Kemal in the early 1930s. The traits of positivism and solidarism were clearly present in their ideology. Therefore, despite its left-oriented discourse, Kadro’s ideology was quite compatible with Kemalist populism, regarding its interpretations of elitism, the people, society, and social classes. At this juncture, Kadro’s Kemalist interpretations and its tailoring of left-oriented concepts placed the journal closer to Kemalism and to its solidarist-positivist rightist core rather than Marxism and socialism.

Regarding its wish for immediate action rather than convincing the public, the Yön movement seemed similar to Unionists and early Kemalist cadres. However, it differed from them by referring to “the people” as a more active element, especially in its early years. In its attempt to connect socialism and Kemalism via the populist arrow, Yön was more similar to the Markopaşa journal. However, in the long run, Yön followed a similar pattern to Mustafa Kemal and its populist discourse diminished in time.

Regarding *republicanism*, all of the journals shared the anti-monarchist and anti-theocratic ideals of Kemalism, and like Mustafa Kemal they highlighted the differences between the Kemalist republic and the Ottoman Empire. Still, none of the journals advocated liberal democracy. Kadro often rejected individualism, freedom, democracy, and multi-party system as part of the liberal-capitalist system and sided with the one-party rule of the RPP. On the contrary, “democracy” meant freedom in Markopaşa journal while Yön put much less emphasis on democracy than Markopaşa did due to the different meanings attached to the notion of democracy at their time. However, unlike Kadro,

Yön did not completely discard democracy from its discourse. For this journal, the republic was eventually going to evolve into a socialist regime.

All three journals regarded the economy as a substructure for society and political life and called for an immediate anti-imperialist, non-capitalist development plan. *Etatism*, as the economic wing of Kemalist nationalist policy, was the most important arrow for Kadro. The journal presented its “nationalist etatism” as an alternative to both capitalism and communism and it considered it a regulatory power to organize the society. Compared to the milder interpretation of etatism by Mustafa Kemal, Kadro’s interpretations seemed to be stricter and advocated the state’s domineering power over the public sphere. In spite of its claims of uniqueness, like almost all of the third way (“*tertium genus*”) projects, Kadro’s “third-way solution” was, in fact, still within the limits of a capitalist economy. Still, by explicitly being against capitalist development, Kadro brought a new interpretation to Kemalist etatism, and set a different example from the intellectual tradition of the CUP and other Kemalists cadres.

Like Kadro, Markopaşa always mentioned etatism in connection to anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism. However, in Markopaşa, etatism had a more direct connection to populism. Unlike Kadro, Markopaşa tried to focus on what etatism would have brought to people and how etatism or land distribution policies would have had a positive impact on people’s lives.

Yön attempted to bring a new interpretation to the practices of third-way etatism by connecting them to socialism, thus differing from existing interpretations. The journal’s interpretations were affected by Nasser’s movement in Egypt to a great degree. However, in spite of Yön’s claims, the journal’s “new etatism” plan was still framed within a capitalist economy, rather than being a break from it. Yön claimed that the basic principles of Kemalist theory reflected the basic formula of Turkish socialism, therefore socialism could be taken as one of the arrows of Kemalism. It considered socialism a tool for rapid development and aspired to develop a unique theory, a “domestic socialism”, for Turkey by combining Kemalism and socialism. In order to do that, Yön writers highlighted revolutionary and innovative assertions about Kemalism, and claimed they would complete Kemalism with the help of a socialist ideology.

Kadro, Markopaşa and Yön all supported Kemalist *laicist* policies in order to form a “*nation*” to take the place of the Ottoman “*ümmet*”, and they often followed the Kemalist rhetoric about laicism, which often connected religion, exploitation, and imperialism to each other.

The discussions about laicism and religion were brought up within the context of the economy and the etatist arrow. Kadro especially contributed to creation of the link between underdeveloped economies and corrupted forms of Islam. By equating Kurdish upheavals with reactionism and feudalism, Kadro provided Kemalist ideology with a powerful rhetoric to deal with Kurdish upheavals in Eastern provinces. Markopaşa supported basic laicist principals, but criticized the RPP's use of the reactionary argument to eliminate Kurds or other opponents. Yön, on the other hand, tried to demonstrate that socialism did not necessarily mean an exclusion of religion and it could be in accordance with Islam.

Still, all of the journals supported the early radical laicist policies of Mustafa Kemal, and like him, regarded those who would contest laicism not only anti-Kemalist but also a threat to the republic. Like Mustafa Kemal, they advocated state control over religion rather than an entire separation between religious institutions and the state. They were generally not against religion but against its exploitation by certain groups. In this sense, it is better to call them laicist, rather than secular intellectuals.

In connection with the *reformist arrow*, all of the journals perceived the transition from the empire to republic as a ground-breaking change, and thus the most important reform in Turkey. Still, Markopaşa was clearly more critical of the continuation of the Ottoman mentality within the Turkish Republic, especially regarding governing, power-sharing and suppression mechanisms.

All journals displayed distrust towards the West and in the case of Markopaşa and Yön, also more specifically towards the US. Kadro and Yön also shared a desire to keep connections with third-world countries which followed anti-imperialist and anti-Western paths. Indeed, Kadro's opposition towards the West - which focused on the economy rather than Western culture and included a strong anti-imperialist dimension - set a unique example and separated the journal from traditional anti-Western views of nationalist or Islamist groups. In parallel to their anti-Western sentiments, Kadro and Yön both criticized Marxist theory due to its failure for not bringing a solution for underdeveloped, non-European countries. Kadro particularly categorized socialism and Marxism as European originated ideologies and rejected them along with capitalism and liberalism.

Indeed, Kadro writers made crucial changes to the concepts they borrowed from Marxism, sometimes by keeping its main schema, while emptying its Marxist core or simply by using the

schema in an entirely different context. These three journals, especially Kadro and Yön, were prone to shift the axis of socialism and Kemalism in order to use them according to their needs. In this process, ambiguity and the relatively ill-defined content of Kemalism must have helped them.

Unlike Kadro, Markopaşa did not reject socialism. However, it did not see the West as the only source of development either. In the Markopaşa series, Western powers, especially the US, appeared as symbols of capitalism and exploitation. Meanwhile, Yön's criticism towards the West was not as extensive as it was in the Kadro journal although Yön writers did insist that the Kemalist revolutionism was completely different from Western and Bolshevik models. Indeed, Yön created a dichotomy about Westernisation, as the journal's position towards West changed over time.

Although Yön differed from the other two journals by connecting all the arrows to socialism, it preferred to preserve the existing order, rather than fundamentally changing it. Therefore, and exactly like Kadro, it preferred reformism to revolution and displayed Kemalist features, rather than Marxist-socialist characteristics. In this manner, Yön followed the tradition of the Young Turks, Unionists, and Mustafa Kemal and believed in a transformation in a top-down fashion, not the other way around.

None of these journals made a connection between the conservative nature of Kemalism and its possible European sources. Instead, they tried to reformulate Kemalism within a new left-leaning context and tried to revive the *original* principles of Kemalism.

These three left-leaning journals were the result of different time periods and had different functions and objectives. Kadro mainly consisted of former communists who generated an ideology for the Kemalist government in the early 1930s. Markopaşa was an independent and unique oppositional leftist current in the late 1940s. Finally, the Yön writers were a left-leaning group which claimed to have formulated a domestic socialism for Turkey in the 1960s and attempted to seize the power to realize its aims in early 1970s. Still, all declared that they were Kemalists. It seems they used Kemalism as an umbrella term to include anti-imperialist, republican, etatist, laicist, reformist and some of nationalist features to different degrees which would bring modernism and progress. In this manner, they tried to form an ideal version of Kemalism to be in accordance to their left-oriented ideas.

It is quite interesting to observe how tremendous the effect of Kemalism was on these three journals, which were different in many ways but were still brought together by the strong hegemonic power of Kemalism. Whether they criticized, challenged or contributed to it, all of these journals insisted on keeping Kemalism as part of their ideology. It seems that their interpretations opened Kemalism to left-wing attributions to a great degree and the different examples they set found followers within left-leaning and leftist currents in the following years. Although Markopaşa's line was more oppositional and can be placed closer to the TIP of the 1960s due to its relatively more leftist line, Kadro and Yön became pioneers of the "Ulusal Sol" (The National Leftism) movement which endures to this day in Turkish politics.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Kadro Articles

- “Ankara, Moskova, Roma III”, Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 9, p. 34, September 1932
- “Ankara, Moskova, Roma V”, Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 11, p. 38, November 1932
- “Ankara, Moskova, Roma VII”, Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 13, p. 29, January 1933
- “Avrupa Bize Ideal mi, Ornek Olabilir mi?” Hakkı Mahir, Kadro, issue 18, p. 59, June 1933
- “Benerci Kendini Niçin Oldürdü?”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 4, p. 31, April 1932
- “Bergson Bahsi ve Hürriyet Telakkimiz”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 13, p. 42, January 1933
- “Bir Münakaşanın Manası”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 17, p. 5, May 1933
- “Bir Ruh Fantazisi Yahut Yerli Peygamber”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 1, p. 32, January 1932
- “Bizdeki Azlıklar”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 16, p. 52, April 1933
- “Buhranlar ve İnkılâplar Telakkisi”, Hakkı Mahir, Kadro, issue 21, p. 47, September 1933
- “Cihan Buhranı Bitti mi”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 10, p. 28, October 1932
- “Cihan İçinde Türkiye: Bir İcmal”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 6, p. 30, June 1932
- “Çökmekte Olan Cihan Nizamı”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 1, p. 22, January 1932
- “Dersim ve Derebeyi”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 6, p. 41, June 1932
- “Devletin Yapıcılık ve İdarecilik Kudretine İnanmak Gerekir”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 15, p. 13, March 1933
- “Emperyalizm Şahlanıyor mu?”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 16, p. 5, April 1933
- “Ergenekon Efsanesi”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 13, p. 5, January 1933
- “Eskiler Almayalım”, Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 4, p. 44, April 1932
- “Faşizm ve Türk Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi,” Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 8, p. 36, August 1932
- “Fırka Mektebi”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 9, p. 30, September 1932
- “Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi I: Faşizm”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 18, p. 5, June 1933
- “Fikir Hareketleri Arasında Türk Nasyonalizmi II: Marksizm”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 19, p. 6, July 1933
- “Fikirde İstiklal”, Yakup Kadri, Kadro, issue 22, p. 28, October 1933
- “Halkevleri,” Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 3, p. 35, March 1932
- “Hürriyet Mefhumu Etrafında”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 21, p. 29, September 1933
- “İnkılabımız ve Hilafet”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 1, p. 39, January 1932
- “İnkılabımızın Sesi”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 11, p. 33, November 1932

“İnkılâp Bitti mi (İnkılabın İdeolojisi)”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 3, p. 5, March 1932

“İnkılap Heyecanı: Antuziazm”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 2, p. 5, February 1932

“İnkılap Neslinin Şarkısı”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 22, p. 9, October 1933

“Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 1, p. 3, January 1932

“Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 13, p. 3, January 1933

“Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 15, p. 3, March 1933

“Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 21, p. 3, September 1933

“Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 22, p. 7, October 1933

“Kadro” (Introduction Article), Kadro, issue 35-36, p. 7, December 1934

“Kreuger, Hitler, Goethe”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 4, p. 27, April 1932

“Kronik: İçtimai Zihniyet”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 31, p. 42, July 1934

“Kuvayi Milliye”, Falih Rıfkı Atay, Kadro, issue 16, p. 11, April 1933

“Makina Medeniyeti”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 7, p. 26, July 1932

“Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi I”, İsmail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 25, p. 34, January 1934

“Millet İçinde Sınıf Meselesi II,” İsmail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 26, p. 20, February 1934

“Milli Kurtuluş İnkılabının Cihanşümül Ehemmiyetini Anlıyan Anlıyana”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 18, p. 37, June 1933

“Milli Kurtuluş Hareketlerinin Ana Prensipleri”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 8, p. 6, August 1932

“Milli Kurtuluş Hareketleri ve Bunların İnkılap Nazariyeleri”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 9, p. 39, September 1932

“Milli Kurtuluş Hareketleri İçinde Bizim Tezimiz”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 12, p. 38, December 1932

“Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına I”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 1, p. 8, January 1932

“Müstemleke İktisadiyatından Millet İktisadiyatına II”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 2, p. 9, February 1932

“Niçin ve Nasıl Sanayileşmemiz Lazım”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 6, p. 13, June 1932

“Pesimist (İnkılabın Psikolojisi)”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 1, p. 4, January 1932

“Plan Mefhumu Hakkında”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 5, p. 5, May 1932

“Rejimler Nasıl, Niçin Değişiyor”, Burhan Asaf, Kadro, issue 12, p. 27, December 1932

“Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 11, p. 17, November 1932

“Sosyal Milliyetçiliğin Zaferi”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 35-36, p. 8, December 1934 - January 1935

“Şark Vilayetlerinde Derebeylik I,” Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 11, p. 22, November 1932  
“Şark Vilayetlerinde Derebeylik II”, Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 12, p. 18, December 1932  
“Türk Devletçiliği İhtibas Devletçiliği Değildir”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 17, p. 16, May 1933  
“Türkiye’de Derebeylik Rejimi I”, Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 7, p. 16, July 1932  
“Türkiye’de Derebeylik Rejimi II”, Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 8, p. 30, August 1932  
“Türk İnkılabı Kürsüleiyor”, Tahir Hayrettin, Kadro, issue 19, p. 37, July 1933  
“Türkiye’de Milli Sanayi Hareketi”, Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 10, p. 20, October 1932  
“Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatında Borçlanma Şekilleri,” Ismail Hüsrev, Kadro, issue 3, p. 25, March 1932  
“Umumilikle Mücadele İçin Köy Kampları: Harf İnkılâbı”, Vedat Nedim, Kadro, issue 1, p. 43, January 1932  
“Ziya Gökalp”, Şevket Süreyya, Kadro, issue 2, p. 29, February 1932

### **Markopaşa Articles**

“Ayıp”, Markopaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 18 December 1946  
“Bay Yaşar Emre Soruyor”, Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 4, 6 January 1947  
“Baltalık Sakini Arkadaşlar”, Markopaşa, issue 18, p. 2, 21 April 1947  
“Büyük Ölüler Kongresi,” Markopaşa, issue 17, p. 1, 17 April 1947  
“Geçmiş Zaman Olur ki Hayali Beş Para Etmez”, Markopaşa, issue 9, p. 1, 3 February 1947  
“Geçmiş Zaman Olur ki Hayali Beş Para Etmez”, Markopaşa, issue, 19, p. 2, 28 April 1947  
“Gutenberg Matbaası”, Markopaşa, issue 16, p. 1, 7 April 1947  
“Görülmemiş Tiyatro”, Markopaşa, issue 13, p. 1, 3 March, 1947  
“Hangi Cepheden Gelirse Gelsin, Emperyalizmin Aleyhindeyiz”, Markopaşa, issue 19, p. 1, 28 April 1947  
“Hep Laf”, Markopaşa, issue 8, p. 1, 27 January 1947  
“Halktan Yolsuzluk ve Yokluk Vergileri de Alınmalıdır”, Markopaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 16 December 1946  
“Hep Laf”, Markopaşa, issue 8, p. 1, 27 January 1947  
“İstiklal”, Markopaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 25 November 1946  
“Jurnal”, Markopaşa, issue 16, p. 2, 7 April 1947  
“Köylü Bezgindir”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 2, 6 June 1949  
“Köy Medreselerinin Açılmasına Dair Fetva Çıktı”, Markopaşa, issue 7, p. 3, 20 February 1947  
“Korkulu Rüya”, Markopaşa, issue 13, p. 3, 3 March 1947

“Korku Dağları Bekler”, Markopaşa, issue 15, p. 2, 17 March 1947  
“Korkuyoruz”, Markopaşa, issue 12, p. 1, 24 February 1947  
“Kozlu Maden Kuyuları” (caricature), Markopaşa, issue 23, p. 1, 10 October 1947  
“Kraldan Fazla Kral Taraftarı”, Markopaşa, issue 8, p. 3, 27 January 1947  
“Kenan Döner’in Marifetleri”, Markopaşa, issue 11, p. 1, 17 February 1947  
“Kem Gözlere, Kem Sözlere”, Markopaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 9 December 1946  
“Markopaşa ve Demokrat Parti”, Markopaşa, issue 7, p. 1, 20 January 1947  
“Markopaşa Bir Hyde Parktır”, Markopaşa, issue 14, p. 4, 10 March 1947  
“Markopaşa Dert Dinliyor”, Markopaşa, issue 20, p. 4, 5 May 1947  
“Markopaşa Dert Dinliyor,” Markopaşa, issue 21, p. 4, 17 May 1947  
“Milleti Aldatmasınlar”, Markopaşa, issue 23, p. 1, 10 October 1947  
“Ne İnkılapçılık”, Markopaşa, issue 13, p. 1, 3 March 1947  
“Ne İstiyoruz?”, Markopaşa, issue 10, p. 1, 10 February 1947  
“O Zaman Gör Kepazeliği”, Markopaşa, issue 13, p. 2, 3 March 1947  
“Recepkrasi ve Celalkratik”, Markopaşa, issue 18, p. 1, 21 April 1947  
“Siyaset Panoraması”, Markopaşa, issue 20, p. 1, 5 May 1947  
“Sıralarını Bekliyorlar”, Markopaşa, issue 4, p. 3, 16 December 1946  
“Markopaşa ve Demokrat Parti”, Markopaşa, issue 7, p. 3, 20 December 1947  
“Tam Demokrasi”, Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 1, 6 January 1947  
“Tatar Ağaları Yaya Kaldı”, Markopaşa, issue 14, p. 1, 10 March 1947  
“Teslim Tesellüm İşi”, Markopaşa, issue 22, p. 3, 19 May 1947  
“Topunuzun Köküne Kibrit Suyu”, Markopaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 16 December 1946  
“Ucuz Hayat”, Markopaşa, issue 5, p. 2, 6 January 1946  
“Yabancı Sermaye”, Sabahattin Ali, Markopaşa, issue 2, p. 1, 2 December 1946  
“Yabancı Şahit, Yalancı Şahit”, Markopaşa, issue 11, p. 1, 17 February 1947  
“Yaşasın Millet”, Markopaşa, issue 21, p. 1, 17 May 1947  
“Yeşil Sarık”, Markopaşa, issue 9, p. 1, 3 February 1947  
“18 Milyon Türk Ne Olacak,” Markopaşa, issue 21, p. 1, 5 May 1947

### **Markopaşa - Secondary Series**

“Efendimiz Köylü”, Markopaşa - Secondary Series, issue 3, p. 1, 11 November 1948  
“Geçmişte Bugün”, Markopaşa - Secondary Series, issue 10, p. 3, 31 December 1948

“Havayı Aşk Eser Serde, Efendim Nerde Ben Nerde”, Markopaşa - Secondary Series, issue 1, p. 1, 29 October 1948  
“Maden İşçileri”, Markopaşa - Secondary Series, issue 1, p. 3, 29 October 1948  
“Mukaddes Zincirlerimiz”, Markopaşa-Secondary Series, issue 1, p. 1, 29 October 1948  
“25 Senede”, Markopaşa - Secondary Series, issue 2, p. 3, 3 November 1948

### **Malumpaşa Articles**

“Açık Mektup”, Malumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 29 September 1947  
“Bekliyoruz”, Malumpaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 22 September 1947  
“Bir Gazete Çıktı”, Malumpaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 8 September 1947  
“Bir Alçak”, Malumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 29 September 1947  
“Çok Yaşayın”, Malumpaşa, issue 2, p. 1, 15 September 1947  
“Dikkat Dikkat Dikkat”, Malumpaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 8 September 1947  
“Gazetemize İçerlemişler”, Malumpaşa, issue 3, p. 2, 22 September 1947  
“İşçi Meskenleri İçin Ameli Yollar Aranıyor”, Malumpaşa, issue 1, p. 2, 8 September 1947  
“Parmak”, Malumpaşa, issue 5, p. 3, 6 October 1947  
“Malumpaşa Ansiklopedisi”, Malumpaşa, issue 1, p. 2, 8 September 1947  
“Vur Fakat Dinle”, Malumpaşa, issue 5, p. 1, 6 October 1947  
“Yeni Kabine Hakkında Bizim Fikrimiz”, Malumpaşa, issue 5, p. 4, 6 October 1947

### **Merhumpaşa Articles**

“Altı Oktan Atılanlar”, Merhumpaşa, issue 2, p. 3, 16 October 1947  
“Acımız”, Merhumpaşa, issue 2, p. 1, 16 October 1947  
“Bir Alçak”, Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 22 September 1947  
“Bu Bir Rezalettir”, Merhumpaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 25 October 1947  
“Eski ile Yeninin Farkı”, Merhumpaşa, issue 3, p. 2, 25 October 1947  
“Fikir ve Küfür”, Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 1 November 1947  
“Genç Arkadaş”, Merhumpaşa, issue 1, p. 1, 26 May 1947  
“Hudut”, Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 1 November 1947  
“Her Şey Aslına Döner”, Merhumpaşa, issue 3, p. 2, 25 October 1947  
“Milletin Postunu Paylaşıyorlar”, Merhumpaşa, issue 3, p. 1, 25 October 1947  
“Tüzük Müzik Hikayesi”, Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 1 November 1947

“Yem Borusu”, Merhumpaşa, issue 4, p. 1, 1 November 1947

### **Ali Baba Articles**

“Babafıngo”, Ali Baba, issue 2, p. 2, 2 December 1947

“Bir Yerim Kaldı”, Ali Baba, issue 2, p. 3, 2 December 1947

“Kalkın Ey Ehli Vatan”, Ali Baba, issue 4, p. 2, 16 December 1947

“Insanlara Inanmak”, Ali Baba, issue 2, p. 1, 2 December 1947

“Ona Ne Şüphe”, Ali Baba, issue 2, p. 2, 2 December 1947

“Uşak Ruhu”, Ali Baba, issue 4, p. 1, 16 December 1947

“Ne Zor Şeymiş”, Ali Baba, issue 1, p. 1, 25 November 1947

“Millet Haramilerin Elinde”, Ali Baba, issue 1, p. 1, 25 November 1947

### **Yedi Sekiz Paşa Articles**

“Insandan Madutsun”, Yedi Sekiz Paşa, issue 1, p. 4, 29 April 1949

“Neden Muvaffak Oluyoruz”, Yedi Sekiz Paşa, issue 1, p. 3, 29 April 1949

“Yedi Sekiz Paşa'nın Lügati”, Yedi Sekiz Paşa, issue 1, p. 3, 29 April 1949

### **Hür Markopaşa Articles**

“Asır Değil Hasır”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 14, p. 3, 8 August 1949

“Biz Halka İnaniyoruz”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 10, p. 1, 11 July 1949

“Demokrasi Terbiyesi”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 17, p. 1, 29 August 1949

“Hâlâ Yalınayak”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 6, p. 1, 13 June 1948

“İşçi Sigortaları”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 15, p. 2, 15 August 1949

“Sabahattin Ali ve Milli His”, Hür Markopaşa, issue 9, p. 1, 4 July 1949

### **Başdan Articles**

“Milliyetçilik”, Başdan, issue 12, p. 2, 26 October 1948

“Türkiye Sosyalist Partisi Genel Sekreteri Esat Adil Müstecaplı ile Ropörtaj”, Başdan, issue 2, p. 2, 17 August 1948

“Türkiye'de İnkılap Başlamamıştır”, Başdan, issue 7, p. 1, 21 September 1948

## **Zincirli Hürriyet**

“Asıl Büyük Tehlike Bugünkü Ehliyetsiz İktidarın Devamıdır”, Sabahattin Ali, Zincirli Hürriyet, issue 1, p. 1-2, 5 February 1948, IISH Collection - Amsterdam

## **Yön Articles**

“Açık Seçik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 199, p. 7, 20 January 1967

“Ağaları Tanıyor musunuz?”, Yön, issue 4, p. 11, 10 January 1962

“Amerika ve Arap Sosyalizmi”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 61, p. 3, 13 February 1963 “AP'nin Öğrettikleri”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 51, p. 3, 5 December 1962

“Arap Dünyası Uyanıyor mu: Nasır, İslam ve Sosyalizm”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 159, p. 10, 15 April 1966

“Arap Sosyalizminin Kaynakları”, Yön, issue 26, p. 15, 13 June 1962

“Arayış I”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 12, p. 9, 7 March 1962

“Asya Tipi Üretim Nedir”, Selahattin Hilav, Yön, issue 151, p. 4, 18 February 1966

“Atatürkçülük Emperyalizme Karşı Savaş Demektir”, İlhami Soysal, Yön, issue 137, p. 5, 12 November 1965

“Atatürk’ün Özlediği Türkiye’yi Kurabildik mi?”, Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 47, p. 12, 7 October, 1962

“Atatürk Türkiyesinde Ekümenlik, Patriklik”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 84, p. 10, 6 November 1964

“Aydın Din Adamları” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 36, p. 4, 22 August 1962

“Azınlık Okulları” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 34, p. 6, 8 August 1962

“Barzani’yi Tanıtıyoruz”, Yön, issue 41, p. 12, 26 September 1962

“Baticılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler II: Batı Emperyalizmi ve Batı Uygarlığı”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 98, p. 12, 19 February 1965

“Baticılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler V: Niyazi Berkes Türk Aydınlarını Anlatıyor”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 103, p. 8, 19 March 1965

“Baticılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler VIII: Milli Kurtuluş Savaşı”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 105, p. 10, 2 April 1965

“Baticılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler X: Tarih Tezi’nin Temel Kavramları”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 107, p. 11, 16 April 1965

“Bildiri” (Aydınların Ortak Bildirisi), Yön, issue 1, 20 December 1961

- “Bilim Açısından Din”, Selahattin Hilav, Yön, issue 149, p. 14, 4 February 1966
- “Bir de Ermeniler Çıktı”, (the writer was not mentioned), Yön, issue 47, p. 5, November 1962
- “Biz Ne İstiyoruz”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 198, p. 3, 11 January 1967
- “Bizim Milliyetçiliğimiz”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 3, p. 7, 3 January 1962
- “Bizim Sosyalizm Anlayışımız”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 36, p. 3, 22 August 1962
- “Büyük Oyun”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 197, p. 3, 6 January 1967
- “Cepheler Belirliyor”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 44, p. 3, 17 October 1962
- “Çıkmazlar İçinde Bir Işık: Ordu”, İlhami Soysal, Yön, issue 37, p. 7, 10 October 1967
- “Demokrasi ve Sosyalizm”, Sadun Aren, Yön, issue, 34, p. 3, 8 August 1962
- “Demokrasi Anlayışımız”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 30, p. 3, 11 July 1962
- “Devletçilik: Ne İstedığımızı Biliyor muyuz?”, Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 1, p. 18, 20 December 1961
- “Devrimciliğin Halkçılığı”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 47, p. 4, 7 October 1962
- “Devrimcilik Nedir”, Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 48, p. 6, 14 October 1962
- “Dinde Sola Açılış”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 45, p. 17, 14 October 1962
- “Doğu” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 3, p. 5, 3 January 1962
- “Doğu Davamız” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 26, p. 12, 13 June 1962
- “Efendilerimiz”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 3, p. 3, 3 January 1962
- “Emperyalizm ve Kapitalizme Karşı Atatürk”, (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 74, p. 8, 7 October 1962
- “Fikir Atatürkçülüğü ve Kelime Atatürkçülüğü”, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Yön, issue 6, p. 9, 24 January 1962
- “Garip Bir Devletçilik”, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Yön, issue 19, p. 9, 18 April 1962
- “Gericiler Azınlıktadır”, Erdoğan Alkan, Yön, issue 49, p. 14, 21 November 1962
- “Halkçılık İlkesi ve Sosyalizm”, Sadun Aren, Yön, issue 47, p. 5, 10 October 1962
- “İnanç Buhranı”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 11, p. 3, 20 February 1962
- “İnönü'den Beklediğimiz”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 9, p. 3, 14 February 1962
- “İnönü'nün Konuşmaları: Rejim ve Atatürkçülük”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 6, p. 3, 24 January 1962
- “İrkçı Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye”, İdris Küçükömer, Yön, issue 52, p. 11, 12 December 1962
- “İrkçılık Nedir” (Speech of Deputy Recai Iskenderoğlu), Yön, issue 41, p. 8, 26 September 1962
- “İslamın Cenneti Sosyalizmdir”, Cahit Tanyol, Yön, issue 130, p. 7, 24 September 1965
- “İslamda Halk Hareketleri”, Hilmi Ozgen, Yön, issue 37, p. 9, 29 August 1962
- “İşçiler ve Devletçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 29, p. 4, 4 July 1962



- “Kalkınma Programı 1: Arayış”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 12, p. 9, 7 March 1962
- “Kalkınma Programı: Devletçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 26, p. 7, 13 June 1962
- “Kapitalist Gözüyle Marksizm”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, issue 203, p. 2, 17 February 1967 *as cited in* Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar, Atılğan, 2002, p. 106
- “Kaynağa Dönüş”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 47, p. 3, 7 November 1962
- “Kemalizm Orta Malı Değildir”, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Yön, issue 17, p. 9, 11 April 1962
- “Komünizm Nedir” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 54, p. 6, 26 December 1962
- “Kökü Dışarıda Bir Dernek”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 125, p. 5, 20 August 1965
- “Köyde Sosyalizm”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 38, p. 20, 5 September 1962
- “Küba”, Türkkaya Ataöv, Yön, issue 2, p. 22, 27 December 1961
- “Kürt Meselesi”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 194, p. 3, 16 December 1966
- “Kürt Meselesinde Son Gelişmeler” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 158, p. 1, 8 April, 1966
- “Medrese Atatürkçülüğünden Gerçek Atatürkçülüğe”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 85, p. 3, 13 November 1964
- “Milliyetçilik”, Mümtaz Soysal, Yön, issue 3, p. 11, 3 January 1962
- “Milliyetçilere Sesleniş”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 77, p. 3, 25 September 1964
- “Milliyetçi Komünistler”, İlhami Soysal, Yön, issue 148, p. 8, 21 January 1966
- “Mukaddesat Tezgahtarları”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 8, p. 7, 7 February 1962
- “Müslümanlık ve Sosyalizm”, Muhammed Uda (Egypt), Yön, issue 82, p. 12, 23 October 1964
- “Nasır'ın Hedefleri”, Yön, issue 29, p. 16, 4 July 1962
- “Nasır'ın Sosyalizmi”, Yön, issue 1, p. 21, 20 December 1961
- “Nasır Mısır Sosyalizmini Anlatıyor”, Yön, issue 7, p. 19, 31 January 1962
- “Nehru Sosyalizmi”, Fatma Kansu, Yön, issue 12, p. 17, 7 March 1962
- “Niçin Sosyalizm”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 7, p. 3, 31 January 1962
- “Rejim Buhranı”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 10, p. 3, 21 February 1962
- “Sınıf Mücadelesini Kim Körüklüyor”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 57, p. 3, 16 January 1963
- “Sınıf Mücadelesi, Sosyalizm ve Milliyetçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 182, p. 3, 23 September 1966
- “Siyasi Notlar: Aybar ve Milli Cephe Çağrısı”, İlhami Soysal, Yön, issue 199, p. 6, 20 January 1967
- “Sosyal Devlet ve Türk Sosyalizmi”, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Yön, issue 40, p. 9, 19 May 1962
- “Sosyalist Cezayir”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 15, p. 3, 28 March 1962

“Sosyalist Gerçekçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 39, p. 3, 12 September 1962 “Sosyalizm Aileye Karşı Değildir”, (the writer is not mentioned) Yön, issue 46, p. 7, 31 October 1962

“Sosyalist Kültür Dernekleri Açıldı” (Notes from a panel discussion), Yön, issue 75, p. 8, 25 May 1963

“Sosyalizm ve İslamiyet Tartışmaları”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 151, p. 12, 18 February 1966

“Sosyalizme Giden Yollar: Sosyalizmden Önce Atatürkçülük”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 69, p. 8, 10 April 1963

“Sosyalizm Komünizmin Zehiri mi Panzehiri mi”, Abdi İpekçi, Yön, issue 5, p. 7, 17 January 1962

“Sosyalizm ve Din”, Beşir Hacı Ali, Yön, issue 81, p. 12, 16 October 1964

“Şemdinli Röportajı 16”, Muzaffer Erdost, Yön, issue 188, p. 12, 4 November 1966

“Türkiye Komünist Partisi”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 157, p. 5, 1 April 1966

“Türkiye’de Kürtçülük” (the writer is not mentioned), Yön, issue 72, p. 8, 1 May 1963

“Türkiye’de Laiklik Üzerine”, Gülten Kazgan, Yön, issue 33, p. 8, 1 August 1962

“Türkiye’de Ordu”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 5, p. 10, 17 January 1962

“Türk Sosyalizmi ve Fikir Atatürkçülüğü”, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Yön, issue 7, p. 7, 31 January 1962

“TIP’e Dair”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 168, p. 3, 17 June 1966

“Yapıcı Milliyetçilik”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Yön, issue 4, p. 3, 10 January 1962

“Yön Bir Demagojiyi Daha Yıkıyor: Nazım Hikmet”, Yön, issue 83, p. 15, 30 October 1964

“Yön Cevap Veriyor (Bildiri)”, Yön, issue 12, p. 11, 7 March 1962

“1962’de Türk Milliyetçiliği”, İlhan Selçuk, Yön, issue 25, p. 7, 6 January 1962

“200 Yıldır Neden Bocalıyoruz VII: Atatürkçülük Nedir Ne Değildir”, Niyazi Berkes, Yön, issue 63, p. 8, 28 February 1963

## **Devrim**

“Çelişme”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 2, 28 October 1969

“Dikta”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 12, 6 January 1970

“Parlamentoculuğun Takkesi Düştü”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 74, 23 March 1971

“Takke Düştü”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 1, 21 October 1969

“Teşhis ve Tedavi”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 73, 16 March 1971

“27 Mayıs Üzerine Düşünceler”, Doğan Avcıoğlu, Devrim, issue 32, 26 May 1970

## Books

- Ağaoğlu, Ahmet, (1933), *Devlet ve Fert*, İstanbul: Sanayi-i Nefise Matbaası
- Ali Sabahattin, (2009), *Bütün Yapıtları: Markopaşa Yazıları ve Otekiler*, Ankara: Yapı Kredi Yayınları
- Atılğan, Gökhan, (2008), *Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar*, İstanbul: Yordam Kitap
- Avcıoğlu, Doğan, (1974), *Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi*, volume II, İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası
- Avcıoğlu, Doğan, (1971), *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın*, volume I-II, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, (1959), *Suyu Arayan Adam*, Ankara: Öz Yayınları
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, (1932), *İnkılap ve Kadro: İnkılabın İdeolojisi*, Ankara: Muallim Ahmet Halit Kütüphanesi
- Aytemur, Nuran, (2007) *The Populism of the Village Institutes: A Contradictory Expression of Kemalist Populism* (Phd Thesis), Ankara: METU
- Benningsen, Alexandre and Wimbush, S. Enders (1980), *Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union: A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial World*, Chicago: Publications of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Number: 11
- Boratav, Korkut, (2003), *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi: 1908-2002*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi
- Boratav, Korkut, (1974), *Türkiye'de Devletçilik*, Ankara: Savaş Yayınları
- Boratav, Korkut, (1974), *100 Soruda Türkiye'de Devletçilik*, İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi
- Bostancı, Naci, (1990), *Kadrocular ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Görüşleri*, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları
- Cantek, Levent, (2001), *Markopaşa: Bir Mizah ve Muhalefet Efsanesi*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Çukurkavaklı, Kemal Bayram, (1978), *Sabahattin Ali Olayı*, Ankara: Yenigün Yayınları
- d'Encausse, Helene Carrere, (1992), *The Great Challenge: Nationalities and the Bolshevik State (1917-1930)*, New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers
- Galiyev, Sultan (2006), *Bütün Eserleri* (edited by Ozgür Erdem), İstanbul: İleri Yayınları
- Goloğlu, Mahmut, (1974), *Milli Şef Dönemi (1939-1945)*, Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi
- Karaosmanoğlu, Yakup Kadri, (2013), *Politikada 45 Yıl*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Karaosmanoğlu, Yakup Kadri, (1967), *Zoraki Diplomat*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi

- Karpat, Kemal, (1959), *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System*, Princeton-New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- Kıvılcımlı, Hikmet, (2008), *27 Mayıs ve Yön Devrim Hareketinin Sınıfsal Eleştirisi*, İstanbul: Sosyal İnsan Yayınları
- Koçak, Cemil, (1986), *Türkiye'de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938-1945)*, Ankara: Yurt Yayınevi
- Landau, Jacob M. (1995), *Pan Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation*, Indiana University Press, 1995
- Mardin, Şerif, (1983), *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri (1895-1908)*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Nesin, Aziz, (2005), *Bir Sürgünün Anıları*, İstanbul: Nesin Yayınevi
- Nesin, Aziz, (1975), *Geriye Kalan*, İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi
- Parla, Taha & Davison, Andrew (2004), *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or Order*, New York: Syracuse University Press
- Parla, Taha, (1991), *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları, Atatürk'ün Nutku*, volume 1, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Parla, Taha, (1992), *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları, Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Oku*, volume 3, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Parla, Taha, (2009), *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Korporatizm*, İstanbul: Deniz Yayınları
- Peker, Recep, (1936), *İnkılap Dersleri*, Ankara: Ulus Basımevi
- Saydur, Mehmet, (2001), *Marko Paşa Gerçeği*, İstanbul: Çınar Yayınları
- Smith, Jeremy, (1999), *The Bolsheviks and the National Question (1917-1923)*, London: Studies in Russia and East Europe Series
- Stalin, Joseph, (1953), *Marxism and the National Question* in J. Stalin Works, volume II, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House
- Sülker, Kemal, (1968), *Sabahattin Ali Dosyası*, İstanbul: Ant Yayınları
- Toprak, Zafer (1995), *İttihat Terakki ve Devletçilik*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları
- Tekeli, İlhan & İlkin, Selim (2003), *Bir Cumhuriyet Oyküsü: Kadro'yu ve Kadrocuları Anlamak*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları
- Tunçay, Mete (1967), *Türkiye'de Sol Akımlar (1908 - 1925)*, 2nd Edition, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi
- Türkeş, Mustafa, (1999), *Kadro Hareketi: Ulusçu Bir Sol Akım*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi

Tör, Vedat Nedim, (1976), *Yıllar Böyle Geçti*, Milliyet Yayınları

Ulus, Ozgür Mutlu, (2011), *The Army and the Radical Left in Turkey: Military Coups, Socialist Revolution and Kemalism*, London: I.B.Tauris

Vâ-Nu, Müzehher, (1975), *Bir Dönemin Tanıklığı*, İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1975

Yanardağ, Merdan, (2008), *Türk Siyasal Yaşamında Kadro Hareketi*, İstanbul: Siyah Beyaz Yayınları

Yıldız, Aytaç, (2011), *Üç Dönem Bir Aydın: Burhan Asaf Belge*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Zürcher, Erik-Jan, (1984), *The Unionist Factor: The Role of the Committee of Union and Progress in the Turkish National Movement: 1905-1926*, Leiden: Brill

Zürcher, Erik-Jan, (2007), *Turkey, A Modern History*, London-New York: I.B. Tauris

### **Other Articles**

Ali, Sabahattin, (23 June 1943), “*Milliyetçinin Tarifi*”, Tan Newspaper, in Sabahattin Ali, *Bütün Yapıtları: Markopaşa Yazıları ve Otekiler*, Ankara: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2009, p. 130

Altun, Fahrettin, (2010), “*Discourse of Left-Kemalists in Turkey: Case of the Journal, Yön, 1961-1967*”, Middle East Critique, Vol. 19, No. 2, p. 135

Atılğan, Gökhan, (2009), “*Sosyalist Milliyetçilik Söylemi (Türkiye, 1961-1968): Temeller, Arınlıklar*”, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 2009, volume 64, issue 3, p. 2

Atılğan, Gökhan, (2007), “*Türkiye Sosyalist Hareketinde Anti-Emperyalizm ve Bağımsızlıkçılık (1920-1971)*”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Sol, volume VIII, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 661

Çelik, Nur Betül, (2009), “*Kemalizm: Bir Hegemonik Söylem*”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, volume II, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 75

Dumont, Paul, (1984), “*Origins of Kemalist Ideology*”, Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey, (edited by) Jacob M. Landau, Leiden: Brill, p. 25

İnsel, Ahmet, (1988), “*Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Devletçilik*”, Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 1915

Kansu, Aykut, (2009), “*Türkiye’de Korporatist Düşünce ve Korporatizm Uygulamaları*”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, volume II, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 253

Kuyaş, Ahmet, (2009), “*Yeni Osmanlılar’dan 1930'lara Anti-Emperyalist Düşünce*”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, volume II, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 247

Nesin, Aziz, (1984), “*Cumhuriyet Döneminde Gülmeceye Baskı: Markopaşa Orneği*”, Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 1435

Tekeli, İlhan & İlkin, Selim (2007), *Kadro ve Kadrocuların Öyküsü*, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Sol, volume VIII, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 600

Tunçay, Mete, (2007), “*Türkiye’de Komünist Akımın Geçmişi Üzerine*”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Sol, volume VIII, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 349

Türkeş, Mustafa, (February 2001), “*A Patriotic Leftist Development Strategy Proposal in Turkey in the 1930s: The Case of the Kadro Movement*”, International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 33, No: 1, p. 91-114

Türkeş, Mustafa, (October 1998), “The Ideology of the Kadro (Cadre) Movement: A Patriotic Leftist Movement in Turkey”, Middle Eastern Studies, vol. 34, No: 4, Turkey  
Before and After Atatürk: Internal and External Affairs, p. 92-119

Türkeş, Mustafa, (2004), “*Kadro Dergisi*”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 464

Yıldız, Ahmet, (2009), “*Kemalist Milliyetçilik*”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm, volume II, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınlar, p. 210

Zürcher, Erik-Jan, (2005), “*Ottoman Sources of Kemalist Thought*”, Late Ottoman Society: Intellectual Legacy, Elisabeth Özdalga, (ed.), New York: Routledge, p. 15

Zürcher, Erik-Jan, (2007), “*Ottoman Legacy of the Turkish Republic*”, The State and the Subaltern: Authoritarian Modernization in Turkey and Iran, (edited by) Touraj Atabaki, London - New York: I. B. Tauris, p. 95

Zürcher, Erik-Jan, (2008), “*From Empire to Republic: Problems of Transition, Continuity and Change*”, Turkey in the Twentieth Century (La Turquie au vingtième siècle), ed. by Erik-Jan Zürcher, Vol. 3, Berlin : Schwarz, p. 15

Zürcher, Erik-Jan, (2009), “*Jön Türkler: Sınır Bölgelerinin Çocukları*”, Savaş, Devrim ve Uluslaşma: Türkiye Tarihinde Geçiş Dönemleri (1908-1928), İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, p. 139

“*Devlet Kapitalizmi*”, (1988), Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, (edited by Murat Belge), volume 2, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 593

“*NEP*”, (1988), Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, volume 3, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 694

“*Narodnizm*”, (1988), Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, volume 2, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 495

“*Mısır: Nâsır Sosyalizmi*”, (1988), Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, volume 4, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, p. 1297