

Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna

DOTTORATO DI RICERCA IN

STUDI GLOBALI E INTERNAZIONALI-
GLOBAL AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Ciclo XXX.

Settore Concorsuale: 14/B2 - STORIA DELLE RELAZIONI INTERNAZIONALI,
DELLE SOCIETA' E DELLE ISTITUZIONI EXTRAEUROPEE

Settore Scientifico Disciplinare: SPS/06 - STORIA DELLE RELAZIONI
INTERNAZIONALI

Governing the “Crises”:

Socioeconomic Exploration of Cultural Processes in Interwar Italy and Turkey
via Experiences of *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* and *Halkevleri*

Presentata da: Dott. Avi Mizrahi

Coordinatrice Dottorato

Prof.ssa Daniela Gianetti

Supervisore

Prof.Stefano Bianchini

Esame finale anno 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly I am grateful to life, that crossed my path with that of my friend of life, my love Sara. It is this mutual path of travel and discovery that inspired me to cultivate this work, together with many things else. Then, I am thankful to my extended family who supported me emotionally during the preparation of this thesis.

From the academy, I would like to thank sincerely to my thesis supervisor Prof.Stefano Bianchini for his eminent and supportive advices in each process of this work. I am also thankful to Prof.Taha Parla whom I had the chance to engage in a constructive discussion with, during the early research period of this dissertation. Lastly I appreciate to the colleagues in EHESS whom I was lucky to meet with and have profitable debates on my research during my fellowship in Paris.

Governing the “Crises”:
Socioeconomic Exploration of Cultural Processes in Interwar Italy and Turkey
via Experiences of *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* and *Halkevleri*

ABSTRACT

Interwar European historiography teaches us significant lessons on states' reactive responses to economical and social instabilities. In such an atmosphere of “insecurity” one sees more states adopting socioeconomic policies for the construction of a so-called “society in harmony.” Thus such institutional policies build the path for tranquilization and participation as well as survival and reaction. This thesis questions the processes that lead to the foundation of *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* (OND) in Italy and *Halkevleri* (People Houses) in Turkey in comparison. It departs with the socioeconomic analysis of capital distribution crisis and capital accumulation crisis in inter-war Italian and Turkish contexts with developing totalitarian and solidaristic corporatist models respectively. In this base, it tests the hypothesis; if employment of these institutional policies by relative inter-war governments reflected a reactionary response to crises of an “infrastructurally perceived threat” leading to social disintegration. The research methodology is developed on three levels, regards to (1) theoretical, (2) discursive and (3) policy formation matters. It firstly approaches the infrastructural and superstructural circumstances in each national context. Then it maps the perception patterns of intellectuals and law-makers leading to specific policy making practices. Following an excavation of primary and secondary sources, it observes that the hypothesis is partly rejected. The thesis defends that foundation of OND confirms the statement of being a reactionary policy against an “infrastructurally perceived

threat” embodied as “organized labor”; however formation of *Halkevleri* negates the statement of being a reactionary policy against an “infrastructurally perceived threat.” It is observed that formation of *Halkevleri* reflects a reactionary policy against a “superstructurally perceived threat” imagined to be “counter-revolution.”

Governare le “crisi”:

Esplorazioni socioeconomiche dei processi culturali nel periodo interbellico italiano e turco attraverso l'esperienza dell'Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro e *Halkevleri*

ABSTRACT

La storiografia europea interbellica ci insegna lezioni sulle reazioni reattive degli stati alle instabilità economiche e sociali. In tale atmosfera di "insicurezza" possiamo vedere che più stati adottano politiche socioeconomiche che hanno come obiettivo la costruzione di una cosiddetta "società in armonia." Possiamo notare inoltre che tali politiche istituzionali, influenzano un *modus operandi* che genera tranquillizzazione e partecipazione, oltre che sopravvivenza e reazione. Questa tesi mette in discussione e al confronto i processi che portano alla fondazione dell'Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro (OND) in Italia e di *Halkevleri* (casa dei popoli) in Turchia. Partendo dall'analisi socioeconomica delle crisi di distribuzione del capitale e di accumulazione dello stesso, nel contesto interbellico italiano e turco, la tesi sviluppa rispettivamente i modelli di corporativismo totalitario e solidaristico. Su questa base teorica, la seguente ipotesi è analizzata: l'impiego di queste politiche istituzionali da parte dei relativi governi durante il periodo interbellico, può essere considerato come una reazione reattiva alla “percepita minaccia infrastrutturale” che porta alla cosiddetta disintegrazione sociale? La metodologia di ricerca si sviluppa su tre livelli: (1) questioni teoriche, (2) discorsive e (3) politiche. In primo luogo affronta le circostanze infrastrutturali e sovrastrutturali che caratterizzano i due contesti nazionali. In seguito, mappa i modelli di percezione degli intellettuali e dei legislatori che portano all'applicazione di specifiche pratiche di policy-making. La ricerca di fonti primarie e

secondarie ci conduce all'osservazione che l'ipotesi è in parte falsa. La tesi difende e conferma che la fondazione OND è una risposta reazionaria alla "percepita minaccia infrastrutturale" incarnata come "lavoro organizzato". Se questa ipotesi è vera nel caso italiano, l'esempio turco porta a una diversa interpretazione: la formazione di *Halkevleri* riflette una politica reazionaria contro una "percepita minaccia sovrastrutturale" immaginata come "controrivoluzione".

INDEX

1.INTRODUCTION	p.13
1.1. THE TOPIC/ PROBLEM	p.13
1.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THE WORKING HYPOTHESIS	p.17
1.2.1. Research Questions	p.17
1.2.2. Working Hypothesis	p.19
1.3. METHODOLOGY	p.19
1.4. THESIS STRUCTURE	p.22
2.POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY ON CORPORATISM	p.26
2.1. INTRODUCTION	p.26
2.2. HOWARD J.WIARDA: STUDYING CORPORATISM COMPARATIVELY	p.28
2.2.1. Liberal-Pluralist Approach	p.30
2.2.2. Marxist Approach	p.31
2.2.3. Corporatist Approach	p.33
2.3. PETER J.WILLIAMSON: THREE MODELS OF CORPORATISM	p.35
2.3.1. Consensual-Licensed Corporatist Model	p.36
2.3.2. Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model	p.36
2.3.3. Contract Model (Neo-Corporatism)	p.39
2.3.4. An Overview: General Characteristics and Critics	p.40
2.4. TAHA PARLA: PRECISE DISCUSSION ON CORPORATISM	p.44
2.4.1. Discussing Corporatism's General Characteristics	p.44
2.4.1.1. Criticizing the “3 rd Way” Argument	p.44

2.4.1.2. Different Layers of Corporatist Social Theory	p.45
2.4.1.3. Positioning Corporatism: Imagining a Society in Harmony	p.45
2.4.1.4. Attribution to Emile Durkheim	p.48
2.4.2. Corporatism as a Reaction to Crises: Accumulation and Distribution Crises	p.52
2.4.3. Two variants of Corporatism: Parla's "Solidaristic" and "Fascistic" Variants	p.53
2.5. CONCLUSIONS	p.55
3. PARTICULAR CASES-THEORIZING CORPORATISMS:	
IMAGINING SOCIETIES IN HARMONY	p.58
3.1. INTRODUCTION	p.58
3.2. CONTEXTUALIZING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	p.60
3.2.1. Freeing the Corporatist Theory from its "Pejorative Application"	p.60
3.2.2. Opposing the "Political Culture" Argument	p.62
3.2.3. Accumulation and Distribution Crisis leading to Solidaristic and Totalitarian Corporatisms	p.64
3.2.3.1. Developmental Capitalism in Context: Accumulation Crisis	p.65
3.2.3.2. Advanced Capitalism in Context: Distribution Crisis	p.66
3.2.3.3. Solidaristic and Totalitarian Corporatist Models Revisited	p.66
3.2.3.4. Point of Theoretical Separation: Criticizing Parla and Davison	p.68
3.2.4. Comparison in Reference to International Context	p.71
3.3. DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES IN ITALY:	
TOTALITARIAN CORPORATIST MODEL	p.75
3.3.1. Understanding the Totalitarian Mindset: Incorporation to the State "from within"	p.76
3.3.2. Totalitarian State Approaching the "Individual": Labor as "Social Duty"	

and the Producer Cult	p.78
3.3.3. “Representation” in its new form: Bringing the <i>Masses</i> within the state	p.83
3.3.4. Voices from the Paradigm: Discussions on Corporatist Policy in Italy	p.88
3.4. DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES IN TURKEY: SOLIDARISTIC CORPORATIST MODEL	p.92
3.4.1. Revisiting Social Thought of Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)	p.92
3.4.1.1. Gökalp's “ <i>Tesanütçülük</i> ” (Solidarism): Institutionalization of Division of Labor	p.94
3.4.2. Policy-Makers: <i>Tesanütçülük</i> (Solidarism) in Discourse and Practice	p.96
3.4.2.1. Izmir Economy Congress of 1923 and the Proposals on Economic Policies	p.99
3.4.2.2. Discussing Corporatism after Gökalp: Voices from the Paradigm	p.100
3.4.2.2.1..Recep Peker: Party-Centered Vision	p.102
3.4.2.2.2. <i>Kadro</i> 's “National Liberation Movement” Thesis and Critique of Italian Fascism	p.104
3.5. CONCLUSIONS	p.107
4. PARTICULAR CASES- CORPORATIST CULTURAL POLICIES: PROMOTING SOCIETIES IN HARMONY	p.113
4.1. INTRODUCTION	p.113
4.2. OPERA NAZIONALE DOPOLAVORO	p.116
4.2.1. Understanding the Sociopolitical Climate- Italian Case	p.116
4.2.1.1. <i>Case del Popolo</i>	p.116
4.2.1.2. “ <i>Dopolavoro</i> ” and the Path to OND	p.117

4.2.1.3. Mario Giani's Evolving Proposal	p.119
4.2.2. Analyzing OND	p.123
4.2.2.1.OND Working Structure	p.123
4.2.2.1.1. Institutional Hierarchy	p.127
4.2.2.1.2. Enrollment Process	p.128
4.2.2.2. Approaching OND	p.130
4.2.2.2.1. Maximizing Production	p.130
4.2.2.2.2. “People” as a Non-Class Unit	p.131
4.2.2.2.3. A Corporatist National “De-Alienation”?	p.133
4.3. HALKEVLERİ	p.135
4.3.1. Understanding the Sociopolitical Climate- Turkish Case	p.135
4.3.1.1. Historical background in class context	p.135
4.3.1.2. <i>Türk Ocakları</i> / Turkish Hearths	p.137
4.3.1.3. <i>Serbest Cumhuriyet Partisi</i> / Free Republican Party (FRP)	p.140
4.3.1.4. Menemen Incident	p.141
4.3.1.5. Framing the Political Dynamics	p.142
4.3.1.5.1. Zürcher's argument of “transition”	p.142
4.3.1.5.2. Şimşek's argument on “institutional renewal”	p.144
4.3.2. Analyzing <i>Halkevleri</i>	p.145
4.3.2.1. <i>Halkevleri</i> Working Structure	p.145
4.3.2.1.2. Branches and Organizational Activities	p.147
4.3.2.2. Approaching <i>Halkevleri</i>	p.153
4.3.2.2.1. Ideological Motivations	p.153

4.4. CONCLUSIONS	p.156
CHAPTER 5. INTER-PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES:	
INTERWAR ITALY AND TURKEY	p.160
5.1. INTRODUCTION	p.160
5.2. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: EVOLVING PERCEPTIONS	p.162
5.2.1. 1922-1927 Period: Distance	p.163
5.2.2. 1928-1932 Period: Rapprochement	p.166
5.2.2.1. Repercussions of 1928 Italo-Turkish Treaty	p.166
5.2.2.2. 1929-1930: Relations in Regional Perspective	p.168
5.2.2.3. Climax: 1932 Turkish Committee's Visit to Italy	p.170
5.2.3. 1932-1939 Period: Diverging Agendas	p.171
5.2.4. Remarks	p.176
5.3. INTERNAL POLICIES:	
ANALOGICAL THINKING AND DIFFERENTIAL THINKING	p.178
5.3.1. Cultural Politics in Dual Perspective	p.179
5.3.1.1. “Revolution Ideology: Youth Generation Issue” by Şevket S.Aydemir (1932)	p.179
5.3.1.2. “Popular and Youth Organization in Italy” by Selim Sırrı (1933)	p.183
5.3.2. Socioeconomics in Dual Perspective	p.184
5.3.2.1. “Fascism in the Near East” by Ettore Rossi (1932)	p.184
5.3.2.2. “Turkey in the Changing World Relations” by Vedat Nedim (1932)	p.187
5.3.2.3. “How and Why the Regimes are Changing?” by Burhan Asaf (1932)	p.188

5.3.2.4. “Non-Classification and Economy Politics” by Vedat Nedim (1932)	p.189
5.3.3. RPP 4 th National Congress of 1935	p.191
5.3.3.1. “R.Peker's Discourse” (1935)	p.191
5.3.3.2. “Kemalist Program' of Republican People Party" by Ubaldo Faldati (1935)	p.192
5.4. CONCLUSIONS	p.194
6. CONCLUSIONS	p.197
BIBLIOGRAPHY	p.210
ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS AND LEGISLATIONS	p.217

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

“Salute from Kemalist Turkey to Fascist Italy!”

(*Cumhuriyet* Newspaper, 22 May 1932)

Turkish newspaper, “*Cumhuriyet*” (Republic) announced the meeting of two statesman, Benito Mussolini and İsmet İnönü, scheduled for 27 May 1932 in Rome, with this banner headline from the first page. Following a whole page glorifying the industrial modernization acts of Italy, the newspaper printed an illustration of two flags getting inside one another, a “*fasces*” inside the Turkish flag. Looking back to the interwar years, one asks the question, if these two countries did so-called “salute” each other in considering their internal policies? Can we speak about the similarities or differences of these two states, in their economical policies, their socio-political approach to modernization specifically during the interwar years (1922-1939), in response to economical uncertainties of 1930's?

1.1. THE TOPIC/ PROBLEM

In light of this concern, infrastructural and superstructural circumstances in the development of the following two institutions of mass organization in these countries are investigated: *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro*/National Recreational Club (OND) in Italy and *Halkevleri*/People Houses in Turkey. Therefore, central problematic of this research deals with the question of “How Italian and Turkish scholars and law makers approached a corporatist, conflictless national imagination and developed institutional cultural policies between 1922 and 1939?”

Stimulated by this central problematic, this thesis builds a discussion on the base of the theory of corporatism, with references to intellectual discussions on policy applications. Furthermore in detail, via theorization of totalitarian corporatism and solidaristic corporatism respectively in Italy and in Turkey, specific socio-economic policies are explained in reference to “distribution crisis” and “accumulation crisis” experienced in different stages of capitalist development in these two countries. Only in this regard the processes that lead to the organizing of consent in Italian and Turkish states during the first half of the twentieth century are explored with a special focus on the abovementioned institutional cultural policies in relation with states' national modernization policies.

Literature focusing on the socioeconomic discussions, political platforms and interpretations on policy-making practices of the interwar Turkish Republic is instructive. Thus as it is encountered in these sources, an interpretation of the Republican government's policies towards “more authoritarian” tendencies following the economical difficulties of 1930's, with references to the failed experience of Free Republican Party and incidents such as Menemen event, in a process leading to the foundation of People Houses is present. (Mateescu 2006; Zürcher 2004a, 2004b; Bozarslan 2013) On the other hand there is an approach on describing such political rhetoric and policies in relation to a larger context, via a theoretical language built on the theory of corporatism; in its particular variant of solidaristic corporatism. (Parla 1985; Parla and Davison 2004)

Furthermore studies regarding the cultural policies, particularly the employment of the People Houses project in Turkey are also relevant. However these works as well focus excessively on

the policies of this institution and highlight the particular characteristics of them explained in relation to the ideological reference points promoted by the Republican government. In this sense they approach the institution and its activities – such as theater, folklore, music exc.- as part of the larger “nation-building” paradigm that aims to explain the Turkish modernization of the early republican era; or via highlighting the “peasantist” ideal glorified by the very institution. (Karaömerlioğlu 1998; 2006; Öztürkmen 1994) They definitely serve as a base for us to give meaning to such cultural policies. However in this thesis it is argued that sole explanations based on the theoretical schemes of nationalization, peasantism or populism, limit current researchers to interpret the political discussions took place during the interwar years in the relevant countries; as well as the public policy applied in relation to a political sociology based on a corporatist vision of the social reality. I argue that separating this reality from the national and the international context firstly lacks to explicate the role of the socio-economic factors that lead to the foundation of the institution and secondly it touches so ephemerally to the imagined, attributed role to the institution in an international context, in comparison with its contemporaries.¹

1

In this regard, existing researches are closely engaged with the literature on Nationalism Studies. Works such as *Imagined Communities* of Benedict Anderson (2006), *Banal Nationalism* of Michael Billig (1995) and *Nationalism* of Ernest Gellner (1997) provide a perfect outline on sketching the idea of nationalism, treating it as a modern phenomenon. Especially Gellner's note on to state's restrictive role on promoting certain “native” cultural practices is enlightening. (1997) Such framework could as well consist of “proper cultural traits” and “traditions”, as Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (1983) mentions with the well-coined term of “invented traditions.” Traits and cultural practices which do serve to the justification and promotion of the “national identities” based on them; which can lead to approach these organizations as the products of a policy in building a “nationalized cultural institutions.” Analysis based on this literature definitely can come up with satisfying explanations on the development of these two institutions; as national policies. Though it is argued that they have the tendency to miss the infrastructural relations which conditioned the path for such policy applications. This is the point which this research aims to incorporate and explore via the theory of corporatism.

In this light, regarding the Turkish case this research aims to build the analytical bond between these two fields of study, via focusing on the socio-economic circumstances that lead to the application of abovementioned institutional cultural policies in Turkey. However, in order to grasp the specific characteristics of this development leading to the employment of People Houses it is analyzed in parallel to the formation of OND in the Italian case.

Specific case studies regarding the cultural policies of the fascist era in Italy are abundant, such as Marla Susan Stone's, Philip V. Cannistraro's and Victoria de Grazia's researches. (Stone 1998; Cannistraro 1972; De Grazia 1981) They are as well definitely enlightening towards cultural policies in application in the period concerned; and specifically as it will be seen in our discussions, de Grazia's work on OND still remains a crucial point of reference. Thus it adopts as well an analysis on a national scale. In this regard this research aims to contribute to this literature via adopting a comparative perspective, in light of the theory of corporatism.

In reading these two cases, one could as well develop a perspective on the “nationalization of the masses” noting George L. Mosse (1975) on this issue, however the departure point of this research is that such an explanation of cultural policies should be studied in the larger context of socio-economic circumstances that created the ground for their implication. Thus this account can be achieved only together with the consideration of the infrastructural dynamics in these cases. Therefore approaching the theory of corporatism, developing its characteristics on socio-economical and cultural policy applications, lets us observe the very particularities, motivations, differences of the policies employed by the governments in question.

Ultimately literature regarding the inter-perception patterns observed among the intellectuals and lawmakers voiced in the public platforms in these two countries, towards each other are relatively poor. On Turkish actors' perception towards Fascist Italy, Ünver's unpublished thesis is present. (Ünver 2001) Thus regarding the Italian perception patterns towards the interwar Turkish transformation, narratives are built generally on the interpretation of the international policy. (di Casola 1990; Barlas 2004) Therefore abovementioned problematic in identifying such inter-perception patterns between such actors, narrated within a cadre evolving international diplomatic context of the interwar era remains a requisite in the literature. While aiming to sketch out these patterns, the last part of the thesis aims to modestly contribute to this literature of history and international relations.

1.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THE WORKING HYPOTHESIS

Departing with the central problematic of the thesis mentioned above; research questions are developed in three levels: general, specific and international.

1.2.1. Research Questions

- In general, which institutions and what kind of socio-economic and cultural policies did Turkish and Italian states employ to achieve consensus during the interwar era? How such policies are formed; did they aim at a “public image construction” or can they be identified as parts of a social-engineering project?

It can be expected that the practical outcomes of the interwar socio-economic and cultural policies governed by Italian and Turkish states had the power to employ diverse methods to

strengthen nation-building. They could be in a range from education policies, promotion of several cultural products or censorship on media organs limiting its reproduction. However, this research particularly approaches to analyze the cultural political decisions made by the lawmakers in the first half of the 20th century, focusing specifically on the institutional policies in order to achieve the image of a “social harmony” or a “conflictless society.” Thus in this regard, we aim to engage in a more complex analysis of such institutional cultural policies with close reference to the socio-economic conditions that paved the path for their employment with exhibiting the particularities and differences between these cases.

- In specific, what were the intentioned -infrastructural/superstructural- motivations of such institutional policies (in OND and People Houses)? What were the institutional similarities and differences between OND and People Houses experiences, in regards to their administrative structures and practical activities?

Foundation of these two institutions should not be isolated from the historical context that they were developed in. As it is mentioned above, infrastructural and superstructural circumstances do play crucial roles in their development. Thus, firstly the intentions of the policy-makers when they have decided on foundation of these organizations need to be questioned. Secondly it's important to clarify if such decisions reflected reactionary policies towards “perceived threats” that put social stability in danger; and if so, how can they be categorized in these cases, as infrastructural or superstructural threats? Thirdly can they be seen in correlation with the socio-economic policies governed by these states?

- In order to grasp the development of the corporatist policies in an international context; How did the intellectuals and policy-makers in Italy and Turkey perceive each other? Can we speak inter-perception patterns that influenced the corporatist decision-making processes? How the images of these two countries were introduced in the public sphere?

Following a comparative account based on the data gathered in each national case in light of the two abovementioned levels of investigation, it's fundamental to frame our narrative on an international context. Therefore, the commentary articles and news appearing in Italian sources on Turkish policies as well as the data found in Turkish sources on Italian policies published in the period concerned in this thesis deserve investigation. In this regard, inter-perception patterns, attitudes towards the socio-economic corporatist transformation of “the other” are questioned, within a greater cadre of evolving diplomatic relations between the countries.

1.2.2. Working Hypothesis

In this regard, the working hypothesis which will be tested during this research is like the following: “The formation of *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* and *Halkevleri* as institutional policies employed by interwar Italian and Turkish governments, is the product of a reactionary response to crises of an 'infrastructurally perceived threat'² leading to social disintegration.”

1.3.METHODOLOGY

² Throughout the thesis, terminology of “infrastructure/base” and “superstructure” are used with reference to the Marxist literature. (See: Marx 1970.) “Infrastructurally perceived threat” is approached as an agency (individual, group or institutions) which is perceived to menace primarily the factors of the infrastructure such as relations of production, means of production. “Superstructurally perceived threat” is approached as an agency (individual, group or institution) which is perceived to menace the factors of the superstructure, such as political, cultural practices.

Exploration of the validity/falsifiability of such a statement requires a path that not only describes the intellectual and theoretical discussions on “social harmony” and culture but also the policy decisions sponsoring the very institutions in question. Interdisciplinary approach is stressed in the theoretical part of this work, and it is primarily based on the literature of sociology, political science and history. Therefore, research methodology consists of the following three levels, regards to (1) theoretical, (2) discursive, (3) policy formation matters.

(1) Firstly as the comparative framework of this study is sustained via theory of corporatism, it's fundamental to analyze the sources on this literature. The historical background of the development of this socioeconomic theory, its approach towards social organization and the role of the state needs to be theorized before proceeding with our discussion. In this regard sources of the authors such as Howard J.Wiarda (1997), Peter J.Williamson (2009), Philippe C. Schmitter (1974) and Taha Parla and Andrew Davison (2004) are considered. As it is further mentioned in depth in the thesis, it is important to highlight that the theory of corporatism is treated as a category with its subtypologies; theorized in this thesis via solidaristic and totalitarian corporatisms. Therefore the general category of “Corporatism” is not treated as synonyms to “Fascism” or “Authoritarian government” or whatsoever. On the contrary as will be seen in the discussions proceeded in the thesis, “Fascism” is understood only in its particular Italian context; and it is not treated as a generic form developing an ideal type leading to comparative analysis as in Roger Griffin (1991).³

(2) Secondly, primary sources regarding the specific cases concerned in this research are

³ See thesis section 3.2. CONTEXTUALIZING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK for further clarification on this matter.

analyzed. Catalogues of five following libraries are consulted: Rome Central National Library, Paris FMSH, Paris BUFR, Paris BULAC, Paris BDIC NANTERRE libraries. The sources consulted are Ankara People Houses journal *Ülkü*, newspaper *Cumhuriyet* and intellectual review *Kadro* regarding the Turkish sources; and political journal *Critica Fascista*, magazine of news and commentaries particularly on foreign affairs *Oriente Moderno*, newspaper *Il Popolo d'Italia* and the pro-regime magazine *Gerarchia* in the Italian case. These sources are consulted in order to sketch out sufficient data regarding three categories of analysis: First category concerned the socio-economic discussions in Turkish and Italian sources towards themes of internal policies in respective countries, including discussions related to the issue of corporatism. Secondly, articles and news, which related to the cultural policies, OND and People Houses experiences in these respective countries, are consulted. Thirdly, the news and articles in Italian sources regarding Turkish policies and in Turkish sources regarding Italian policies are categorized. Following the consultation of these seven sources' available numbers published between the period of 1922 and 1939; 258 pieces of news and articles related to the themes concerned, are analyzed.

(3) On the third level of the methodological planning, practical outcomes of the policy formations are focused on. In this regard from one side the institutional structures of two organizations are studied, activities organized from their internal branches are focused on. On the other hand direct documents, declarations on socio-economic and cultural policy published by the law-makers are consulted, such as “Labor Charter” regarding the Italian case, and documents regarding the Izmir Economical Congress including Recep Peker's declaration at the 4th RPP Congress and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's speech and adressings in the Turkish case. (Atatürk 1997)

1.4. THESIS STRUCTURE

Following this introductory chapter, on this methodological base, theoretical discussions and the interpretation of the data encountered are narrated in four main chapters of the thesis. In this regard, first main chapter **“2. POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY ON CORPORATISM”** aims to build a theoretical platform with references to the socio-economic theory of corporatism; on three layers- macro, medium and micro. In its first main section⁴ the general characteristics of the Corporatist approach in analyzing the social whole is discussed with contrasting it to the Liberal-Pluralist and Marxist approaches; with references to Howard J.Wiarda. In the second section⁵, theoretical analysis is whetted and the three models of corporatism is conceptualized with references to Peter J.Williamson; as Consensual-Licensed Corporatist Model, Authoritarian-Corporatist Model and Contract Model (Neo-Corporatism). In this section, his second model coined as **“Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model”** is highlighted which served us to even get in to micro layer in the third section⁶ of this chapter with references to Taha Parla's approach to the concept. Fundamental brick of our theoretical discussion, two crises lead by the capitalist mode of production; identified as **“crisis of capital distribution”** and **“crisis of capital accumulation”** are introduced in the third section of this chapter with references to Parla. Its further elaboration in the second main chapter helps us to develop the theory on totalitarian corporatism and solidaristic corporatism in analyzing the Italian and Turkish cases respectively.

In this regard, with reference to the abovementioned first research question, the second main chapter **“3.PARTICULAR CASES-THEORIZING CORPORATISM: IMAGINING**

⁴ 2.2.HOWARD J.WIARDA: COMPARATIVE CORPORATIST APPROACH

⁵ 2.3. PETER J.WILLIAMSON: THREE MODELS OF CORPORATISM

⁶ 2.4. TAHA PARLA: PRECISE DISCUSSION ON CORPORATISM

SOCIETIES IN HARMONY” is developed in three main sections. In the first section⁷, theoretical framework, which is discussed in the previous chapter, is contextualized and the critics towards them regarding several points are voiced. In light of this theory in the second main section⁸, Italian discussions on socio-economic policies are reported with specific references to policy applications; with references to the totalitarian corporatist model. Following this in the third section⁹ Turkish case is analyzed with references to discussions on socio-economic policies. In this section, as before, intellectual discussions are voiced with references to evidences of policy application.

Following these discussions with the references from socio-economic policy applications, in regards to the abovementioned second research question, the third main chapter of **“4. PARTICULAR CASES- CORPORATIST CULTURAL POLICIES: PROMOTING SOCIETIES IN HARMONY”** analyzes the institutions of OND in Italy and People Houses in Turkey. In this regard the chapter is divided into two main sections. In the first main section¹⁰ the Italian case is analyzed with references to the sociopolitical climate in which the idea and the application of the OND was developed. In order to grasp this historical context, institutions of *case del popolo*¹¹ and *dopolavoro*¹² are studied, before analyzing the development of OND. In this part the data regarding the OND working structure is analyzed and interpreted with references to the theoretical framework. In the second main section¹³ of the chapter, the organization of People Houses is analyzed. In this regard, similar to the above section firstly the

⁷ 3.2. CONTEXTUALIZING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

⁸ 3.3. DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES IN ITALY: TOTALITARIAN CORPORATIST MODEL

⁹ 3.4. DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES IN TURKEY: SOLIDARISTIC CORPORATIST MODEL

¹⁰ 4.2. OPERA NAZIONALE DOPOLAVORO

¹¹ Literal translation: people houses

¹² Literal translation: after-work

¹³ 4.3. HALKEVLERİ

sociopolitical climate is narrated in order to grasp the historical context in which the institution was developed. In this regard, the organization of “*Türk Ocakları*/Turkish Hearths” is specifically highlighted, together with references to other political and social incidents in the Turkish context of 1930's. Following this account on the sociopolitical climate, the institution of People Houses are approached, and the data regarding its working structure, its branches and activities are interpreted in the theoretical context. With regards to the particular period of time concerned in this thesis (1922-1939), above chapters specifically aim to put light on the first three stages of the policy process. These include the study of the structural circumstances leading to the (1) “policy initiation”; decision-making agencies' responses to such circumstances drawing to (2) “policy formation”; followed by the actual realization of the policies via institution-building at the stage of (3) “policy implementation.”¹⁴ (Heywood 2007: 430)

In light of the discussions developed in the previous chapters, it is argued that both of the contexts were structured by two different crises of the capitalist economy. With reference to two corporatist models it is argued that they both reacted to the crises in an anti-socialist, non-liberal however not anti-capitalist manner. However this comparative analysis of two national cases should not miss the transnational aspect of policy making practices. This is the point where the act of observing the “others” policies, its political trajectory, becomes crucial. Related to the abovementioned third research question, in the fourth main chapter of the thesis, “**5. INTERPERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES: INTERWAR ITALY AND TURKEY**” socio-political positions voiced by the Turkish and Italian intellectuals in the inter-war era are narrated in an international cadre. In this regard the archival data, news and commentaries appearing on the

¹⁴ For further information on Heywood's conceptualization of the policy process and its further stages; see Heywood 2004.

Turkish sources on Italian interwar policies and Italian sources engaged in Turkish policies are demonstrated. According to the findings, this narrative is developed in two sections. In the first section¹⁵, aiming to position the contextual cadre, data (news and commentaries) regarding the international relations between two countries are elaborated. This narrative is constructed with constant references to the diplomatic relations between two countries. In this regard this helped the interpretation of the patterns as “evolving perceptions” as the data found in high correlation with the dynamics of the diplomatic relations between the two countries. In the second main section¹⁶, data regarding the internal policies are demonstrated. In this regard, with constant references to the data, two diverse attitudes among the authors are observed; these are explicated as “analogical thinking attitude” among the authors of the Italian sources and “differential thinking attitude” among the authors of the Turkish sources analyzed.

Following the assessment of the sources and evidences exhibited in the previous four main chapters, in the final chapter **6.CONCLUSIONS**; in light of the theoretical framework and the data collected, final arguments are developed with a reference to the evaluation of the abovementioned working hypothesis.

¹⁵ 5.2. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: EVOLVING PERCEPTIONS

¹⁶ 5.3. INTERNAL POLICIES: ANALOGICAL THINKING AND DIFFERENTIAL THINKING

CHAPTER 2. POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY ON CORPORATISM

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The corporatist perspective, introducing itself as the “third way”¹⁷ is presented as anti-socialist and non-liberal; however it is definitely not anti-capitalist. Therefore it can be expected that appropriate identities promoted via state institutions embrace such principles. In light of this, the cultural policies promoted institutionally reflect such sociopolitical assumptions: blessings of “an ideal society”, as well as crises of “perceived threats” of social disintegration. Considering the interwar Italian and Turkish states and their particular, distinct socio-economical modes of organization of the society; this thesis aims to put light on a specific field of discussion: institutional cultural policies shaped in light of such a principle of construction of a conflictless society- “a harmonious society” without class conflicts; as a reaction to the “perceived threats” of social disintegration. During this investigative path, we approach to identify the characteristics of these “perceived threats”, which are argued to condition and trigger the application of such cultural policies.

In this regard this chapter is elaborated on how the idea of creating an “harmonious” society without class conflicts was promoted by respective states' policies and how they were incorporated to the citizen models imagined by the law-makers; compatible with the so-called “national interests” above the individual and incompatible with particular class interests. However, as it will be seen in the following pages, the theoretical discussion in this chapter is done without particular references to the Turkish and the Italian cases, but it is developed on a

¹⁷ The term is used in the sense that corporatist system offered an alternative to capitalist and socialist ways of organizing the social whole.

general theoretical platform aiming to map out the mind-set of the corporatist social thought as well as the political practices triggered by this vision. Thanks to this theoretical introduction in the following chapters particular cases of Turkey and Italy will be elaborated in comparison and contrast.

This chapter is developed on the following four sections aiming to give a general information on the studies of corporatism. Firstly, in **2.2. HOWARD J.WIARDA: STUDYING CORPORATISM COMPARATIVELY**, with constant references to Howard J.Wiarda's particular work on “Corporatism and Comparative Politics-The Other Great “Ism” (1997), distinctiveness of the corporatist vision in comparatively analyzing the social and economical processes in certain cases is introduced. In this section, the term corporatism is approached as a “point of view”, as a “mind-set, which builds the language of social analysis.” In order to describe such vision, as Wiarda points them out, firstly liberal-pluralist and Marxist approaches towards social analysis are studied briefly; then the difference of the corporatist optic is highlighted. Developing our discussion on corporatism, in the second main section of this chapter, named as **2.3. PETER J.WILLIAMSON: THREE MODELS OF CORPORATISM** in light of Peter J.Williamson's ground-breaking work on corporatist social thinking and policies, “Varieties of Corporatism: A Conceptual Discussion” (2009), the three varieties which Williamson theorizes in his work, as “Consensual-Licensed Corporatist Model”, “Authoritarian Licensed Corporatist Model” and “Contract Model (Neo-Corporatism)” are discussed. This part aims to highlight the second model, “Authoritarian Licensed Corporatist Model” as the suitable model for our theoretical platform and seek to develop our discussion to a narrower theme in the third section of this chapter. Third main section, named as **2.4. TAHA PARLA: PRECISE**

DISCUSSION ON CORPORATISM, a model, an ideal type of the corporatist thought and policy-making practices is put out in references to Taha Parla's two works on “The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp: 1876-1924” (1985) and “Corporatist Ideology In Kemalist Turkey: Progress Or Order?” (2004) with Andrew Davison. With references to positivist thinker Emile Durkheim, this theoretical background on corporatist social thought is essential for our further discussion in the next chapters in this thesis. Finally, the last part of this chapter, **2.5.CONCLUSIONS**, in light of the information given in the above three layers of this discussion aims to build a vertical, continuous sequence starting with (1) Howard J.Wiarda's general approach on comparative studies and his explanation of the corporatist approach; followed by a more specific theme of (2) Peter J.Williamson's three models of analysis of corporatist models leading to his conceptualization of the “Authoritarian Licensed Corporatist Model”; followed by an even more detailed approach of (3) Taha Parla, developed by his references to French sociologist Emile Durkheim and his conceptualization of two varieties of corporatism; which will be criticized and further developed in Chapter 3.

2.2. HOWARD J.WIARDA: STUDYING CORPORATISM COMPARATIVELY

In this first part of the thesis, a general discussion leading to the theorization of corporatism is focused on. This theorization will consequently provide us with a platform, which we will be developing our comparative analysis on. Therefore, below a brief discussion, leaded by Howard J.Wiarda, on three approaches on social analyses as “Liberal-pluralist approach”, “Marxist approach” and the “Corporatist approach” is noted. In the next part followed by Wiarda's explanation, we will be passing into a more specific layer with Peter J.Williamson, built on the third (corporatist) approach mentioned above.

Regarding the discussions on comparative studies one observes two main paradigmatic approaches in which the case analysis are based on. These two approaches can be coined as the “liberal-pluralism” and “Marxism”. However, firstly it can be said that limiting the comparative research within the framework of these two models definitely blocks our perspectives of analysis, regarding the cases, which are “harder” to fit in the abovementioned two models. Secondly, such distinction do connotes, reproduces the classical identifications used by the “cold-war-era social and political analysis.” According to this simplistic classification “liberalism-pluralism was largely found in the Western democratic nations (United States and Western Europe)” and only within this approach/paradigm scholars used to analyze such countries' cases in comparative politics. While Marxism and the idea of scientific socialism, used to be a method of analysis which would be used for the study of the cases concentrated more in the Soviet Union or the so-called “Eastern bloc countries.” (Wiarda 1997: 3)

Within this framework the theory of corporatism opens a new platform to develop comparative political studies regarding the cases that do not “simply fit” in the theoretical models outlined by the liberal-pluralist and Marxist models. To explain it briefly, both of these three cases develop particular languages in analyzing the state-society relations. These specific terminologies, which they base their analysis on, condition how the theorists come up with models explaining the political realities. Before proceeding with further discussions, below it is noted how Wiarda outlines the theoretical framework of these three approaches and their conceptualization of “interest groups”, which lead to the distinctiveness of the corporatist thought.

2.2.1. Liberal-Pluralist Approach

Within the liberal-pluralist approach interest groups are imagined, organized in the society as “free, unfettered, and completely independent from the state. Interest groups can organize on any issue; in the modern liberal state there are few if any restrictions on interest group activities.” (ibidem, 5) As one could guess this also brings the essential characteristic, which the liberal-pluralist paradigm based itself on: competition. Competition may exist between the organized interest groups, among different sectors, or even among the groups within the same professional sector. In this liberal framework/ approach, what one sees is that there exists a belief that such “freedom-based” principles on gathering and organizing interest groups and the competition that rises among them lead to origins where “good and effective” public policy emerges. Wiarda's argument on the “liberal function” of competition gives a very good perspective on this position:

“For the plethora of competing groups serves not only to advance a great variety of policy positions but also forces everyone to compromise, to accommodate and reach a democratic solution. And in this intense competition among interest groups, according to liberal-pluralist theory, the state (executive, legislative, juridical branches) plays a relatively minor role. It umpires and referees the group struggle but does not try to control it; the state in this theory, serves as a transmission belt and filter for interest-group activities, but it does not dominate the process or seek to impose its own purposes on it.” (ibidem, 5-6)

Briefly it can be argued that this approach minimizes the state interference in economic processes of production, prioritizes the role of the interest groups and promotes individual initiatives and their investments. Therefore, as it will be seen below, the difference of the liberal-

pluralist framework from the corporatist approach is that the interest-groups such as occupational groups, syndicates of different professional sectors or employer organizations are given enough space to seek for their particularistic interests, without the intensive interference or pressure applied by the state institutions. Therefore, in theory within the liberal-pluralist approach one can't observe the organizing mechanism leaded by the state institutions; for corporations. In this regard, liberal-pluralist social theory equips us with an analytical language that is useful for this study, however not sufficient to develop our comparative study on our abovementioned two cases. Below, with the second approach, which Wiarda mentions in his book, as “Marxist Approach”, another particular position towards the organization of the interest groups are analyzed. Thus it remains important for us to grasp the literature on comparative political analysis; and the Marxist approach builds only a part of it. Further as it will be discussed below theoretical platform of our discussion will proceed with the analysis of the “Corporatist Approach.”

2.2.2. Marxist Approach

Contrasting to “liberal-pluralist” vision, within the Marxist paradigm, as the social realities are identified via the concept of “class” and the “conflict between the classes” is viewed as the integral part of the social experiences, the term inter-class “interest groups” based on professional occupations are viewed as alien, inappropriate categories of coordination. At this point, Wiarda points out the Soviet experience, and the relation between the state and the organized interest groups within those particular circumstances. Within this system, one observes the “all-encompassing” state mechanism, which coordinates the organized interest groups subordinated to this mechanism. This would mean that, in practice interest groups may be

organized, however they would not have any independence or autonomy from the state institutions. (ibidem, 6) To give an example to this kind, one can imagine the workers' associations of a particular sector (ex. construction sector). Syndicalist organizations of a particular sector could be welcomed in this case. However the difference from the “liberal-pluralist” paradigm outlined above is that within the socialist policies raised on the Marxist social approach; the State may not leave space to the bourgeoisie class portrayed as the “oppressor” within the capitalist mode of production, and as a consequence there may not be any kind of interest group organizations institutionalized as “employers' unions.” (ibidem, 6)

Here it is important to note that within the absence of such organizations the role of the state is also transformed. Briefly, in theory there would be no state umpiring and refereeing among the organized interest groups, but an all-embracing state promoting the benefit of a particular class, gathering occupational groups under its all-inclusive social structure. It is useful to note that the analytical language the Marxist theory provides us remains essential. As it will be seen in the following parts of this chapter, Marxist critique on the crisis lead by the capitalist mode of production, helps us to situate and understand the corporatist policies as reactions to such instabilities. However, as it will be seen once again in the following chapters of this thesis, we aim to go beyond the orthodox Marxist understanding of the separation between the economic infrastructure from the cultural superstructure, and aim to theorize the organization of two mass institutions with references to the corporatist theory, serving us the theoretical platform of comparison.

2.2.3. Corporatist Approach

Continuing our discussion with Wiarda's identification of corporatism, he underlines the fact that the corporatism's advocates prefer to represent it as “the third way”- “as an alternative route to modernization that avoids the disadvantages of the other two.” (ibidem, 6) As it will be seen in the following parts of this chapter, there will be several counter-arguments to this conceptualization as well. Even though it could be criticized as a subjective classification, to give us an introductory ideal type, Wiarda outlines the following three characteristics of the corporatist political vision: “(1) a strong but not totalitarian state, (2) structured (neither totally controlled nor fully-free) interest groups that are usually limited in number and functions, and (3) interest groups that are part of the state-as distinct from completely independent as found under liberal-pluralism.” (ibidem, 7)

At this position it is also important to note that in Wiarda's theory on corporatism, he argues that it was only the “West”, with his conception, “Europe and, by extension, Latin America”, that historical forms of corporatism are turned eventually to general ideologies in guiding social and economic processes. In light of the same argument, Wiarda defends that in other areas, such as Africa, Asia and areas under “Islamic sway”, which historical corporatist forms were present, they did not evolve to full-fledged ideologies, but remained as social orders prioritizing group solidarity and communitarianism. (Wiarda, 1997: 19)

Even it sounds as an essentialist and orientalist argument, Wiarda tries to strengthen his point with a “materialist” claim that the reason of the “non-evolution” of the corporatist ideologies in “Non-Western” societies is that, they have never experienced an inundation by the West's

emphasis on individualism. Here, Wiarda underlines also the evolution of capitalist mode of production in Western societies which led to class antagonism and brought corporatism as a counter-reaction to the economic and social conflicts brought by it. (Wiarda 1997)

As it is elaborated further in this chapter and in the chapter following, I find this argument problematic with the reason of its essentialist, orientalist-generalizing vision regarding the societies that remain, (according to Wiarda) out of the “Western zone of influence.” An example to this kind can be given with the Ottoman lodge system, organizations based on occupational groups of certain professions, regulating the economic as well as social processes of their communities. As it will be seen also in the following chapter of this thesis, in the social thought of Ziya Gökalp who influenced the social policies led by the Turkish Republican government during the first decades following its foundation, corporatist vision and its theoretical language do equip us with an ideal type and a particular terminology to study societies which did not experience a so-called “well-developed capitalist mode of production as the Western European societies” as proposed by Wiarda.

Therefore before leading our discussion to the next level on the historical types of the corporatist models, it's remarkable to note that in this thesis, characteristics of the ideal type developed by Wiarda together with its critics will engage in the theoretical discussion on corporatism without singling out any cases as “Western”, “non-Western” or such. Thus in the following part, our discussion on corporatism will proceed to the next layer, noting the three corporatist models described by Peter J. Williamson, which will lead to our specific ground of discussion on two particular cases; via elaborating his model of “Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatism.”

2.3. PETER J.WILLIAMSON: THREE MODELS OF CORPORATISM

Following the introductory approach of Wiarda, this part focuses on Peter J. Williamson's conceptualization of three historical models of corporatism. He examines the following three varieties of corporatism, “[1] as a body of nineteenth- and twentieth-century prescriptive economic and social thought; [2] as a practice of certain authoritarian regimes with private ownership of the means of production and wage labor; [3] and as a theoretical tool of analysis employed to study relations between organized groups and the state in ostensibly liberal democracies.” (Williamson, 2009: introduction)

According to Williamson's model, even though they are functional to approach to three different historical periods and the societies (as 19th century Church's social doctrine; interwar era social thought and policies; 20th century modern neo-corporatism) which they were each developed in, regarding their approaches to the State and Society relations, one can observe a continuity among these models that lead the general characteristics of the corporatist thoughts and policies. He comes up with the model that theorizes the corporatist thought and practice within three different categories, named as 1-Consensual-Licensed Corporatism, 2-Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatism, 3-Neo-Corporatism. Briefly, with these three categories, Williamson builds arguments on corporatism in general, pointing out the similarities and the difference in political practice and the philosophical thought that triggers such practices in these three cases. A deeper look on such characteristics of these three models is explored, via analyzing their distinct positions on three factors: (a.State-intermediary group relations, b.Consensus, c.Motivation) that will help us to theorize them in comparison. (Williamson, 2009: 11)

2.3.1. Consensual-Licensed Corporatist Model

In the first model of his scheme, coined as “consensual licensed” corporatist model, Williamson describes a prescriptive economic and social theory. The position of the (a) intermediary groups are situated via licenses given by the state institutions letting them to gain legitimacy and legal acknowledgement. As state licenses these organizations posited between the productive classes (that are employees and employers) state gains the chance to control their actions and hence it sustains a particular economic and social order that it structures its balance. Regarding the second category of (b) consensus, Williamson argues that within this model, one can observe the assumption that a corporatist system will both generate and attain a high degree of consensus on its aims and methods. Therefore supporters of such a system would take-for-granted the acceptance of this corporatist model within this society, and as a result of this acceptance, the state institutions would not even need to interfere harshly on the relations between the intermediary groups that regulate the processes of economic production. Eventually this would result with a notable degree of autonomy for intermediaries and societal actors. Thirdly, regarding the category of (c) motivation, Williamson argues that the reason of existence of the corporatist structures are motivated by the enhance degree of consensus, which means that among general public there exists a belief on need for such institutions controlling the economical and political processes. (Williamson, 2009: 11)

2.3.2. Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model

Second model theorized by Williamson is the “Authoritarian-Licensed” model of corporatism, which is most related to the central theme of this thesis, mentioning particularly the economical and social policies theorized and applied in two cases of the interwar era in Europe. According to

Williamson this model connotes a “politico-economic system as adopted practice in a number of authoritarian corporate states.” As the previous model, Williamson builds this type according to three different categories. Below, his idealization is studied briefly.

In the first category of (a) state-intermediary group relations, state controls the societal and economical actors via licensing the intermediary groups. However, the difference from the previous model is that here, the intermediary groups as well license and otherwise restrict the freedom of economical and social actors. One can think about the Italian case of corporations at this moment. Corporations were institutions, which the state licensed and gave legitimacy to its existence, however, it was again the corporations, which licensed or restricted the freedom of economical and social actors, which were within their sphere of competency. As it will also be seen in the following chapter, this licensing/legitimizing cycle lead the corporations to gather under united entities and demand to be a part of the economical and political process as a state figure. Experiences of national corporative bodies, “Central Corporative Committee/ *Comitato Corporativo Centrale*” the executive; together with the “Chamber of Fasces and Corporations/ *Camera dei Fasci e delle Corporazioni*” (from 1939 and onwards), and their political positions demanding more power and participation within the decision-making mechanisms should be studied with attribution to the licensing/legitimizing cycle mentioned above. (Williamson, 2009: 96)

Secondly, Williamson idealizes this model's characteristics regarding the category of (b) consensus as the following. He argues that within this social order, it is clear for the state officials that they are supporting an economical and political order promoting the “social

harmony” between the different groups of production within the society, with blocking the rise of the class conflicts or with taking under control the already-existing class antagonism. However, there is an assumption among these actors that there is a “limited support” for the underlying values and goals of the corporatist system.

Therefore such a situation legitimizes their approach in imposing this economical and social order via state's repressive apparatus¹⁸. As one could guess this builds and legitimizes the state of mind, which perceives the authoritarian political orders as “functional” and “needed” for the society. It is common that certain groups within such officials would legitimize these authoritarian mechanisms with “tutelary democratic thesis”, or arguments on “continuity of the authoritarian measures until the formation of a mature political culture”. The argument of “tutelary democratic thesis” is accentuated as well, as a counter argument in Parla and Davison; which will be referred in the next chapter. (Parla and Davison, 2004)

Regarding the third category, that is (c) motivation on implementing the corporatist social order within this ideal model, Williamson argues that “corporatist structures are so established as to secure the greatest level of state control practicable.” Therefore they are perceived as permanent and functional institutions, such as “buffers of stability” which promote the continuous firmness of economical production and a solidified, non-conflict social order.

It is important to remark that in the theoretical platform built on this thesis for our further discussion on corporatism, the “Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model” is considered as a mid-layer leading to a further discussion on solidaristic and totalitarian variants of corporatism.

¹⁸ The term is used in reference to Louis Althusser's conceptualization. (Althusser 1971)

Before leading our discussion on these variants, below the final corporatist model outlined by Williamson, which is more related to late our contemporary societies and the 20th century industrial economies, is noted briefly.

2.3.3. Contract Model (Neo-Corporatism)

Final model proposed by Williamson in studying the corporatist political theory and practices is the “Contract Model or Neo-Corporatism.” Within this model (a) state-intermediary group relations are structured by the “contracts” or exchanges of producer groups through bargaining. Such producer group leaders assure that the terms are obeyed by their members via diverse means, which could be also aided by the state. It is important to note in these cases as weaker means for submission is employed, such tendencies would lead to breakdown within the intermediary groups. Regarding the second category of (b) consensus, it is argued that there exists a general consensus, a general support for the existing order. However, actors do also believe that particularistic demands and conflict between the groups, individuals would put the system and its stability in danger. Finally, regarding the third category (c) motivation promotes the foundation of the corporatist structure, thus generating stronger support for the authoritative decisions. This means that the social and economical actors of the interest groups are not strictly engaged or demanding to be engaged in the decision-taking mechanisms as in the previously mentioned model above. Eventually, this makes the corporatist structures within this third model less formal institutionally. (Williamson, 2009: 11-12)

2.3.4. An Overview: General Characteristics and Critics

As one can see from the three models proposed by Williamson, diverse brands of corporatist thought and practice is analyzed, through their positions on three factors mentioned above that are (a) state-intermediary group relations, (b) consensus and (c) motivation. Below five points on corporatist thought and practice raised by Williamson with its relation to Nationalism are noted, which I discuss and in certain cases criticize/question for further theoretical development.

Firstly, regarding the theme of concern of this thesis, Williamson's second model, Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model instantiates an important ideal type to be further developed in the context of the corporatist thought and policies promoted by the governments in interwar Turkey and Italy. Therefore, a vertical correlation is considered between Wiarda's explanation to corporatist approach, Williamson's Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model and Taha Parla's description leading for the theorization of on the solidaristic and totalitarian variants of corporatism, discussed in the next chapter.

Secondly, an important characteristic of the corporatist model mentioned above raises with its non-liberal stand. As it can be noted in Williamson's quotation below, even though corporatists presented their idea of social order as non-liberal, in fact their policies did not reflect an anti-capitalist stand. We will be noting this characteristic once again in the next part of this chapter, as well as in the following chapter when we will be analyzing the theoretical discussions proposed by Turkish and Italian intellectuals towards the liberal value of “individual liberty”, for the sake of the grand “national interest” promoted by the corporatist model.

As Williamson himself quotes on this: “While corporatism was an intellectual response to the advent of industrial capitalism in what was held to be liberal politico-economic systems, and the writers were often sketching of the impact it had upon the proletariat, the theory strongly defended the maintenance of private property as the most desirable form of ownership of the means of production. Corporatism was, in effect anti-liberal rather than anti-capitalist. Liberalism had broken down social bonds and turned society into a mass of atomic, self-seeking individuals devoid of any higher moral purpose.” (Williamson, 2009: 20)

Thirdly, another argument raised by Williamson on the corporatist thought was his reference to the Catholic thinkers and their proposal on the “just social order.” However following this argument, differing from Wiarda, Williamson mentions also the nationalist thinkers, who aim to develop their authentic corporatist social order, elaborating a secular language, with attribution to the “greater glory of the nation” as the moral basis of consensus concerning the economic and social life and its organization. As it is the case, here I feel the need to re-pose my critics towards the “pre-acceptance” of the idea in Wiarda's and Williamson's works that corporatist social thought and policies do and only reflect the Catholic set of values principles.

In this regard, Williamson argues that within this socio-economic order Catholics saw their positions, bound with “Christian love”, that is the application of religious justice via God's will within the society. This was their mind-set in justifying the corporatist order. Whereas the Nationalist corporatists saw the nation as the social whole which the individual and the particularistic groups would melt inside within its grand anatomy. Therefore within individual sacrifice to the national good, they saw the principle factor that keeps the nation together, and

leads to the “national harmony.” Another key concept which is highlighted in this mind-set is the application of justice enlightened, guided by a greater “national interest”, which will be explained once again in the third chapter of this thesis when we will be discussing on the particular themes of corporatist thought in Turkey and in Italy. (Williamson, 2009: 22)

Fourthly, as it will be discussed in the next chapter of this thesis, with constant references to Taha Parla's work on sociologist Ziya Gökalp, corporatist theory do equip us with a functional analytical language in studying the social thought and state policies applied in countries other than the ones “with a Catholic socio-cultural heritage.” Briefly, I argue that corporatist thought could not only be imagined within the Catholicist paradigm. Similar social ideas and political practices may be present as well in non-Catholic communities. In this regard one could note the Ottoman lodge (*loca*) system, organizing different professional sectors of production, within this perspective.

Fifthly, as Williamson points it out, corporatism was not simply defended by the church institutions, but also from the circles opposing its dominance in the society. For example, at this point he argues that the corporatist ideas defended by the atheist nationalists actually were the mutation of the basic arguments proposed by their Catholic colleagues. Below, Williamson's position regarding the “distinct similarity” between the nationalist and the Catholic groups on the issue can be seen. However as he mentions it as well (even in opposition to his previous argument), corporatism was not simply defended via a Catholic social order, but via other metanarratives on social order such as nationalism:

“In respect of the above appoint, it is worth reiterating that corporatism was based on one of two underlying philosophies, Catholicism and nationalism, neither of which is noted as contributing to socialist thought. These two distinctive tendencies within the theory pose a question concerning the unity of the body of thought. To some extent nationalist corporatists clearly adopted, then adapted, Catholic ideas for generating a harmonious and hence unified society. Often atheist nationalist writers read very much like their Catholic counterparts, providing, like the positivists (whose sociology clearly incalculated corporatism), a form of 'secularized Catholicism.’” (ibidem)

Therefore, I would like to remark that the corporatist social vision and the policies that are engineered in its light, in our cases do reflect the ideal society and citizen models which will be studied in-depth in the following chapter of this thesis. At this point, I would like to conclude my argument that the nationalist corporatist vision which branches the central theoretical theme of this thesis, could be in relation with certain theological components and reproduce/regenerate the messages firstly introduced by theological doctrines. However, one should observe the difference of the nationalist doctrine brings to the political sphere, and how it alters/mutates the previous religion-based social messages into new categories of an “harmonious, conflictless national order”, and applies it into a new form of “imagined community.” (Anderson 2006) We will be re-attributing to this point in the following chapter of this thesis while analyzing the concept of a “conflictless society” promoted in interwar Turkey and Italy via political discourse and state policies.

Finally, the most precise layer of our discussion on corporatism is outlined. Continuing from the

theoretical path explained above with Williamson's description of “Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model”, we observe the development of two variants of corporatism, proposed by Taha Parla, as “solidaristic” and “fascistic” corporatism; which I further criticize thus revise in the third chapter. Preceded by a general discussion on the main characteristics of the corporatist idea, with constant references to the French sociologist Emile Durkheim, we will try to discuss corporatism, considering the arguments and counter-arguments on issues of presenting it as the “3rd way” and “a reaction to the accumulation and distribution crisis” brought by the different phases of the capitalist mode of production.

2.4. TAHA PARLA: PRECISE DISCUSSION ON CORPORATISM

2.4.1. Discussing Corporatism's General Characteristics

Firstly I find it useful to give a look also how Parla outlines corporatism as a “worldview” and a theory. Following noting his brief approach towards the concept, we will be developing the discussion on his identification of the types of corporatism, that are the “solidaristic corporatism” and “fascistic corporatism” which will be revisited in the next chapter. Critical characteristic of this theory outlined by Parla can be summed up briefly in his identification of corporatism as “a system of thought and a set of institutions that presuppose a predominantly capitalist mode of production with its central elements of the primacy of private property and enterprise.” (Parla 1985, 44)

2.4.1.1. Criticizing the “3rd Way” Argument

In light of the above quotation, one of the important points presented by Parla of this system of thought is that according to him the corporatist social theory do not pose a “3rd way”, an

alternative to the capitalist or socialist social organizations. Indeed, corporatism by definition could be identified as “anti-socialist” and “anti-Marxist.” It definitely rejects to use the language of the classes or to explain the social phenomenon via an on-going interclass conflict leading to the trophy of one of the classes. However, the new argument that is embraced within his theoretical discussion is that corporatism is also anti-liberal (in philosophy, politics and economics) but not “anti-capitalist.” This is the critical point in where corporatist and socialist theories adopt different stances towards capitalist mode of production.

2.4.1.2. Different Layers of Corporatist Social Theory

Parla points out the three characteristics of the corporatist social theory with the following factors, which connote actually three different “referents” or “layers”. According to him corporatism is firstly “a philosophical-ideology about a model of society and economy.” Secondly, it is “a set of economic and class policies and actual procedures of conducting representation of interests. Finally, it is “a particular form of political institutionalization and authoritative decision-making.” (ibidem, 45) Here, I would like to underline the fact that according to Parla, corporatism is consisted by a coherent ideological form, which connotes a particular social and economical order, developing a conscious language in identifying the social phenomenon and attributing exact roles to the political institutions in the society, such as the institutions of the state or occupational groups concerned. It is also noted by Parla that corporatism in practice does not have to manifest all of the abovementioned three forms.

2.4.1.3. Positioning Corporatism: Imagining a Society in Harmony

Another fundamental characteristic of the corporatist social theory is that, as a model of social

and economic order, “corporatism sees society as an organic and harmonious whole consisting of mutual interdependent and functional complementary parts.” (ibidem, 46) It is also outlined below in the quote of French sociologist Emile Durkheim, within this perspective, the main founding institution in the society, keeping the harmonious atmosphere of interdependency are the occupational groups, in other words, their organizations: corporations. As it can be seen above, in the part focusing mainly on the liberal and Marxist social imagination, we could see that the political terminology, which these two diverse positions developed, differed clearly from the corporatist theory. To keep it brief, opposing to the liberal-pluralist theory, positing the “individual” in the center of its social explanation; and opposing the Marxist theory with its social theory on classes and an on-going struggle of class warfare, corporatists focus on the concept of “occupational groups” in order to explain the social phenomenon.

Their critics towards the liberal-pluralist and Marxist theories arise within the following mind-set. Firstly, they see an anarchistic attitude in the liberal theory and its “over-glorification” of the concept of “individual” and its so-called “liberty.” We will be turning back to this point in the following chapter, in our discussions on the corporatist thought in two particular cases in Turkey and in Italy.¹⁹ Secondly, their attitude towards the Marxist social analysis is very critical. Corporatists' (even using another theoretical terminological approach) do share the argument with the Marxists that capitalist society and its liberal order is doomed to fail with the internal destruction of the society. However, while the Marxists arrive to this point and come up with the “class revolution” as the factor leading to the reparation of the “corrupted” capitalist society,

¹⁹ In order not to detach from the context; at this point I would like to remark the following quote of Recep Peker, general secretary of the Republican People Party in Turkey, (1931-1936) within the period of concern in this thesis. “*Socialism is a system, that aims to demolish his mother Liberty, which he was fed with her milk from her breast, and was raised and strengthened by her.*” (Peker, 1984: 41) See Peker, Recep. (1984) *Inkilap Dersleri [Lessons on Revolution]*, İletişim Yayınevi, İstanbul As mentioned above we will be turning back to this point in the following chapter of this thesis, when we will be analyzing specifically the corporatist thought in Modern Turkey.

corporatists' argument differ from the Marxists'.

They believe that the organized occupational groups, around their interests lead to bring the harmonizing rationale that is missing in the capitalist societies. Therefore with this proposal they also refuse the Marxist theory of class struggle leading to the “class revolution.” As expected, here they see another factor of social dissolution. Their argument is built on the idea that the social and political organizations within the society could only take decisions or engage in the demands if they are all compatible with the “benefits” of the society in whole. Therefore, contrasting to the Marxist approach against the private property and enterprises, they do not see a potential danger in the very factor of “free enterprises” leading to a widening social and economical gap between different factors of the society. At this point, a question arises in “how to keep the harmonious existence between the different components of the society without making structural changes (as proposed by the Marxist critique)?” Corporatists' answer to this phenomenon is building stronger political institutions, which control and support the “national interest”, and keep it above the particularistic interests of individuals or classes. Here as I have tried to point it out, for the corporatists, society is greater than the sum of the individuals that it contains. It glorifies the concept of social interest/national interest that the political institutions, particularly the state should be controlling. However this means that the individual as well as its economic activity, the private enterprise are “tolerated” as long as they are serving to the social interest, defined by the socio-political structures above them. Therefore, “individuals' pursuit of their interests, as well as their private property and enterprise, are considered legitimate insofar as they serve social solidarity and do not violate the public interest-an entity on its own merits.” (ibidem, 46)

2.4.1.4. Attribution to Emile Durkheim

As it is mentioned above, within the discussions on corporatism, we see that liberalism and individual freedoms are treated as factors, which could lead to social dissolution. In this sense, one observes the rise of another concept on discussions regarding the corporatist antithesis for such a “danger”, that is “social solidarity.” Here, as it is mentioned above by Wiarda and Williamson on their discussions regarding the positivists rapprochement towards the idea of corporatism; as Parla's attribution to him in his description of the corporatist thought and as it will be given a larger part on the following chapter focusing on Ziya Gökalp's social thought and his relation to this figure; here I would like to give a space to a passage from Emile Durkheim's trendsetting work on an ideal social order, described from a corporatist vision, with references to his glorification of the recursive concepts of “social solidarity”, “division of labor” leading to formation of “occupational groups/corporations” for the sake of an harmonious social whole.

In this passage, one sees how Durkheim puts an over-emphasis on the organizations of occupational groups and treats them as a founding factor for the social solidarity. This would firstly bind them to their professional group, secondly to their social community and ultimately to the social institutions within state mechanism. As he argues so at a further point, corporations could be also formed on national level. In this way, this could lead citizens participate within the political life via national corporations. As we will be seeing in the next chapter of this thesis, the Italian experience of the foundation of “National Council of Corporations/ *Consiglio Nazionale delle Corporazioni*” should be considered within this mindset of organizing occupational groups on national level, for promoting the “national interest” above the particularistic individual or class aspirations. Below our discussion continues with the following quote of Emile Durkheim

from his canonical work “Division of Labor in Society” 2nd edition, published in 1902:

“In the body of this work, we have especially insisted upon showing that the division of labor cannot be held responsible, as is sometimes unjustly charged; that it does not necessarily produce dispersion and incoherence, but that functions, when they are sufficiently in contact with one another, tend to stabilize and regulate themselves. But this explanation is incomplete... For anomy to end, there must exist, or be formed, a group which can constitute the system of rules actually needed. Neither political society, in its entirety, nor the State can take over this function; economic life, because it is specialized and grows more specialized every day, escapes their competence and their action. An occupational activity can be efficaciously regulated only by a group intimate enough with it to know its functioning, feel all its needs, and be able to follow all their variations. The only one that could answer all these conditions is the one formed by all the agents of the same industry, united and organized into a single body. This is what is called corporation or occupational group.

Now, in the economic order, the occupational group does not exist any more than occupational ethics. Since the eighteenth century rightfully suppressed the old corporations, only fragmentary and incomplete attempts have been made to bring them back with new foundations... Since the market, formerly municipal, had become national and international, the corporation must assume the same extension. Instead of being limited only to workers of a city, it must enlarge in such a way as to include all the members of the occupation scattered over the territory, for in whatever region they are found, whether they live in the city or the country, they are all solidary, and participate in a common life. Since this common life is, in certain respects, independent of all

territorial determinations, the appropriate organ must be created that expresses and regularizes its function.

Because of these dimensions, such an organ would necessarily be in direct contact with the central organ of collective life, for the rather important events which interest a whole category of industrial enterprises in a country necessarily have very general repercussions of which the State cannot fail to take cognizance; hence it intervenes. Thus, it is not without reason that royal power tended instinctively not to allow great industry outside its control when it did appear. It was impossible for it not to be interested in a form of activity, which, by its very nature, can always affect all society. But this regulatory action, if it is necessary, must not degenerate into narrow subordination, as happened in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The two related organs must remain distinct and autonomous; each of them has its function, which it alone take care of. If the function of making general principles of industrial belongs to the governmental assemblies, they are incapable of diversifying them according to the different industries... There is even reason to suppose that corporation will become the foundation of one of the essential bases of our political organization. We have seen indeed. That if it first begins by being outside the social system, it tends to fix itself in it in proportion to the development of economic life. It is, therefore, just to say that if progress continues to be made in this direction, it will have to take a more prominent and more predominant place in society. It was formerly the elementary division of communal organization. Now that the commune, heretofore an autonomous organism, has lost its place in the State, as the municipal market did in the national market, is it not fair to suppose that the corporation also will have to experience a corresponding transformation, becoming the elementary division of the State, the fundamental political unity? Society, instead of remaining

what it is today, an aggregate of juxtaposed territorial districts, would become a vast system of national corporations. From various quarters it is asked that elective assemblies be formed by occupations, and not by territorial divisions; and certainly, in this way, political assemblies would more exactly express the diversity of social interests and their relations. They would be a more faithful picture of social life in its entirety. But to say that the nation, in becoming aware of itself, must be grouped into occupations, -does not this mean that the organized occupation or corporation should be the essential organ of public life?.. Thus the great gap in the structure of European societies we elsewhere point to would be filled... A society composed of an infinite number of unorganized individuals that a hypertrophied State is forced to oppress and contain constitutes a veritable sociological monstrosity. For collective activity is always too complex to be able to be expressed through the single and unique organ of the State.

Moreover, the State is too remote from individuals; its relations with them too external and intermittent to penetrate deeply into individual consciences and socialize them within. Where the State is the only environment in which men can live communal lives, they inevitably lose contact, become detached, and thus society disintegrates. A nation can be maintained only if, between the State and the individual, there is intercalated a whole series of secondary groups near enough to the individuals to attract them strongly in their sphere of action and drag them, in this way into the general torrent of social life. We have just shown how occupational groups are suited to fill this role, and that is their destiny.” (Durkheim 1933, 1-13)

2.4.2. Corporatism as a Reaction to Crises: Accumulation and Distribution Crises

Following this quotation giving us the essential perception on modern corporatism, below we turn back to Parla's description of the corporatist model, as a response to the following two crisis brought by the capitalist mode of production. Parla's argument regarding the rise of the corporatist theories and their path of becoming more commonly applied set of economical policies are related to two characteristic crisis which the capitalist/capitalizing economies develop. These crisis are described as the “accumulation crisis” and the “distribution crisis.” Even though they represent the set of economical problems that the capitalist mode of production brings, they connote different “stages” of the capitalist development, as the “delayed capitalism” and “advanced industrial capitalism” respectively.

In this regard “accumulation crisis” notes the inexistent or insufficient amount of capital accumulated in the hands of the “bourgeoisie”. This insufficient capital accumulation blocks the future investments of the bourgeoisie/pre-bourgeoisie class, inhibits the potential economical development leading to industrialization. Within these social circumstances, it would be hard to describe a clear-cut polarization, leading to class antagonism between proletariat and bourgeoisie. Whilst, at this situation corporatist policies governed by the state institutions serve to provide a disciplined labor force that lacks at the moment and aim to accelerate the private capital accumulation via protective, neo-mercantilist economical policies, leading to a well-developed system of “state capitalism.” In theory this would block the class antagonism via adopting measures that would repress class polarization, and the eventual organization of proletariat.

While the second problem, “distribution crisis” attributes to a situation where it would be possible to distinguish the class polarization between the two classes mentioned above. Furthermore, this polarization would be a reality between a numerous and well-organized advanced labor and a strong monopolistic capital. However here, corporatist economical and social policies aim to control and contain the already-distinguished structure between the labor and the capital, while seeking the reprisal of the former against its perceived and actual threat to the latter. (Parla 1985, 45) Regarding these two crisis, Parla argues that corporatist socio-economical policies are interchangeable according to the type of the crisis experienced in different settings. I oppose Parla's argument of interchangeability thus; we will be revisiting this issue with specific references to Turkish and Italian cases focused on this research in the following chapter of this thesis.

2.4.3. Two variants of Corporatism: “Solidaristic” and “Fascistic” Variants

In this regard the final point which this chapter's methodological discussion points out is Parla's brief outline of the two ideal types of corporatist variants; which is going to be criticized and revised in the next chapter. These are “solidaristic” and “fascistic” variants of corporatism. As he argues, these two models are not in correlation with two economical crisis and the “developmental stages” outlined above. Solidaristic or fascistic corporatist characteristics may be present in both advanced industrial capitalist societies as well as societies with delayed capitalist features. However these circumstances are conditioned by diverse variables such as “social organization, class balance, political culture, and institutional traditions of a particular country.” (ibidem, 45) As it will be turned back to in the next chapter, I find it useful to give a space for Taha Parla's clarification of these two models in depth:

“What distinguishes the solidaristic and fascistic variants of corporatism is essentially the different ways in which they postulate the interrelationship between the Individual, the Society and the State. They both reject the primary categories of Individual and Class of liberal and Marxist models, respectively, and take the occupational group (or organized interest groups fundamentally based on the occupational principle) as the main unit of social organization and political activity. But the fascistic variant assimilates the Society and therefore the Individual, at least in theory, within a rather metaphysicalized corporative State (“Everything within the state, nothing outside the state”), and sees the occupational groups and the corporations as the public organs of the State to control and dominate the civil Society, transmitting to the latter orders of the State concerning the duties and obligations of Individuals who have no prior rights vis-à-vis State, as in the liberal legal and political model.

By contrast, in the solidaristic variant, occupational groups and their corporations serve as a buffer between the individual and the State. While imbuing with public-spiritedness the otherwise egoistical individuals, they also check and restrain the State from encroaching upon the autonomous jurisdictional domain of respective corporations that are the molecules of civil Society, thereby also protecting the rights of the individuals. In solidaristic political theory and jurisprudence, Individuals still have rights, if limited compared to the liberal model, as well as obligations to the Society in the interest of solidarity. In the solidaristic variant, the State is but a regulatory and coordinating institution, with jurisdiction primarily in the intercorporational domain. The reason for this basic difference between two species of corporatism is that fascism attempts to transcend the liberal model by radical negation, while solidarism tries to transcend it by modification, retaining certain political and cultural 'ideals' of liberalism.” (Parla 1985: 49-50)

Finally, it is fundamental also to remind that within this theoretical discussion, corporatism is not definitely seen as a “third way” as its supporters and the corporatist theorists argue so. It is actually simply a derivation of the “first way”, that is capitalism, with giving a non-liberal socioeconomic task to the political institutions in continuously re-organizing the society. (ibidem, 44-45)

2.5. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we tried to build an introductory approach reading of the corporatist theory which will be constantly given references to in this thesis. With this aim we departed our discussion from a macro level with Wiarda's conceptualization of three approaches showing the particularities of the corporatist terminology with its differences from the liberal-pluralist and Marxist readings; towards the social whole and the “interest groups”. Following this in the medium level, we analyzed Williamson's three different models describing the corporatist theory and policies with references to three different historical periods. Here, the “Authoritarian-Licensed Corporatist Model” which is found the most suitable regarding our theme and historical object of research is highlighted. Thus, in this part several points which I have found problematic in Wiarda's and Williamson's approach regarding the application of the corporatist theory to cases with “non-Catholic heritage” is discussed with counter-arguments. Furthermore, in the micro level, with references to Taha Parla we tried to approach the general characteristics of the corporatist model, treating it as a set of practices on economical as well as social policies, with underlining the fundamental concepts that arise with it, such as “social solidarity”, “occupational groups”, “corporations” and “social/national interest.” Here, attributions of Emile Durkheim and his position glorifying the corporatist organization of the society with specific references to the

role played by the occupational groups are outlined. Lastly the critics and further elaboration²⁰ of this discussion will help us to theorize the two variants of corporatism, that are its solidaristic and totalitarian variants which I will be mentioning in deep in the following chapters of this thesis.

Turning back to the central theme of this research, which regards the socio-economic and cultural policies applied in interwar Turkey and Italy, and before proceeding with our comparison, I would like to remark that on this theoretical approach, there is a conscious effort on identifying the corporatist model as a higher category with its sub-typologies. In this sense equating corporatism with fascism, not only obscures the existence of alternative corporatist articulations, but also because of “fascisms” use of a generic term in application to diverse cases, it disqualifies us to make a healthy comparison between our cases.²¹ Therefore, I would like to underline that this work treats the socioeconomic and cultural policies in interwar Turkey and Italy in relation to two diverse corporatist models as solidaristic and totalitarian models respectively, in regards to the relation between the Individual, the Society and the State. However in light of the theoretical discussion taken place in this chapter regarding corporatism (and as it will be mentioned in the upcoming chapter in depth), common political approach influencing the cultural policies developed in these two states can be summarized in these following four points: rejection of conflicts resulted by class antagonism or because of any perceived threat of social disintegration; acknowledging the “occupational groups” or corporation as legitimates which are in correlation with the national ideals; articulation of such “conflictless/classless” social vision to the state-promoted identities of “citizenship” and finally

²⁰ See 3.2.3.4. Point of Theoretical Separation: Criticising Parla and Davison

²¹ See 3.2.2. Opposing the “Political Culture” Argument, on this matter.

introduction of these identity models via cultural policies employed by the government.

Furthermore it can be said that such an aim forces the law-makers and politicians to develop political rhetoric of social coherence and solidarity, via neglecting the existence of social classes (common in Turkish case) or trying go beyond the language of class antagonism with the state-sponsored corporatist model (common in Italian case) – therefore these are reflected via political strategies in achieving such a “regularized-unison image” of a conflictless society. In this sense, such approaches seek to realize the culturalization process to consolidate an approval for the current political projects portrayed as the flag-holders of the national interests embracing all segments of the society.

Following this, in the next chapters firstly, I will outline the socio-economic and cultural practices, followed by a specific focus on the organizational structures of two mass organizations of the concerned period: *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* (The National Recreational Club) in Italy and *Halkevleri* (People's Houses) in Turkey, with acknowledging their differences and particularities of structuralization and policy application.

CHAPTER 3. PARTICULAR CASES

THEORIZING CORPORATISMS: IMAGINING A SOCIETY IN HARMONY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to engage in a discussion regarding the socioeconomic corporatist thought with several references to politicians and intellectuals in interwar Turkey and Italy. In this regard, the first main section, **“3.2.CONTEXTUALIZING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK”** aims to create a theoretical platform in which the comparative analysis will be made in this thesis. This section revisits and bonds the general theoretical discussions on corporatism mentioned in the previous chapter, with the Turkish and Italian specific cases. Therefore its four sub-sections focus on an approach that liberates the corporatist theory from its misleading application of equating it with “fascism” in **3.2.1.Freeing the Corporatist Theory from its “Pejorative Application”**; develops a position that confutes the “political culture” argument regarding the corporatist theory in **3.2.2. Opposing the “Political Culture” Argument**; explores the development of solidaristic and totalitarian corporatist models, explained in relation to the accumulation and distribution crisis of capital relatively with including a brief critique of the model conceptualized by Parla and Davison in **3.2.3. Accumulation and Distribution Crisis leading to Solidaristic and Totalitarian Corporatisms**, and finally clarifies the comparison of the two theoretical models of corporatism in this chapter in **3.2.4. Comparison in Reference to International Context**.

In the second main section, **“3.3. DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES IN ITALY: TOTALITARIAN CORPORATIST MODEL”** with constant references to the

discussions that intellectuals and policy-makers engaged in interwar Italy, we will be clearly seeing the characteristics of the totalitarian corporatist model in its effective form. In analyzing this model, the following sub-sections will lead our discussion, on all-embracing attitude of the totalitarian state in **3.3.1. Understanding the Totalitarian Mindset: Incorporation to the State “from within”**; on totalitarian state's relation with the “individual”, leading to the glorification of the “producer cult” in **3.3.2. Totalitarian State Approaching the “Individual”: Labor as “Social Duty” and the Producer Cult**; on discussions that have taken place on the “corruption” of the liberal democracies leading to a new conceptualization of “representation” in a totalitarian context in **3.3.3. “Representation” in its new form: Bringing the *Masses* within the state**; and finally on the trajectories of the “confirmed/compatible” and the “rejected/non-totalitarian” proposals which could form a possible autonomy within the society in **3.3.4. Voices from the Paradigm: Discussions on Corporatist Policy in Italy.**²²

In the third main section of this chapter, **“3.4.DISCUSIONS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES IN TURKEY: SOLIDARISTIC CORPORATIST MODEL”**, firstly in **3.4.1. Revisiting Social Thought of Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)** there will be a theoretical sub-section focusing exclusively on the solidaristic model discussed by Ziya Gökalp in Turkey, which highly influenced the policy applications during the first decades of the Republic. Followed by this, in **3.4.2. Policy-Makers: *Tesanütçülük* (Solidarism) in Discourse and Practice**, and its further four sub-sections, there will be evidences correlating the theoretical and the practical aspects of the solidaristic corporatist model outlined in this thesis. Furthermore, in this sub-section, similar to the Italian case described above there will be notes on diverse “contradictory” proposals

²² In this regard, totalitarian corporatism in practice will be treated as a “paradigm”, which will let us see its dissolution from several non-totalitarian, autonomy-originator proposals, leading to the stigmatization of the latter, in the Italian case.

discussed in the period concerned, which ended up with rejection, because of their incompatibility with the solidaristic corporatist paradigm in action in the Turkish case.

In **3.5. CONCLUSIONS**, last section of this chapter, with references to the discussions taken place during the chapter, application of totalitarian and solidaristic models in Italian and Turkish cases respectively are re-emphasized. Furthermore the trajectories of the intellectuals and policy makers that suggested “distinct” proposal leading to their rejection are re-noted in order to map the limits of the models mentioned above. Finally, the role of this theoretical contextualization is remarked in order to be referred in the next chapter of this thesis, focusing particularly on the cultural policies with references to two mass institutions in these countries, that are *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* (National Recreational Organization) in Italy, and *Halkevleri* (People's Houses) in Turkey.

3.2. CONTEXTUALIZING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.2.1. Freeing the Corporatist Theory from its “Pejorative Application”

Firstly, before proceeding to develop our discussion on the theory of corporatism in context, and its further sub-typologies, one should accomplish the primary, however the difficult task of freeing the concept of corporatism out of its “pejorative tone and implication.” Therefore, it is important to mention once again that if the meaning of corporatism is left to signify, or being used in synonym with “epithetic” concepts of “fascist” or “repressive” then, as it is noted by Philippe Schmitter there would be little or no utility in developing a systematic comparison, pointing out the similarities and the differences between its sub-typologies. For this reason, one should note that in light of same author's methodology, our discussion is based on an approach

that considers corporatism as a “system of interest and/or attitude representation, a particular modal or ideal-typical institutional arrangement for linking the associationally organized interests of civil society with the decisional structures of the state. As such it is one of several possible *modern* configurations of interest representation, of which pluralism is perhaps the best-known and most frequently acknowledged alternative.” In this regard, focusing on the praxis of such a political experience should liberate its usage within any particular ideology or system of thought. (Schmitter 1974: 86-87) Therefore totalitarian corporatist model and solidaristic corporatist model theorized in this thesis are based primarily on infrastructural-material relations of production and they are distinct from the idea systems “Fascism” or “Kemalism²³” as such, which belong to the superstructural sphere primarily.

On the other hand, the discussions made among the theorists and the politicians regarding the corporatist phenomenon is found important at the same level, as it will be shown in the next pages of this chapter, in giving us the framework, the mindset and the motivations in employment of such regulations and policies. However in this regard, it can be argued that as an important characteristic of studies regarding the comparative history of political thought, the corporatist theoretical explanation do include several subsets within regarding its political proposals, diversifying from Social Christian, ethically traditionalist thought of Wilhelm von Ketteler and Marquis de la Tour de Pin to “bourgeois solidarism” of Emile Durkheim and George Renard; from “secular modernizing nationalism” of Mihail Manoilescu, to “anticapitalist

²³ As the first encounter with the term “Kemalism” in the thesis, it is important to further clarify why it is non-applicable as an analytical tool in our study because of its conceptual characteristics. Zürcher's quote on this matter is enlightening: “The set of ideas or ideals that together formed Kemalizm (Kemalism) or Atatürkçülük (Ataturkism) as it came to be called in the 1930s, evolved gradually. It never became a coherent, all-embracing ideology, but can best be described as a set of attitudes and opinions that were never defined in any detail... As a result, Kemalism remained a flexible concept and people with widely differing worldviews have been able to call themselves Kemalist.” (Zürcher 2004: 181)

syndicalism” of Ugo Spirito and Sergio Panunzio.²⁴ (Schmitter 1974: 87) Therefore, I would argue as well that approaching the corporatist thought as a spectrum with its different ranges is definitely more functional in describing the diverse characteristics of the two cases focused in this thesis.

3.2.2. Opposing the “Political Culture” Argument

As it is noted in the previous chapter, Schmitter as well finds it problematic to perceive corporatism “to be an exclusive part or a distinctive product of particular political culture, especially linked to some geographically circumscribed area such as Iberian Peninsula or the Mediterranean.” (Schmitter 1974: 89) The arguments built on an essentialist, ambiguous term of “political culture” was outlawed in the previous chapter regarding the studies on corporatism.²⁵ Furthermore, the idea of limiting a geographically and culturally determined approach “also fails completely to explain why similar configurations and behavior in interest politics have emerged and persist in a great variety of cultural settings, stretching from Northern Europe, across the Mediterranean to such exotic places as Turkey, Iran, Thailand, Indonesia and Taiwan, to name but a few.” (Schmitter 1974: 90)

²⁴ In order to have a general idea on this view approaching the corporatism as a “range of thought”, I find it useful to quote Schmitter, pointing out diverse positions situated within this spectrum: “These range from such romantic, organic theorists of the state as Friedrich Schlegel, Adam von Müller, G. W. Friedrich Hegel and Rudolf Kjellen; to the pre-Marxist, protosocialists Sismondi, Saint-Simon and Proudhon; to the Social Christian, ethically traditionalist thought of Wilhelm von Ketteler, Karl von Vogelsang, the Marquis de la Tour de Pin, Albert de Mun and, of course, Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI; to the fascist authoritarianism of Giuseppe Bottai, Guido Bortolotto, Giuseppe Papi and Francesco Vito; to the secular modernizing nationalism of a Mihail Manoilescu; to the radical (in the French sense) bourgeois solidarism of Léon Duguit, Joseph-Paul Boncour, Georges Renard and Emile Durkheim; to the mystical universalism of an Ottmar Spann; to the internationalist functionalism of Giuseppe de Michelis and David Mitrany; to the reactionary, pseudo-Catholic integralism of Charles Maurras, Oliveira Salazar, Marcello Caetano and Jean Brétagne de la Gressaye; to the technocratic, procapitalist reformism of Walter Rathenau, Lord Keynes and A. A. Berle, Jr.; to the anticapitalist syndicalism of Georges Sorel, Sergio Panunzio, Ugo Spirito, Edmondo Rossoni, Enrico Corradini and Gregor Strasser; to the guild socialism of G.D.H. Cole, the early Harold Laski, S. G. Hobson and Ramiro de Maeztu; to the communitarianism or bourgeois socialism of a François Perroux or an Henri de Man- not to mention such contemporary advocates as Bernard Crick, W. H. Ferry, Pierre Mendes-France and David Apter.” (Schmitter 1974: 87-88)

²⁵ See 2.2.3. Corporatist Approach

Therefore before leading our discussion with particularly analyzing the diverse ranges of the corporatist thought proposed by the political actors in Turkey and in Italy (and the contrasting approaches defended by the political actors within each national case), in order to have a base, a platform for our further analysis, a primary definition of corporatism is needed. Firstly, I find it useful to clarify the theoretical terminology proposed by Parla and Davison's work on "*Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey*", regarding the conceptualization of the "social" within this cadre:

"Corporatism's distinction lies in its rejection of the categories of individual, class and tradition as the core analytical categories of political vision, though each may play some role within different corporatist articulations. Corporatist formulations derive models of society and forms of political and economical organization from 'occupational groups,' professional organizations, or corporations. These groupings compose the fundamental building blocks of its political vision." (Parla and Davison, 2004: 12)

Secondly, the description proposed by Schmitter below on corporatism is enlightening as well in situating the role of the "interest groups" which are strictly related to the occupational groups mentioned above in Parla and Davison description:

"Corporatism can be defined as a system of interest representation in which the constituent units are organized into a limited number of singular, compulsory, noncompetitive, hierarchically ordered and functionally differentiated categories, recognized or licensed (if not created) by the state and granted a deliberate representational monopoly within their respective categories in

exchange for observing certain controls on their selection of leaders and articulation of demands and supports.” (Schmitter 1974: 94)

Lastly, before proceeding with our comparison, it is remarking that on our theoretical approach, there is a conscious effort on identifying the corporatist model as a higher category above its sub-typologies. In this sense once again, equating corporatism with fascism, not only obscures the existence of alternative corporatist articulations, but also because of an independent literature on “fascism” as an analytical tool -an ideal type- for application to diverse cases via its generic definition, it disqualifies us to make a healthy comparison between our cases.²⁶ It is important to once again underline that the thesis approaches the theory of corporatism as a platform of investigation but not “fascism”. In this regard, in this study we understand the concept of “fascism” only in its particular meaning in the Italian context, and do not approach it whatsoever in its generic form or a model for comparative analysis. Following this theoretical contextualization, we can proceed with our discussion regarding the diverse characteristics of two typologies coined previously, the totalitarian and solidaristic corporatist models in regards to the relation between the Individual, the Society and the State.

3.2.3. Accumulation and Distribution Crisis leading to Solidaristic and Totalitarian Corporatisms

As it is marked as an introduction in the previous chapter of this thesis, Parla and Davison mentions the two models of “fascistic” and “solidaristic” corporatism. However, as an addition to my argument noted above, the term “fascistic” which is strictly related to its generic definition of

²⁶ For this independent domain of approaching “Fascism” in its generical form leading to comparative consideration of diverse case analysis in Germany, Italy, Brazil, Argentina, Japan, South Africa; see Griffin, Roger. (1991). *The Nature of Fascism*, New York: St.Martin's Press.

the term, lets it turn out to be non-applicable as a methodological tool in our case analysis. Hence I find developing a discussion on the Italian case via the generic terminology of "fascistic corporatism" problematic. Therefore in the next part of the thesis I will be regenerating it and will be approaching the term "totalitarian" in defining the corporatist model in application to the Italian case; while building my narrative on the totalitarian character of this case with the arguments further below. Related to our contextualization of the theory, Parla and Davison put emphasis on two primary capitalist contexts which gave rise to the employment of corporatist political and economical policies as described just briefly above. These are coined as the developmental capitalist context which experiences the crisis of "capital accumulation" and the advanced capitalist context, with its circumstances leading the crisis of "distribution of capital."

3.2.3.1. Developmental Capitalism in Context: Accumulation Crisis

In the first context, the state institutions react to the crisis, in order to accumulate the necessary capital to foster investments in a country. Thus in this regard, the corporatist plan serves as a "rationale and justification for a disciplined labor force and capital accumulation under neo-mercantilist policies of state capitalism." (Parla and Davison 2004) As it is seen in the following sections of this chapter, I argue that this context pictures the first decades of the Turkish Republic, as the period concerned in this thesis, that led to the application of solidaristic corporatist policies in order to structuralize a necessary bourgeois class for capitalist development, partly in combination with *étatist* policies. However it is so necessary to remember that within this context the corporations, intermediary economical and social institutions are structured as "buffer zones" between the state and the individuals; differing from the totalitarian model described below.

3.2.3.2. Advanced Capitalism in Context: Distribution Crisis

On contrary to this, regarding the second circumstance pictured by Parla and Davison, “crisis of distribution” is experienced in a context of advanced capitalism, leading to the corporatist political and economical policies take shape in light of the totalitarian corporatist model. It theorizes an all-embracing state model, that literally invades the civil society and seeks to incorporate the social texture within the regimented state apparatus. This is explained by the stronger and more violent threat that it experiences from the already structured class antagonism that have led to the organization of advanced labor and monopolistic classes within the political, economical and social spheres as political parties, employer or employee unions and armed militia groups. Therefore the social conflict experienced in these circumstances are perceived to have a greater potential to overthrow political authority and proceed with the re-organization of social institutions. In this sense, I argue that such harsh division of the social fabric leads to the application of totalitarian corporatist policies, which instead of institutionalizing plurality of interest groups in autonomy, aim to incorporate them within the regimented state apparatus. Thus leading to the positioning of intermediary groups theorized within the corporatist theory, as “auxiliaries of the state”, such as the case with the statual recognition of the pro-fascist labor unions only. In this regard, with references to the Italian case studied in this research, I argue on the crisis of distribution triggering the employment of totalitarian corporatist policies on contrary to the solidaristic model described above.

3.2.3.3. Solidaristic and Totalitarian Corporatist Models Revisited

Furthermore as it will be seen below, I do have another point of theoretical separation with the typologies outlined in Parla and Davison's work. Firstly, their explanation regarding these two

variants of corporatism is still relevant to recall below in order to necessarily modify again. Parla and Davison conceptualizes these two variants as the following.

According to them, differences in conceptualizing the position of the individual within the professional, corporate groups lead to the creation of the two main species of corporatist theory, that are its solidaristic and “fascistic” variants. The main component that distinguishes these two variants are the ways that they structuralize the interrelation between the Individual, Society and the State. While the “fascistic” corporatist type assimilates the social whole and the individual within the ranks of the metaphysicalized State, which is built on an all-encompassing characteristics with the motto of “Everything within the State, nothing outside of the State.” In regards to this conceptualization, the occupational groups, the corporations are posited as the public organs of the State. Therefore in this structure their role turns out to be the transmission and the application of the orders of the State, in a context where the individuals are imagined as organic components of the State itself, bearing their social duties.

On the other hand, the solidaristic variant theorized by Parla and Davison, views the occupational groups, corporations as the “buffers” between the individual and the State. In this sense, they serve to control the otherwise egoistic or particularistic interests of the individuals or other tied groups which they claim to belong. In these circumstances, individuals in political theory and jurisprudence still have rights, even though they are limited in contrast to the liberal pluralist models. Another particularity of this type is the role attributed to the State. In this model, the State is only a regulatory and coordinating institution, which results with the maintenance of an area of autonomy within the society.²⁷ (Parla and Davison 2004, 29-30)

²⁷ For further research on this issue, I find it useful to note that Parla and Davison argue on the existence of more

3.2.3.4. Point of Theoretical Separation: Criticizing Parla and Davison

Following this concise conceptualization of the solidaristic and “fascistic” corporatist models, I find it important to note the point of theoretical separation between my argument and that is of Parla and Davison regarding the infrastructural relations that may lead to the employment of corporatist models. In their work, they develop two arguments. Firstly, they mention the contexts of “developmental capitalism” with its “accumulation of capital crisis” and the “advanced capitalism” with its “distribution of capital crisis” which may lead to corporatist policies. However, secondly they argue that “in both contexts, corporatism may assume either solidaristic or fascistic forms.” (ibidem: 31)²⁸

Even though I agree with the first argument, I disagree with their second hypothesis²⁹, because I argue that in a developmental capitalist context, when the crisis of capital accumulation is experienced, the state mechanism within the corporatist cadre, is conditioned to employ solidaristic corporatist policies. This is experienced because the state reacts to the crisis by structuralizing capital accumulation and channel the resources to the “upcoming bourgeois”, investor groups in the economy, via promoting regulations- such as Industrial Promotion Law of 1927 (*Teşvik-i Sanayi Kanunu*) in Turkey. This context forces the state mechanism to leave an autonomy to such interest groups. This happens because if the state would seek to incorporate them within its regimented structure (as the case with the totalitarian corporatist model), it would firstly hinder the creation of the badly-needed, an autonomous “national” -as perceived

pluralistic and libertarian solidaristic variants on the one hand, and the more totalitarian and autocratic fascistic variants on the other., however do not engage in their further theorization. (Parla and Davison 2004: 30)

²⁸ Parla and Davison's terminology is given as it appears in their work, however in light of the theoretical explanation outlined in previous chapter, as I find the term “fascistic” corporatism problematic for further analysis, I am analysing the Italian case with the concept of “totalitarian corporatism.”

²⁹ Parla and Davison's argument on the non-correlation between the application of “solidaristic” or “fascistic” corporatist measures in both contextual circumstances determined by the crisis of capital accumulation or the crisis of distribution.

“competent” by the law makers- bourgeois class for the capitalist development model; and secondly it would put on risk the capitalist transformation with opening up a space for the “backward, non-productive classes” -in Marxist terminology- such as the landowner and feudal groups, which lack the necessary surplus to foster “bourgeoisization.”

Contrary to this within the advanced capitalist context, with the crisis of distribution in action, in order to employ corporatist policies, the State is conditioned to consider the totalitarian variant. This happens because in such circumstances, there is already class polarization that fosters social and economical instability. At this point, the State does not have the ability to treat intermediary, interest groups within an autonomy, outside of the state apparatus. As there is already organized labor and organized capital in action, in a situation to force their positions via strikes and lockouts respectively, the State's approach to such a conflict via solidaristic measures would consider them an autonomization outside the regime, which can lead to the further polarization within the society. This is the reason I defend that solidaristic corporatist measures are inapplicable in a context of crisis in relatively advanced capitalism, which has already witnessed the antagonism of classes and social instability, even with violent measures.

In theory, the State can also adopt further socialist measures via employing pro-labor regulations. However, staying within the corporatist cadre, aiming the survival of capitalist mode of production, the State, as in the Italian case, adopts totalitarian measures in infrastructural relations and only its reflective measures in superstructural relations such as mythification of a superior “Metaphysical State” which embraces all sectors of the society, as well as the individuals within its ranks. Apart from incorporating the syndicates in its regimented structure,

it can even not institutionalize corporations as private bodies, which would connote an autonomy as well. So, it is forced to enlarge its reaching influence and incorporate them within the state mechanism. This can be seen definitely within the political sphere as well. For example, instead of accepting diverse interest groups represented in different political parties within the parliament, it regimentizes the legislative body itself. It is fundamentally important to note that such institutional transformation is something more than the “one-party” rule, because it doesn't only condition representation to the party apparatus, but it structurally mutates the institution of representation into a “Chamber of Fasci and Corporations” (*Camera dei Fasci e Corporazioni*).

In other words, I am making three claims as the following: In my first claim, I argue that there is a correlation between the application of solidaristic corporatist measures in contexts determined by the crisis of capital accumulation. On the other hand, as my second claim, I argue that there is a correlation between the application of totalitarian corporatist measures in contexts determined by the crisis of distribution. Thirdly, I claim that these models are not applicable interchangeably, independent from the economical structures, that are diverse crisis experienced within the different stages of the capitalist development. Therefore contrasting to Parla and Davison's argument, I argue that solidaristic corporatist measures are not applicable in contexts determined by the crisis of distribution and totalitarian corporatist measures are not applicable in contexts determined by the crisis of accumulation of capital. This creates the main infrastructural difference between our cases in Turkey and in Italy, which led to the application of different policy measures; solidaristic and totalitarian respectively.

Finally, in order to contextualize my argument, it is important to note the diverse economical

circumstances which lead to the application of diverse models of corporatist development. These note the societies of transition in which, where the crisis of capital accumulation notes the inexistent, or “incompatibly-perceived” weak bourgeois class lacking the necessary resources of capital in order to invest in the market and lead the process of the economic development towards industrialization. This connotes the context of the Turkish case on this research, which will be studied in depth below, leading to the theorization of solidaristic corporatism.

On the contrary, the crisis of distribution of capital signifies an economical circumstance which experienced a further stage of development of capitalist production and led to a clear distinction among the bourgeoisie and proletariat classes, and such unequal distribution of capital led to a social conflict initiated by the latter class, resulting in economical and social instability. This brief description connotes the Italian case, which led to the model of totalitarian corporatism concerned in this study. As it is noted in Schmitter's macrohypothesis, different forms of corporatism are led by diverse basic imperatives and the needs of capitalism to regenerate its existence and proceed to reproduce and accumulate further resources. This is regarded as the main reason of differences among diverse models of corporatism which will be noted below, reproduced by experiencing the different stages of national institutional contexts and international circumstances of capitalism. (Schmitter 1974: 107)

3.2.4. Comparison in Reference to International Context

Regarding the international context of the period concerned in this thesis, marking the first years of 1930's, one should as well note the international economical instability triggered by the circumstances led by the First World War, and the 1929 “Great Depression.” Within the

intellectual circles, we also see a decline of a “taken-for-granted” support towards the neoclassical economics and the passive role attributed to the governments in circumstances of free-market economies. In order to grasp this critical attitude towards the unregulated free-market economy which was even voiced between the end of the First World War and the Great Depression, the following arguments of British economist, John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) whose proposals influenced deeply the macroeconomical policies employed by diverse governments of the following decades of the 20th century are remarkable. Keynes in 1926, argued as below:

“It is not true that individuals possess a prescriptive "natural liberty" in their economic activities. There is no 'compact' conferring perpetual rights on those who Have or those who Acquire. The world is not so governed from above that private and social interest always coincide. It is not a correct deduction from the Principles of Economics that enlightened self-interest always operates in the public interest. Nor is it true that self-interest is enlightened; more often individuals acting separately to promote their own ends are too weak to attain even these. Experience does not show that individuals, when they make up a social unit, are always less clear-sighted than when they act separately.” (Keynes 1952: 312)

In this sense, staying within the conceptual cadre proposed by Schmitter, I would argue that the Turkish case fits to the solidaristic corporatist model, not only because of the pre-conditions that led to its development, but also because of the practical outcomes employed by the Republican government, in the concerned period. One could show the senior officials attitude in Turkey in founding a second political party in order to strengthen the popular representation

within the parliament, firstly via Progressive Republican Party “*Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*” by Ali Fuat Cebesoy (1882-1968), Kazım Karabekir (1882-1948), Refet Bele (1877-1963) and Rauf Orbay (1881-1964) in September 1924; and secondly via Free Republican Party “*Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası*” by Ali Fethi Okyar (1880-1943) in August 1930. Thus it is important to consider that, even though the closures of the abovementioned political parties were witnessed in June 1925 and in December 1930, experiences of their existence as institutions mark the attitude of the senior officials in seeking popular participation in politics, via multi-party electoral system. However multi-party system was seemed unsuccessful in practice, in the national elections held in April 1931 and in February 1935, independent candidates elected as deputies were present in the parliament with 30 seats on 317 and with 27 seats on 428 respectively. Thus transition to the multi-party politics was inaugurated only in January 1946, via foundation of Democratic Party “*Demokrat Parti*” founded by ex-deputies of the Republican People Party, Celal Bayar (1883-1986), Refik Koraltan (1889-1974), Adnan Menderes (1899-1961) and Mehmet Fuat Köprülü (1890-1966). The party has won the elections in May 1950 and governed the country for 10 years, until the military coup experienced in 27 May 1960.

Contrasting to this, in the Italian case with the new electoral reform get in action; in 1929, the parliamentary elections were conditioned to a form of plebiscite. This law incorporated the Grand Council of the National Fascist Party within the state and limited the representation only for this party. Therefore the referendum taking form of a plebiscite regarded the approval or disapproval of the single list proposed by the very party. Thus in Italy party's conglomeration within the state and leading to its identification with it is fully realized in the parliament as well. However, as mentioned above, Turkish political practice with Progressive Republican Party, the

Free Republican Party and the presence of the independent candidates as deputies in the parliament marks the difference between the Italian totalitarian corporatism and the Turkish solidaristic corporatism seeking autonomization of representation on this concern, in the political sphere of the latter.

As it is partly noted by Gagliardi, in this regard the main characteristics of the Italian case; in social and economical policies of the period can be noted with (1) the cult of producer and the productivism in order to deviate the class identities, (2) clear rejection of the liberal system of representation, finding its democracy “corrupted” and come up with an alternative corporatist mode which would incorporate the “producers” within the state via their fellow corporations and (3) with developing economical policies as a response to the distribution crisis developed by the capitalist mode of production, thus seek to accomplish the process of further industrialization. (Santomassimo 2006: 252; Gagliardi 2016: 413) This would be realized by the mythification of the “metaphysical State”, which is imagined as an entity, well-integrated into the political and economical life of the society. Thus this “integration” attributes a higher, hierarchical role to the state as the “author of society, of the new society of organizations, and ... as the conceptual genesis of the individual.” (Stolzi, 2014: 156) Therefore within this perception one imagines a totalitarian state which embraces all branches of the social texture.

However on the other hand within the corporatist model experienced in transitory, developmental capitalist context it can be noted that main characteristics include (1) identity politics which would promote a popular component based on corporational, professional departments, portrayed as functional in realizing the social solidarity, without references to inter-class social conflicts; (2) no rejection of the liberal system of representation nor employment of corporatist electoral

reforms, on contrary employment of regulations seeking the institutionalization of multiple interest group within the ranks of a state-monitored civil society, but not within the ranks of a “Metaphysical State” as the totalitarian model; (3) economical policies seeking to accumulate capital in order to have the necessary resources for investment, therefore employ policies based on promotions to structuralize a compatibly-perceived “national bourgeois” which could foster the industrialization process. Furthermore in the solidaristic corporatist variant, “the state not only encourages and advises the economy; it directs, supervises, and manages it. The state assumes the role of arbiter between labor and capital and between employer and employee by frequently legislating against both strikes and lockouts in the higher interest of the public good.” (Parla and Davison 2004: 31-32) After this brief contextualized theoretical comparison, our debate proceeds with the section below on socio-economic discussions and policies regarding the Italian case concerned in this thesis, which will be followed by the Turkish case afterwards.

3.3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISCUSSIONS AND POLICIES IN ITALY: TOTALITARIAN CORPORATIST MODEL

During the “*ventennio fascista*” twenty year period following the Fascist assumption of power in Italy in 1922, the theme of corporatism was brought to public attention via discussions which involved the intellectuals and the law-makers positions' on this phenomenon on diverse platforms, such as the theme appearing in public speeches and in diverse journals. Apart from such discussions, actual institutions were founded by these very policy-makers, that fostered debates on this issue. Therefore this section aims to touch to both of these aspects of the corporatist phenomenon, that are discussions in which this theme is analyzed and developed together with the formation of the political institutions such as the “Ministry of Corporations”,

“National Council of Corporations” or the “Chamber of Fasci and Corporations” and approval of regulations such as “Labor Charter” (*Carta del Lavoro*) in 1927. In this regard it is functional to develop our discussion via touching the intellectual trajectories of particular figures from the Italian case regarding the discussions and the application of corporatist policies, such as Giuseppe Bottai (1895-1959), Ugo Spirito (1896-1979) and Alfredo Rocco (1875-1935). In this sense, following their political path on corporatism, together with their appointments to different positions of the regime's institutions will let us have an idea on how the paradigm of totalitarian corporatism was treated within the circles of the government hierarchy as a “paradigm”, and until which point their proposals on economical and social policies were put in practice or were labeled as “incompatible” within such circumstances.

3.3.1. Understanding the Totalitarian Mindset: Incorporation to the State “from within”

As it is noted by Alessio Gagliardi in his work *“Il Corporativismo fascista”*, corporatism within the fascist context was imagined as a rigid system of classification of diverse social groups. In this sense, the existence of diverse interest groups were not denied. Instead of denial the state mechanism sought to “institutionalize” and “regimentize” such interest groups and introduce them a political legitimacy which aimed their full assimilation within the values and the practices of the regime. One could note the idea of fascist syndicalism in this sense, which will be recalled in the next chapter with Edmondo Rossoni. Therefore, as it will be noted below, the cult of “producers” and the glorification of the “national interest” were accentuated within this framework of assimilation of diverse interest groups within the single, organic body of the regime. (Gagliardi 2010: IX)

However such classification signified as well the placement of each individual to a particular category of professional belonging. Organizations within the cadre of occupational classification were somehow tolerated, but structures which put on public platform the class antagonism between the employers and the employees were strictly forbidden. In this sense as it is argued in diverse sources, social policy of the government was to internalize such divisions and seek solutions via their assimilation within the state mechanisms. (Gagliardi 2010; Stolzi 2014)

Another concept which arises within the corporatist mindset regards the individual development. Here, it is once again important to recall that, within this framework the individual is not imagined in the sense of the liberal paradigm. Therefore such mission of incorporate development would also only be realized via intermediary institutions located between the state and the individual. However, this did not connote simple, passive linear relation between the state and the individual, but instead it would lead to an “organic development of the individual personality” as quoted by Rocco. Therefore, the state would invest on the necessary structural equipment and the organization for the individual subject which cultivate the assurance of a participation and a mutual relation between the state and society. (Rocco 1938 [1918]; Stolzi 2014: 156)

The concept of hierarchy should be noted with its particularity in the corporatist order as well. In this sense, the hierarchy was not seen as a basic relation of highness or inferiority. That is why it aims to develop a new language, that would cover more than the distinctions between the “above” or “below”, between the “authority” and the “autonomy.” Instead, hierarchy was just a mean, such a condition for the masses to be tied to the state from within. (Stolzi 2014: 157) As it can be argued, in such a social structure, the individual would experience authority, gain power,

and receive recognition only by incorporation to the state via abovementioned intermediary organizations.

Regarding the institutional transformation employed by the fascist regime in Italy, one can note the establishment of Ministry of Corporations/*Ministero delle Corporazioni* in 1926, followed by the launch of a corporative trade-union system. Then, it followed the establishment of National Council of Corporations/*Consiglio nazionale delle corporazioni*, aiming to control the work of the corporations. Later, transformation of the electoral system in 1928, succeeded with an institutional renewal that is the formation of the Chamber of Fasci and Corporations (*Camera dei fasci e corporazioni*) in 1939. Even though there may be noted several “contradictions” within the regulations and the timing of the institutional establishments proposed by Gagliardi. (Gagliardi 2016: 415) In regards to our theoretical discussion, the fact of establishment of such institutions apart from their chronological order, contribute to our discussion in forming the totalitarian corporatist model.

3.3.2. Totalitarian State Approaching the “Individual”: Labor as “Social Duty” and the Producer Cult

Regarding the Italian case, one could analyze the content proposed in the Labor Charter/ *Carta del Lavoro*, in 1927, organizing the professional position and relations between the worker and entrepreneur groups of the economic sphere. Such document gives us an idea (at least in legal application) of the simple principles of a corporatist economical policy, promoted by the Italian government during the interwar era. Below we analyze the characteristics of this document, proposed by Alfredo Rocco. One of the first characteristics that arises within this document is the

“passivization of the worker and employer groups” within an economical platform governed by an all-embracing state mechanism and its referring institutions. As it is mentioned previously, the cult of the producers also plays an important role in the corporatist imagination of the social whole. Here it's important to note the first two points proposed in the Labor Charter as see below as a starting point of reference for our an analysis:

1. “Italian Nation is an organism with its aims, life, means of action that are superior to the power and the lifetime of the individuals or the groups that it contains. It is a moral, political and economical unity that realizes itself integrally within the Fascist State.

2. Work/Labor, in its organizative, executive, intellectual, technical and manual forms is a social duty. In this regard, and only in this regard it is protected by the State. The production complex is unitary from the national point of view; its objectives are unitary and they re-assume the well-being of persons and the development of national strength.” (S.E 1997) ³⁰

As it can be seen in these two points of the Labor Charter, within this paradigm the meaning attribution to the concept of “*lavoro*” (work/labor) was not renounced to an individual interpretation. Within the organic social whole that built the “Italian nation”, only realized within the ranks of the “Fascist state”, work/labor was treated as more than the essence of the productivity, but as a “social duty” towards the nation and the state itself. Here, there should be noted two main characteristics of this mindset.

³⁰ Original text in Italian is as follows:

I. “La Nazione italiana è un organismo avente fini, vita, mezzi di azione superiori per potenza e durata a quelli individui divisi o raggruppati che la compongono. E' una unità morale, politica ed economica che si realizza integralmente nello Stato fascista.

II. Il lavoro, sotto le sue forme organizzative ed esecutive, intellettuali, tecniche, manuali è un dovere sociale. A questo titolo, e solo a questo titolo, è tutelato dallo Stato. Il complesso della produzione è unitario dal punto di vista nazionale; i suoi obbiettivi sono unitari e si riassumono nel benessere dei singoli e nello sviluppo della potenza nazionale.”

Firstly, it regards the “Italian nation” which is interpreted as to be able to fulfill its capacity by being incorporated to the Fascist state. This remains the base of the idea of the regimentation of the social whole, that is with the proposed term of “fascistization” of the Italian society. Therefore, within this paradigm, there would be no place for “plural Italianities” that is, incorporation of diverse political positions within this national identity would be interpreted as “incompatible.” For example, political positioning of the “Communist Italians” of the time, such as that of Antonio Gramsci, or “Liberal Italians” such as Benedetto Croce, would be treated as problematic, in the sense that their approach would be interpreted to be in a deep contrast with the “greater interest of the nation”, which was equivalent to the regime's interest. So with their “anti-regime” positions they would be locked within the category of the “non-national.”

Secondly, we see an acknowledgement regarding the action of “work/labor.” In correlation with the corporatist theory, outlined in the previous chapter in this thesis, here “work/labor” is considered as a “social duty”; in this sense, a duty of the citizen towards the society in whole. Thinking this principle, in correspondence with the primary point outlined above, if the “Italian nation” as a social whole could only reach its ultimate development within the “Fascist state”, and the concept of “work/labor” is treated as a “duty” towards the society, any economic action should bear the responsibility towards the “Fascist state”, which is seen as the unique interpreter of “the national interest.”

Therefore within these two points we see how the process of the homogenization of the corporatist thought and practices are taking effect. Treating the concept of “work/labor” as a duty towards the society, and the imagination of the “Italian nation” only in its regimented form,

incorporated to the dominant ideology stands out as the main characteristic of the totalitarian corporatist model.

However, on the other hand, while we observe the sacralization of the work/labor as a social duty. We see a social policy approach that is well-tailored not to trigger or promote class belongings within the society. As it is mentioned in the previous chapter, within the corporatist social thought, it is believed that a social conflict, arising with a class antagonism could lead to the dissolution of the society from within. Therefore, at this point, it is seen as very critical to develop another form of social identity, which could glorify the concept of work/labor, bound the individual citizens to the greater regimented social whole, together with an attribution to the “national interest” that is situated above the particularistic class benefits. These points build the conceptual base, the reasoning which leads to the glorification of another social category, that is the cult of the producer. In the next chapter the process which lead to the glorification of this cult, in institutional cultural policies, with focusing on the internal organization of the *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* (National Recreational Organization) is discussed in depth.

The apotheosis process of the “producer cult” in the Italian case is also noted in Stolzi's work approaching the corporatist theory from the legal point of view. As noted by her, the philosopher Giovanni Gentile apart from his intellectual profile, known also with his participation in preparation of the pro-regime texts of “The Manifesto of the Fascist Intellectuals” (*Il Manifesto degli intellettuali fascisti*) of 1925 and “The Doctrine of Fascism” (*La dottrina del fascismo*) of 1932, do also make attributions to the political motivation of the regime, going beyond the liberal understanding of the “individual” by reaching its subject via their efficient capacity of

“productivity.” Gentile's position on the issue was as the following:

“[As the state had to] reach the individual... it did not look for the individual as the abstract political individual that the old liberalism took as an indifferent atom; it instead looked for the individual in the only way it could find it [...] as a specialized productive force.” (Gentile 1982 [1927]: 275, in Stolzi 2014: 157)

Within this cadre, as it is noted by quotations from the Labor Charter, we note the existence of a social attribution to labor and the property as well. Stolzi as well notes this climate of regimentation towards the “functionalization of subjective rights.” This led a process in which increasingly assimilated labor and property “as rights belonging to the individual and as rights capable of reproducing duties, in respect of the satisfaction of social and public interest.” (Stolzi 2014: 150)

Here one sees the fundamental path of the corporatist vision towards laws and regulations regarding the labor and the property. Even though subjects are regarded such rights, their autonomy is always conditioned to the satisfaction of a superior, national interest. Thus, advocating their abovementioned subjective rights only would be considered as fostering “particularistic or class interest” in order to hinder the social harmony aimed by the corporatist policies and regulations. Therefore, strikes and lockouts enforced by the proletariat and bourgeois classes respectively, are regarded as divisive and in contrast to the “social duty” attributed to labor and property; therefore are banned for the sake of the greater national interest.

This approach is particularly evident in the work of Alfredo Rocco. It can also be seen in the trade union law, drafted by him and put in force in 1926. According to this legislation, the recognition was granted only to fascist unions, therefore it reinforced the “fascistization” of social and economic institutions which regulated such relations. Furthermore, the magistracy of labor was formed as a new institution with jurisdiction over collective labor, and finally as it is mentioned above, such regulation put in force the prohibition of strikes and lock-outs, conditioning them to penal persecution in case of their realization. (Stolzi 2014: 153)

In the same document, instead of positioning an authoritarian set of policies on trade unions and labor activities, one sees a “genuine system of controlling and governing relations between classes.” This is accomplished by the rigid identification of each individual of the system within a professional social category. Furthermore, the displacement of the social conflict is not simply realized by its rejection, but by bringing all the legitimate syndicates under the influence of the mechanism of the state. As proposed by Gagliardi, “in other words 'private' interest groups, represented by legally recognized Fascist syndicates, acquired the status of 'public' institutions.” Therefore this would end up with the “incorporation” of the social conflict within the ranks of the state, of course in recognition with the regime's bound to violence and repression. (Gramsci 1975; Gagliardi 2016: 419)

3.3.3. “Representation” in its new form: Bringing the *Masses* within the state

Regarding our discussion of the totalitarian character of the regime in Italy, leading us in developing the model of “totalitarian corporatism”, it is useful to remark the Doctrine of

Fascism, "*La Dottrina del Fascismo*" published in 1932, with the signature of Benito Mussolini, while the first part of the work is attributed to the philosopher Giovanni Gentile. In below quotation, at the 7th point outlined in this doctrinal declaration, it can be seen how Mussolini and Gentile themselves attributed to the "anti-individualist" character of the regime, which sought its realization only via its integration within the state: by bringing the masses within the state. As an action of "integration" meaning an act of process; therefore I would argue that Italian fascist regime, it was "totalitarianism" - a process in itself; and its social and economic policies are the reflections of this "totalitarian corporatist model" outlined in this thesis. 7th point of the doctrine declaration goes as the following:

"Anti-individualistic, is the fascist conception of the State; and for the individual, only if it coincides with the State, which stands for the conscience and the universal will of man in his historical existence. It is against classical liberalism, which arose from the need to react absolutism and exhausted its historical function when the State is transformed into the very conscience and the will of the people. Liberalism denied the State for the particular individual's interest; fascism reaffirms the State as the true reality of the individual. And if the liberty has to be attributed to real man, and not to that abstract puppet imagined by individualistic liberalism, fascism is for the liberty. It is for the only liberty, in its serious entity, the liberty of the State and the individual within the State. Since, for the fascist, everything is within the State, and nothing of man or spiritual values exists, or even have any value, outside of the State. In this sense fascism is totalitarian, and the Fascist State, as a synthesis and the unity of all the values, interprets, develops and strengthens the life of the people." (Mussolini 1936)

Within the mindset of this corporatist order, a strand of critics can be noted towards the representative system of the liberal democracies, via parliaments. In this regard, Salvatore Lupo as well notes in his work, *“Il fascismo: la politica in un regime totalitario”*, fascists furthermore opposed the so-called “complicated games of representation which defined the liberal system in general, and the Italian liberalism in particular.” However, the position supported by the fascists regarding the representation was that, it was only via realization of the “Fascist state”, the masses would be fully “inserted” in the new state, in its “new, organic form.” (Lupo 2005, 23) In this way, there would not be any “plays” of the liberal democracies via “corrupted elections”, but a new systematic solution, as promoted by Giuseppe Bottai and Alfredo Rocco, built on the corporatist model. As it is noted above this was the main theoretical stimuli that led to the introduction of Chamber of Fasci and Corporations (*Camera dei Fasci e Corporazioni*) in 1939 as a legislative institution, in place of the Chamber of Deputies (*Camera dei Deputati*).

Chamber of Fasci and Corporations was formed by the head of government, members of the Grand Council of Fascism/ *Gran Consiglio del fascismo*, members of National Council of Fascist National Party/ *Consiglio Nazionale del Partito nazionale fascista* and by the members of the National Council of Corporations/ *Consiglio Nazionale delle Corporazioni*. In fact the largest contribution was provided by the National Council of Corporations in this structure. It was forming the 525 of 682 the so-called “national councillors/*consiglieri nazionali*” of the organization. In this regard the members of the organization were not even elected with the so-called plebiscites, but they were directly appointed to the Chamber via their posts at their abovementioned original institutions. Once they leave their positions at the original institution they were automatically leaving their positions at the Chamber as well. Therefore via such

organization, the fascist party officials and appointees from the categorative institutions were reputed to be the direct “representatives of the nation” in whole. (Gagliardi 2010: 155)

As early as 1925, just after three years of the fascist assumption of power via March on Rome, Giuseppe Bottai has been writing harshly towards the realization of this corporatist order, in strong contrast with the “dysfunctional” representative systems of liberal democracies. He has been arguing that “there must be given an historical and programmatic significance to the anti-democracy of fascism. Fascism is anti-democratic because it has risen up to defeat a regime that is oligarchical and tyrannical in essence but so-called democratic [...] As an inherited patrimony, the most enlightening historical criticism is that, in Italy there has never been democracy – we repeat- if one understands the direct participation of the masses to the State, and do not look out for the means of electoral mechanisms, but for the virtue of a clear and precise awareness of the political, economical, financial and spiritual life of the Nation.” (Bottai 1925: 283) Here, one notes the glorification of the concept of the “integration of the masses” within the “Fascist State” again. Such theme, continuously appears in the discussions, seeking to theorize the system of the “new state” with its “new man.”

Archives of the political journal *Critica Fascista* consulted in the research process of this thesis, edited by Bottai was another platform of discussion of this kind. Even though it may sound contradictory, within this political rhetoric, time to time -depending on the platform of speech, its period of time and its subject- one sees arguments regarding such “mass integration within the state” as the realization of a “fascist democracy” as well. In a short commentary appeared on the pages of *Critica Fascista* in 1933, there is even reference to a Spanish liberal philosopher José

Ortega y Gasset, regarding his critics towards the anti-liberal stand of the Bolsheviks. In order to grasp Bottai's mindset, below one can see how such argument was re-interpreted within this rhetoric and ended up into the ranks of re-defining democracy, from an anti-liberal strand. Below one can read the translation of this brief commentary, in order to see the conceptual contradiction that such discourse built itself on:

“Antiliberal Democracy/ So many ears get offended by hearing the pronunciation of the word 'democracy!' Maybe the burden is because of the memories that one would not even want to have, or an inborn and justified hostility against a rotten vanished world but the fact is that the word is not only innocent, but deserves to be historically rehabilitated. Here is an acute clarification of one of the writings of the author José Ortega y Gasset, speaking of democracy and liberalism:

Ancient democracies were absolutist powers, more absolute than any of the monarch's so-called 'absolutism.' Greeks nor the Romans did not know the inspirations of liberalism. The idea that the individual limits the power of the State and a portion of single persons remain outside of the public jurisdiction can not be perceived within the classical mindset. It is a Germanic idea, it is the same origin that places one over the other in castles' stones. Where “germanesimo” did not touch or even liberalism take root. Thus when Russia wanted to substitute the absolutism of Tsars, it imposed a democracy that was not less absolutist than the other; Bolshevik is an antiliberal.

Fascism is anti-liberal, nevertheless, it is starting to become increasingly an organic democracy.

Democracy but not liberalism, that is the participation of the masses in the life of the State, but without limiting the powers of the State.” (Bottai 1933: 451)

Here it can be mentioned the transformation witnessed within the intellectual excavation, among the pages of the theoretical journal, *Critica Fascista*. Here, the argument is stressed on anti-liberal stand, however not non-democratic stand, as it was believed to actualize the “real democracy” via a totalitarian mode of representation, promoted by the social and economical policies. Such position is observed frequently on “the real democracy of the people”, following the electoral reforms portrayed as the “fascist democracy” in the discussions appeared among such intellectual circles in Italy.

3.3.4. Voices from the Paradigm: Discussions on Corporatist Policy in Italy

Furthermore , regarding the discussion on corporatism in Italy, one should not ignore the heterogeneous spectrum of ideas proposed by diverse intellectuals and policy-makers on this issue, involving a deep discussions on the minor differences attributed to the applications of corporatist policies. Following points could be briefly reminded: Alfredo Rocco, of the nationalist movement who entered to the ranks of fascism in 1923, served as the president of the Chamber of Deputies, Minister of Justice from 1925 to 1932, advocated a corporatist model of law which was organized in such a manner that each type of conflict or class discontent had to be submissive to the law-makers of the state. On the other hand, Giuseppe Bottai's approach was based on the “artfully manipulation” of the relations of groups and associations, by the ranks of the state. Only this way would approach the realization of the “*new man*” who would dedicate himself to the principles of the regime. Contrary to this kind thinkers such as Giovanni Gentile and

Ugo Spirito claimed that it was the responsibility of the corporatist order to effectuate an identification, kind of assimilation between the state and the individual, that is to say between the private and the public spheres.

On this regard, Ugo Spirito's proposal in suggesting to corporations to substitute the private enterprises and the state holders in owning economic properties; having an independent role in decision-making processes is remarkable. Therefore as it marks a particular case, I would like to briefly focus on his denied proposal in May 1932, at a convention organized in Ferrara regarding studies on corporatism and syndicalism, (*Convegno di studi sindacali e corporativi di Ferrara*). I argue that its importance lies in the fact of demonstrating us the “limits of policy application” of the totalitarian corporatist model in Italy.

Spirito's argument foresaw a change on the role attributed to the corporations, as “intermediary institutions”, previously theorized as between the individuals and the state, functioning for the integration of the primary in the latter. This would propose the foundation or transformation of already existing corporations into owners of the enterprises, and create the category of “property owning corporation/corporation property” (*corporazione proprietaria*). This would give the rights of decision-making on property and production to an actor, independent from the free entrepreneur, to the corporations-which were designed as the state organs, “*organo dello stato*.” (Gagliardi 2010: 22)

At this point Karl Polanyi's brief analysis on corporatism with references to the Italian case points out exactly this point of the quarrel on altering the relations of production. Polanyi

approaches the Italian case, contrasting with the “guild socialism” which in theory leads to the mutation of the relations of production by granting industrial ownership to the “producers”- that is the labor force. However in the Italian case as it is described well by Polanyi's explanation rigid economical and political is conserved:

“The modern term 'corporativism' again is a derivate of the Italian for gild, namely 'corporazione.' The idea to revive the gild system under the conditions of modern large scale industry was mooted both by socialist and fascists after the Great War. In gild socialism, as represented by G.D.H Cole in the 20s, the producers became the owners of industry, and the gild form of organization was meant to ensure both functional democracy and harmonious cooperation with the State and municipality. In Italian fascism the gild was meant to serve the opposite purpose. Ownership remained with the capitalists, i.e. with the non-producers, the workers unions or syndicates forming merely a section of the gild or corporation. A society thus grounded was the utter denial both of industrial and political democracy.” (Polanyi 2010: 6)

Consequently in fact, Spirito's proposal was refused at the congress, and even he was blamed for changing fundamentally the property relations which “guaranteed” economical development. Thus it shows us as well the non anti-capitalist essence of the totalitarian corporatist measures, which is focused previously in the theoretical section of this chapter.

It is important to note that apart from these diverse approaches to the phenomenon, all these positions approached the role of the intermediate bodies, which were institutions situated between the state and the individual. Only via their existence, the corporatist order of justice

would lead to an establishment, portrayed as the innovation of the corporatist order, “the third area of law”, between the private and the public domains. (Stolzi, 2014: 152)

Therefore in this case, state's approach in the liberal systems were criticized and it was found insufficient to form a social harmony. Their opposition was towards the idea of situating the state mechanisms as “external” actors which could only assist the social unrests via “supervision.” Contrary to this, the regime's idea was to build an all-encompassing state which with its presence was able to condition the corporate institutions, and as Bottai notes to make them become “productive auxiliaries of the state.” (Bottai 1928b: 398 in Stolzi 2014: 153)

Within this framework, the ultimate development for the creation of the “new man” would only pass via participation of the individual in such social organizations, that would lead to a conglomeration within the state. As it is noted by Stolzi, within the corporate law fundamental perception of the social whole was that the state was seen as the “author of society, of the new society of organizations, and ... as the conceptual genesis of the individual.” (Stolzi 2014: 156) Here Volpicelli's mode of defining the individual is enlightening as well, as the “way of being of society.” (Volpicelli 1930: 203 in Stolzi 2014: 153) Following this detailed debate regarding the discussions taken place in inter-war Italy on corporatist social and economical policies, with constant references to legal documents, leading to the theorization of the totalitarian corporatist model; below our examination proceeds with the Turkish case concerned in this thesis, and formation of the solidaristic corporatist model, in context.

3.4. DISCUSSIONS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICIES IN TURKEY: SOLIDARISTIC CORPORATIST MODEL

3.4.1. Revisiting Social Thought of Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)

During the first years of its foundation in 1923, Turkish Republic's military and civil bureaucrats were highly influenced by the modern idea of nation-building. Apart from implementing several structural reforms in diverse fields such as on clothing, alphabet, state structure, they also made several discussions on valuing a "classless/conflictless, national culture" which would be in correlation with the construction of a new "modern" identity. Particularly the thoughts of a sociologist, Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924) on building the "Turkish national identity", based on conceptual synthesis of culture (*hars*) connoting "national origins" and civilization (*medeniyet*) signifying "Western skills and techniques" influenced such reforms. (Gökalp 1923) However it is important to note that particular thinkers who influenced Gökalp had a distinct approach to the "social" and favored the corporatist organization of the social whole, such as the positivist functionalist theorist Émile Durkheim.

As it is noted by Bianchi in his work regarding the interest groups and the political development in Turkey, Ziya Gökalp can be regarded one of the major ideologues of modern Turkish nationalism of the period, with his ideas regarding the political economical organization of the society. Considering the main sources which influenced his thought, he can be named as "[Turkey's] first clear advocate of corporatism." (Bianchi 1984: 92) As it is remarked, this vision approached the society as "an organic and harmonious whole consisting of mutually interdependent and functionally complementary parts" and in light of this vision the solidaristic corporatist model of the society, argued on the fact that "the sum is [imagined as] greater than the

numerical total of individuals; it has its own reality and prerogatives vis-à-vis individuals. Individuals' pursuit of their interests, as well as their private property and enterprise, are considered legitimate insofar as they serve social solidarity and do not violate the public interest-an entity on its own merits.” (Parla 1985: 46)

In this regard his ideas on the organization of the society and the economy should be noted in our discussion on the Turkish case of “imagining a society in harmony” which found its realization with implication of solidaristic corporatist policies. When Gökalp's text are analyzed, one sees a great influence of Emile Durkheim's structural functionalist approach within his sociological conceptualizations. His arguments on corporations, professional groups as core organizations in building an “organic society” can be notes in this cadre.

Furthermore as Osman Tolga as well notes on Gökalp's economic thought, Gökalp saw in solidarist model the potential to overcome the existence of the social classes. In this regard particularistic groups such as clans, casts, classes were to be abolished and instead the professional lodges, gatherings should have replace their places within the society. Only via their existence members of the society would be correlated to eachother with strong bonds. (Tolga 1949: 14) Thus, Gökalp's argument regarding the structuralization of the professional groups within the society is voiced as early as his writings dating back to 1918, as the following: “Because if the society is to be seen as an organism, it would be only the occupational groups' function to be the organs of the life duty of this organism. For this reason, with the evolution of the societies, division of labor expands and occupational organizations gain further support and importance even more.” (Gökalp 1918, in Tolga 1949: 14)³¹

³¹ Original quotation is found in Ottoman Turkish scripts in (Gökalp 1918). Above text in English is translated from

His appraisal of an “organic society” which was structured in a functionalist manner among occupational groups became reference to his contemporary policy makers and the intellectuals who followed his path afterwards. As it is demonstrated by Bianchi, in this sense “...his writings anticipated several social and economical policies of Kemalism such as 'populism', étatism and corporatist experiments with professional associations.” (Bianchi 1984: 93)

3.4.1.1. Gökalp's “*Tesanütçülük*” (Solidarism): Institutionalization of Division of Labor

In this regard in a great deal of his works Gökalp made attributions to the concept of “solidarism” (*tesanütçülük*), which forms the primary reason in identifying the Turkish case on economical and social policies studied in this research as “solidaristic corporatism.” On the other hand it is also relevant to note that his ideas did create an intellectual point of reference for the policy makers of the country. Furthermore, via the faculties of sociology and law at Istanbul University, following the 1960 coup d'état, several intellectuals emerged in the country as the “foremost advocates of corporatism” that also revised Turkey's constitution following the coup d'état. It is also important to note that, within the period when he was writing on such issues, he was well aware of forming so-called “alternative” development model, that would go beyond the liberal and socialist economical organizations of the society. (Bianchi 1984)

Focusing deeper in his conceptualization of “culture” (*hars*) and “civilization” (*medeniyet*), Gökalp defended the application of a corporatist model of social organization and even argued that the “highest form of civilization... [is] the corporate nation.” Therefore, within such conceptualization based on the synthesis of the “Western civilization model” with the “Turkish cultural essence” of the society, Gökalp believed on the social and economical development of

the text in Modern Turkish scripts found in (Tolga 1949: 14).

the country was bound into a corporatist mode of organizing the society. With reference to the Western societies, he once again noted that “the most advanced nations of Europe are developing in this direction. In light of this classification, it will be seen that Turkish nation [currently] belongs to the communal type and that in the future it will develop into a corporate nation.” (Gökalp 1959: 125) This ideal would only be realized with the advancing division of labor, which was once again a term borrowed from Durkheimian sociology.

In this manner firstly, he argued that the institutionalization of the corporations in local manner would be useful for their activities. Furthermore his second argument was regarding the re-organization of such institutions in national scale. This would lead to a national participation of the individual subjects within such intermediary groups, conditioned by their professional groups of attachment. His proposal regarding such institutionalization was as the following:

“[Lodges] must be organized in every city with a secretary general rather than sheikh at its head. In each city there should also be organized a central committee composed of delegates of all the different lodges in the city; this committee will be called a business exchange/*iş borsası* and will have the task of supervising the common affairs of the lodges in the city and regulating the city's economic life... After lodges have been organized in each city, they will organize themselves into a federation and will establish a headquarters in the national capital... [and] organize a confederation and elect members of its General Assembly. Members of the various intellectual pursuits will also create their respective professional federations and join the confederation. Once this has been done, all these professional groups will have been united in the form of regular army.” (Gökalp 1968: 106-107 in Bianchi 1984: 98)

Furthermore, within the solidaristic corporatist manner proposed by Gökalp, there was no attribution whatsoever to replace the geographical representation in the legislature with the corporatist manner, via corporations/professional associations, contrasting to the totalitarian corporatist variant theorized in this thesis. As it is noted in this chapter, this is marked as a difference between the solidaristic corporatist model and the totalitarian corporatist model theorized in this thesis. However, even though such arguments were not present in his essays, in Gökalp's model foundation of professional associations are promoted in order to strengthen social solidarity for two reasons via two paths:

Firstly, he argued that organization of such institutions would participate in the development of business ethics and morality which would foster the consciousness of autonomous however interdependent occupations instead of divisive consciousness of antagonistic classes. Secondly, he argued that such organizations would become intermediary institutions in the realization of greater projects sponsored by the state, such as the sectors regarding the heavy industrialization, which would in theory lead to the economical independence of the modern nation. (Bianchi 1984: 99)

3.4.2. Policy-Makers: *Tesanütçülük* (Solidarism) in Discourse and Practice

Such similar declarations and speeches are announced by the senior officials of the regime in public meetings or within the manifestos of the Republican People's Party itself as well. One can note Mustafa Kemal's speech dating back to 1931 below to a group of candidates of the RPP, which clearly reproduces the solidaristic ideal proposed by Gökalp a decade earlier, which is

later framed within the “six arrows”, as “populism/ peopleism” (*halkçılık*)³²:

“One of our basic principles is to consider the people of the Turkish Republic not as composed of separate classes but as a community divided among various occupations with regard to the division of labor for individual and social life. Farmers, craftsman, laborers and workers, free professionals, industrialists, merchants and civil servants are the main working groups comprising Turkish society. The labor of each of these is indispensable to the life and well-being of the others and society in general. The goal which our party aims at with this principle is to obtain a social order and solidarity instead of class conflict and to establish harmony among interests so that they will not injure one another. Interests will be balanced according to their degree of capability, knowledge and contribution.” (Arar 1963: 31)

However in order to consolidate a consistent capitalistic development in this corporatist model, in theory, one important factor of the economical mechanism was missing: a compatible-perceived “national bourgeois.” It can be seen that the particular group of investors were found as insufficient, on contrary to the foreign investors and the local non-Muslim employers. (Tezel 1982: 124) Therefore the economical policies sought for the “accumulation of capital” instead of its distribution, in order to gather necessary primary capital to foster national investments towards the capitalistic development of the country. Thus as it is argued in this thesis, this modal of development embraced the solidaristic corporatist model, which neglected the possibility of the formation of self-conscious “workers class” or an ultimate social conflict which could develop cause to class antagonism. In public speeches of the time one can observe such solidaristic attitude approaching the groups within the society based on their professions,

³² Six principles introduced at the 3rd Party Congress of the Republican People's Party in 1931: “Nationalism, Laicism, Transformationism, Statism, Populism, Republicanism.” For further specific analysis of these principles - “six arrows” - in Turkish, Parla's (1995) study remains essential. In English see (Parla & Davison 2004: 68-140).

corporations imagined as the indispensable organs of this organic society. Thus categorizing the society among the employers, farmers, tailors, traders etc. according to professions was seen suitable. However within this economical transition, the role of the state was imagined something more than a “regulator” but it administered the role of the “promoter” via its interference mechanism for the creation of a “national bourgeois”, coined by Mustafa Kemal as “millionaires”, in his public speech in Izmir on 30 January 1923:

“According to me, our nation do not contain classes which would follow very different aims from eachother and enter into a conflict with the others for this reason. Current classes are necessary and fellows to eachother. Therefore Republican Party governs the jurisdiction, progress and the welfare of all the classes.” (Tezel 1982: 126)

Furthermore, Mustafa Kemal continued his argument on building such a “wealthy class” via promotions, in 7 February 1923 as the following:

“How many people do we have as the owners of large lands? How big are these lands? If one investigates, he would see that according to the greatness of our country no one owns such large lands. Therefore the owners of such [large] lands are to be safeguarded as well. Then, there comes the craftsman and the merchants trading between small towns. We are definitely obliged to govern and conserve their interests. How many millionaires do we have? None. Thus we are not to become enemies with the ones who have some relative amount of money. However we will work to create many millionaires, even billionaires in our country.” (ibidem)

One sees his such tone regarding the structural reforms of Turkish officials towards the solidification of the bourgeois class in Turkey, also in international circles as well. In this regard, Mustafa Kemal's talk to Soviet Ambassador in Ankara, Semyon Ivanovich Aralov in 1922 is remarkable. He was quoted by the ambassador as the following:

“There is no workers class in Turkey, because there is no developed industry. We need to consolidate our bourgeois into a bourgeois class still... My aim ... is to help the Anatolian merchants and let them become richer.” (Aralov 1967: 234-235) Even more such promises found their real application via regulations regarding relations between labor and capital, declared following the Izmir Economic Congress, held in February and March 1923.

3.4.2.1. Izmir Economy Congress of 1923 and the Proposals on Economic Policies

Such arguments were in correlation with the regulations regarding relations between labor and capital, declared following the Izmir Economic Congress, held in February and March 1923. There were around 1000 participants at the congress made out of deputies, certain landowners of large properties, Turkish merchants from Istanbul, artisans from Anatolia and certain workers. However the worker groups were coming from enterprises governed by the Istanbulite businessman. In this group, Turkish merchants of Istanbul numbered the most crowded participation to the congress. It turned out to be a platform of social and political contact among the merchant groups and senior officials, civil and military bureaucrat cadres.

Following the congress, majority of the economical decisions and the declaration of “Economic Oath” (*Misak-i İktisadi*) discussed were put in act. Such as abolition of “*Aşar*” tax of production

on agricultural products was put in law in 1925. Adoption of Switzerland Civil Code with its relatively less-restricted rights regarding the private property were put in law in 1926. Foundation of *İş Bankası* as a national bank in 1924, regulation of a new Industrial Promotion Law (*Teşvik-i Sanayi*) in 1927 could as well be seen as the realization of the decisions taken at the Izmir Economic Congress in 1923. Therefore in this sense, main occupation regarding the economical development in the first decades of the republic, were specifically on industrialization, agriculture and banking sectors. However, as noted by Tezel and Bianchi, regarding the discussions taken place in the congress on the worker's rights, one observes a diverse account with regulations such as the abolition of strikes and lockouts, put on force in June 1936. Furthermore just two years after the congress, instead of their incorporation within the state or their political regimentation, labor unions were closed down, leaving only the singular corporatist structures, forming the only buffer zones between the state and the individuals. (Tezel 1982; Bianchi 1984: 101)

3.4.2.2. Discussing Corporatism after Gökalp: Voices from the Paradigm

Turning back to the main theme in this section, that is the discussions on corporatism, following Gökalp's social approach in implementation of corporatistic policies, one sees two different group of actors/platforms which continued debating on the issues, and seek a so-called “third way” for the social and economical development of the new state. One of the specific figures among the senior officials³³ of the regime, Recep Peker (1888-1950), with trying to explain his interpretation of the so-called “Kemalist revolution”, his illiberal stand, corporatist approach

³³ Illiberal figures among the senior officials of the regime include names such as Mehmet Esat Bozkurt and Mustafa Şeref Özkan as well. Thus in this part, Recep Peker's trajectory marks a special case, with his articles appearing on People Houses journal *Ülkü*, with his relation to the People Houses; and his further breakaway and removal from chairmanship of the RPP in 1936, until his brief return as the Prime Minister in 1946, during the period of transition towards the multi-party elections. (See: Zürcher 2004b)

towards domestic problems of the country as well as his tone in analyzing international affairs was of this kind. His lesson notes of “Revolution History”, dating back to 1934/1935, his speeches to the party members, appeared in *Ülkü*, People House magazine in 1936; arguing the "unimaginability" of a patriotism outside of the ranks of the Republican People Party are remarkable. However, it's important to note that even though Peker recognizes the illiberal corporatist solutions of Italy; he still argues on the diversity of the Turkish revolution, and its incomparability with the other cases, as it will be mentioned later in the chapter.

Another platform was formed around the political review journal *Kadro*, which was published between January 1932 and January 1935. Authors in this journal had mainly activist or political backgrounds as intellectuals within Marxist circles. For example, a founding author of the journal, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir (1897-1976) was a director of the Turkish Communist Party between the years of 1920 and 1927. The main idea proposed by the *Kadro* movement was that in reality Turkey neither had the necessary tools for capital accumulation nor have experienced the class struggle of advanced capitalism. According to their perception, this gave the unique historical notion to Turkey, to realize the former however by avoiding the latter. (Bianchi 1984: 103)

As I will be focusing more deeply to this journal in Chapter 5 of this thesis, here below I would like to note only one article published in it, by Burhan Asaf criticizing an Italian turcologist Ettore Rossi, in 1932 as a response to his article explaining the Turkish revolution with comparisons to the Fascist transformation in Italy, in which he argues with economical references to the “distinct” corporatist development applicable to the Turkish case.

3.4.2.2.1.Recep Peker: Party-Centered Vision

Peker's figure remains as a particular one during the first decades of the foundation of the Turkish Republic. Recep Peker (1888-1950) was born in 5 February 1888, in Istanbul. He completed his education in Kocamustafa Paşa Military School (*Askeri Rüştiyesi İdadisi*), followed with *Harbiye* school in 1907. In 1911-1912 he had fought in Yemen, in Tripoli against the forces of the Italian Kingdom, as part of the Ottoman forces. And following this, he was enrolled in the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913. Afterwards in the 1st World War, he fought in Trace and Caucasus. After the World War, he was graduated from Erkanı Harbiye Mektebi (military school). Then he was called once again, and during the occupation of Anatolia, he had fought as a “*binbaşı*” field officer in the 20th army.

In 23 April 1920, with the foundation of the National Assembly he was appointed as the General Secretary of the Assembly. While in 1923 he was elected as a deputy from Kütahya district. In 1924-1925 he was appointed as the Minister of Interior; and between 1925-1927 he was appointed as the Minister of National Defense, in correlation with his previous experience in the military field. In 1927 he was selected as the second time to serve as the Republican People Party's general secretary, and in 1928 he was appointed as the group spokesperson at the assembly. While in 1928-1930 he was appointed as the Minister of Agriculture. Furthermore, he was present in the 3rd Congress of the Party in 1931 as the Secretary in General, in which for the first time RPP claimed to represent the whole nation which was conceived as a classless, solidaristic and united social formation.

Following this brief information on his political and military background, it is important to

consider his intellectual trajectory, his political experience in the 1930's and outline his ideal position towards the government policies. As it can be observed in the sources analyzed in this thesis, and in his writings, Peker was a supporter of the one-party-state ideal from the beginning. In this sense, the foundation of the Free Republican Party in 1930 marked a crucial point for his position, and actually such a failed experience led him to adopt more strict positions for the unification of the party and the state, and adopt an economical stand of a strong etatism, as it can be noted in his notes of the “Lessons of the History of the Revolution.” This marked a clear corporatist model, of economical and social policies.

According to him, liberal parliamentary democracy had led the polarization of the society become visible, as the stratification among the groups were already deepened by the “anarchistic” capitalist relations of production. Therefore class distinction was fortified by the strengthening capitalist production and the socialist groups raised within a liberal atmosphere. In that sense as he quotes, “Socialism is a system, that aims to demolish his mother Liberty, which he was fed with her milk from her breast, and was raised and strengthened by her.” (Peker, 1984: 41) His interpretation of the solution to these “problems” of liberalism and socialism would be the corporatist path, incorporated within his nationalist ideal. Therefore, instead of the class solidarity, he proposes a “national solidarity”, instead of the liberal policies of parliamentary discussions, he asks for a unison party-nation and practice electoral participation within the party, which is also noted in *Ülkü*, journal of People Houses, in May 1936. His speech was reported in the journal as the following:

“Recep Peker noted that in the anarchic situation of the liberal state type and the classical

parliamentarism, that is damaging the national strength, there seems to be arisen a superficial difference among our co-patriots as being 'partisan' or 'patriot'; as well as viewpoints of parties that are seeking individual or group benefits against the country's benefits, that is being a patriot while staying exterior to the party. He also noted that in today's Turkey, as a national state, there is only one national party, that is Republican People Party. The idea of being a patriot outside the party has no validity for us.” (Ülkü, 1936: 161)

According to this ideal, the regime and the party should condition the citizens and create a uniformity of the party and the state. Therefore this would lead the citizens to navigate always “within the frames” of “fair patriotism”. Imagining the nation as a conflictless, harmonious whole builds the base of this corporatist approach. However it is important to note that his such position as well led to his stigmatization from the Republican People's Party from 1936, until his return as the prime minister for one year, during the presidency period of İsmet İnönü in 1946.

Within Peker's model actually, there lies at least three principles aiming to structuralize society via (1) rejection of conflicts resulted by class antagonism or because of any particularistic-profit seeking group within the society; via (2) acknowledging the “occupational groups” or corporations as legitimates which are in correlation with the national ideals; via (3) articulation of this regimented “conflictless/classless” social vision to the state-promoted national identities.

3.4.2.2. *Kadro's* “National Liberation Movement” Thesis and Critique of Italian Fascism

Thus, similar to the corporatist principles outlined above, authors of the *Kadro*, intellectual monthly review, offered a theory of a so-called “Third Way”, apart from capitalism and

socialism. According to this thought, contemporary world witnessed two major contradictions, these were firstly among the classes in the industrialized countries; secondly between the countries with high technological concentration and the other ones which lost their former industries, such as the colonies and semi-colonies. Solution for the first conflict was via class struggle, however the second one could be won only via wars of liberation. The crucial point which made these authors to be closer to the previously outlined corporatist thought is that “if the national liberation movements would follow strategies of development suited to their objective situations and possibilities, class contradictions would never become socially and politically so dominant.” (Adanır, 2001: 355)

This attitude on specific strategies of development that would “surpass” the class antagonisms in Turkey, were discussed in comparison to the Italian case well. Such as in the article “*Faşizm ve Türk Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi/ Fascism and the Turkish National Liberation Movement*” by Burhan Asaf, dating from August 1932. It was written as a response to an Italian Turcologist, known in Turkish circles, Ettore Rossi's article on Turkey, explaining the republican transformation from the cadre of “Westernization”.³⁴ In this sense Asaf's account deepens the differences between the Turkish and Italian transformations. He notes the adaptation of the Italian criminal law, Swiss civil law, laicism, adaptation of Latin alphabet and exc. However according to him, the Turkish transformation cannot be coined simply as “Westernization” which could lead to the misconception of thinking it together with “Fascism.” He argues that this term “Westernization” could be more suitable for the “Balkan” nations, as they are willing to be alike with the “west” for many decades; while the Turkish transformation stays so particular and

³⁴ Italian Turcologist Ettore Rossi was later invited to give a conference on Turkish Studies in Italy, at the Ankara People House in 1933. His visit in Ankara was covered by the Italian journal *Oriente Moderno*'s October 1933 number by Carlo Alfonso Nallino. (Nallino 1933: 511)

independent from the other social transformations. Thus Asaf outlines the three differences between Italian and Turkish circumstances and socio-economic policies. According to Asaf with his terminology:

1- Fascism is a movement trying to save a meta-capitalist Italy from the anarchy and the bureaucratic machinery produced by the class antagonism. With the regime of corporations, tranquilization of the class conflicts are aimed at. While in “national liberation revolution”, transformation from the meta-colonial Ottoman Empire and the creation of Turkey according the contemporary conditions are aimed at. As the Turkish nation had started its revolution within a “non-classified” society, it rejects the classification and aims at the implication of the policies which would let such an antagonism impossible. This is the reason of the étatist policies employed in economical sphere.

2- Fascism was forced to be declared following the world war triggered by democratic damages, leading to colonial aspirations. This is the reason why while fascism is étatist in its internal policy, it follows a liberal economy in international scale, and this leads to a contradiction. While “Kemalism” is a revolt against colonialism; against foreign forces coming from the exterior. As it represents an anti-colonial stand with perfection, it is étatist in internal and external policies. So, it rejects contradiction towards classes and nations.

3- As Fascism is a movement that came to life in a meta-capitalist society, it can't be adopted by capitalist or non-capitalist societies. One can see these examples in Spain, as it was a failed experience and in Germany it is forced to be transformed towards left. At this point, it should be

mentioned that Asaf's writing dates back to 1932, when in 1931 the republic was proclaimed in Spain. Thus Francisco Franco came to power as Caudilo of Spain in 1936, and stayed in power until 1975. Furthermore Asaf argues that "Kemalism" would stay as an ideal and a source of an ideology for the nations that not yet realized their national liberation movements. (Asaf, 1932)

Therefore in this sense, it can be said that writers in *Kadro* review adopted a tone, cautious towards the Fascist Italy, however it's also true that they perceived the difference of the corporatist social and economical policies implied by the fascists in interwar era in Italy. As it remains as a theme strictly related to the problematic of this study, in Chapter 5 of this thesis, there will be a deeper discussion on the perception of *Kadro* towards Italy. On the other hand, it's important to note that their étatist, so-called "left-leaning" position were not found compatible with the solidaristic corporatist paradigm of the Turkish senior officials, and as a consequence *Kadro* journal was closed down in 1935.

3.5. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, contextualization of our discussion regarding the two corporatist models, with constant references to the intellectual discussions and policy documents brought up in two cases concerned in this thesis, is approached. Therefore, in regards to the debates taken place in these two contexts, we came up with the development of the totalitarian corporatist model and the solidaristic corporatist model, in explaining the Italian and Turkish cases respectively. However, as it is noted in the first section of this chapter, this is done by criticizing several aspects of the comparative theory of corporatism proposed by Parla and Davison. While embracing their notification regarding the "crisis of capital accumulation" and the "crisis of capital distribution"

leading to corporatist policies, theoretically it is argued that a linear correlation is present between the application of solidaristic corporatist measures in a context with crisis of capital accumulation and the application of totalitarian corporatist measures in a context with the crisis of capital distribution. Finally, non-interchangeable application of these measures in these cases are theorized.

Firstly, in contextualizing this argument within the Turkish case the role of the accumulation crisis which reflects the lack of “productive capital” in the hands of a compatibly-perceived “national bourgeois”, which could become the motor of production within the early period of the capitalist economy is evidenced. For this reason, it is possible to remind the “Wealth Tax” (*Varlık Vergisi*) 1942, a taxation of capital, which in practice affected several non-Muslim citizens of the country, conditioning them to pay extraordinary amounts of taxes according to their business and households. Here, the situation described by Parla in the above chapter of this thesis should be remembered as well. In a society which experiences the early stage development of capitalist mode of production, which could not “catch up” with the industrial production, crisis of capital accumulation was aimed to resolve in this way, by the mobilization of the “non-national”, that is perceived as “unproductive/unorganized” capital to the state accounts, which were to be used to promote the construction of a “national bourgeois” which was compatible with the “national interest”, embraced by the regime. (Akar 2000)

Secondly, regarding the Italian case, one can remember Parla's description of the second situation of crisis triggered by the capitalist mode of production in industrial settings, that is the distribution crisis. Institutionalization of the corporatist councils for particular sectors and a

general corporation council in the national level should be seen in light of this theory. In a society which has already experienced the processes of formation of an antagonism between the worker and the employer groups, state's investment on the corporations as the “balancing mechanism” to suppress and to keep this inter-class conflict under control reveals an important pillar of the economical policies promoted by a corporatist state with a harsh experience on social and political consequences of the I. World War and the two “red” years of class warfare followed by the instability promoted by the war.

Furthermore as it is seen above there existed definitely different strands and ranges in intellectual positions towards policy proposal in both of the cases studied in this research, which are mentioned in specific references to the trajectories of Alfredo Rocco, Giuseppe Bottai and Ugo Spirito in the Italian case and the ones of Ziya Gökalp, Recep Peker and the authors of the *Kadro* review in the Turkish case. However, as it is argued, totalitarian corporatism in Italy and solidaristic corporatism in Turkey still are regarded as the mainstream paradigms which condition the discussions with references to actual socio-economical policies in these countries, in the specific concerned periods. On the other hand, their relation with the distinct conceptualizations of the “nation” will be discussed in the next chapter. Therefore arguments developed in this discussion remains constant due to two following reasons:

Firstly, in cadre of the Marxist theory this thesis refers to two economical crisis experienced in different stages of capitalist development leading to two different modes of policy application, namely the crisis of distribution of capital in advanced capitalist settings and the crisis of capital accumulation in developmental capitalist settings. It is argued that in order to proceed with the

capitalist mode of production, in the first case the state is conditioned to employ totalitarian corporatist measures on infrastructure, and only its reflective measures in superstructure as the Italian case. While in the second case the state seeks to accumulate capital and channel the resources to a national bourgeois for further investments, therefore it is conditioned not to be totalitarian, and to structuralize an autonomous space, “an incubation” for the interest groups via promotions that will lead them to grow into a “compatible” bourgeois class as in the Turkish example.

Secondly, abovementioned corporatist variants became paradigmatic due to actual policy applications, as it is shown with references to institutions and documents highlighted in this chapter. However it is true that even they were the off-springs of the solidaristic corporatist paradigm, Recep Peker's party-centered vision and Kadro movement's *étatist* proposals in 1930's differed than the mainstream model in Turkey. Thus that is the very explanation that such proposals were not applied in policies when they fell out of the solidaristic paradigm. The removal of Recep Peker from the RPP chairmanship in 1936 can be explained with reference to this separation between his direct illiberal stand and the mainstream solidaristic model which does not straightly reject liberalism but aims to go beyond it with adaptation, “with retaining certain political and cultural 'ideals' of liberalism.” (Parla 1985: 49-50)

Similar to this, in the Italian case Ugo Spirito's proposal on “property owning corporation/corporation property” differed from Bottai's proposal in situating the corporations as “auxiliaries of the state”. However as history shows us Spirito's such proposals were found non-applicable in the Ferrara Congress of syndicalist and corporatist studies in 1932, because of their

incompatibility with the totalitarian corporatist paradigm in action in Italy.

In order to clarify this distinction between these two models, several characteristics of the totalitarian corporatism, in reference to the Italian case are noted as (1) the glorification of the cult of producer and the productivism in order to deviate the class identities, a (2) definite rejection of the liberal system of representation, finding its democracy “corrupted” and proposing an alternative that would realize the ultimate totalitarian model of the corporatist order with conditioning representation to the participation in the regimented intermediary institutions (3) and developing economical policies as a response to the distribution crisis developed by the capitalist mode of production, thus seek to accomplish the process of further industrialization. (4) Finally, structuring a superior, “metaphysical State” that would embrace all sectors and the subjects of the social whole, up to a point of identifying itself as the “author of the society”.

On the other hand, within the solidaristic corporatist model experienced in transitory, developmental capitalist context, main characteristics were noted as (1) identity politics which would promote a popular component based on corporational, occupational departments, portrayed as functional in realizing the social solidarity, without references to inter-class social conflicts. (2) Representation re-enforced without the rejection of the liberal system or without a model fostering corporatist electoral reforms. On contrary to this, with employment of regulations seeking the institutionalization of multiple interest group within the ranks of the civil society, but not within the ranks of a “Metaphysical State” as in the totalitarian model, incorporated to a single political party. (3) Economical policies promoting the accumulation of capital in order to have the necessary resources for investment, therefore employment of

regulations based on promotions to structuralize a “national bourgeois” that could energize and invest in the necessary means of industrialization for capitalist development.

In base of this theoretical conceptualization with references to the historical contexts concerned in this thesis, in the next chapter we will be focusing on particular policy applications on cultural processes via analyzing two mass institutions in these countries, “*Halkevleri*” (People Houses) in Turkey and “*Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro*” (National Recreational Organization) in Italy.

CHAPTER 4. PARTICULAR CASES -

CORPORATIST CULTURAL POLICIES: PROMOTING SOCIETIES IN HARMONY

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural historiography of interwar era in Europe teaches us definitely significant lessons on states' reactive responses to postwar economical and social instabilities. In such an atmosphere of insecurity we see more states adopting authoritarian policies for (re)constructing conflictless societies via indoctrination. Being such a common characteristic of the era, such policies build the path for tranquilization and participation as well as quietus and reaction. This makes the study of two mass organizations of *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* (National Recreational Organization) and *Halkevleri* (People Houses) important even though they are coming from two unique contexts. However these institutional policies reflecting the states' will to effect and condition the everyday lives of its citizens remain remarkable. The common base which lets us proceed with our comparison, in light of the theoretical discussion taken place in the previous chapter of this thesis, is the corporatist explanation of the society, as an entity organized on interdependent occupational groups and the art of keeping distant to the Marxist terminology of “classes” and its “struggle.” Keeping in mind the two economical crisis (accumulation and distribution) experienced during two different levels of the capitalist development, contextualized in two cases concerned in this thesis; in this chapter, trajectories of the abovementioned social organizations are explored. This is done by seeking the conditional characteristics which paved the way for their establishments; political agents' (individuals as well as groups) role in embracing the development of these institutions as a response to socioeconomic conflicts among different groups in the society; and finally the internal structures

of these institutions showing us the fields in which they have operated and how this reflected the distinct ideological stands of the two corresponding governments' policies.

This chapter focuses on the cultural policies which led to the foundation of two mass national organizations, *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* in Italy and *People Houses* in Turkey, institutionalized during the inter-war era at the respective countries concerned in this thesis. Such contemporary analysis is realized, explaining the reasons of the state promotion of these two organizations, in context to particular, distinct corporatist models. At the end of the each section of this chapter, respective institutional experiences are approached with reference to the theoretical discussions. Following these brief analysis of the institutions in historical and social contexts of each particular case, at the conclusion part of this thesis, there will be further elaboration of the points highlighted in this chapter, associated with the theoretical debates raised in the previous chapter.

In this regard, the first main section of this chapter, **4.2. OPERA NAZIONALE DOPOLAVORO** focuses particularly on the leisure-time organization *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* in Italy. This section is divided into two sub-sections aiming to give a tangible comprehension of the sociopolitical context in which it was developed in, its internal structure and interpretations of its activities. In this regard the first sub-section named **4.2.1. Understanding the Sociopolitical Context- Italian Case** focuses on the processes in which the organization was developed. In this regard, this narrative is developed in three parts as **4.2.1.1. Case del Popolo**, **4.2.1.2. “Dopolavoro” and the Path to OND**, and finally in **4.2.1.3. Mario Giani's Evolving Proposal**. The second sub-section named **4.2.2. Analyzing OND** aims

to center the internal structure of the organization with references to its several characteristics that stand out during the research process of this thesis. In this regard, under this sub-section in **4.2.2.1. OND Working Structure**, the organization is examined with attribution to its internal organization and its four activity departments. Following this description, the institution is theoretically approached, and the reasons of its establishment, together with its social roles are interpreted in **4.2.2.2. Approaching OND**.

The second main section of this chapter, **4.3. HALKEVLERİ**, analyzes the institutional trajectory of the organization in Turkey in two levels. In correspondence with the previous section on Italian case, this section as well is developed in two sub-sections. In the first sub-section named as **4.3.1. Understanding the Sociopolitical Context- Turkish Case**, firstly the historical context that gave birth to the foundation of the organization is highlighted in **4.3.1.1. Historical Background in Class Context**. Following this, references to a particular institution (*Türk Ocakları/ Turkish Hearths*) having a “ruptured continuity” with the People Houses, that stand up during this research process of this section’s is made in **4.3.1.2. Türk Ocakları/Turkish Hearths**. After such analysis, two incidents that structured the sociopolitical landscape in Turkish politics at the time are appointed via **4.3.1.3. Serbest Cumhuriyet Partisi/ Free Republican Party (FRP)** and **4.3.1.4. Menemen Incident**. Finally the contextualizing part is ended with reserving a space to two theoretical explanations exploring the exact time of early 1930's Turkey, leading to the foundation of People Houses, in **4.3.1.5. Framing the Political Dynamics**. In the second sub-section, in correspondence with the order followed with the previous section on Italy, in **4.3.2. Analyzing Halkevleri**, the institutions' organizational system is explored via **4.3.2.1. Halkevleri Working Structure**. Finally theoretical explanations with

references to the organization's structure are developed in **4.3.2.2. Approaching *Halkevleri***, to be followed in the conclusion part of this thesis.

4.2. OPERA NAZIONALE DOPOLAVORO

4.2.1. Understanding the Sociopolitical Context- Italian Case

4.2.1.1. *Case del Popolo*

Firstly, before focusing specifically on the organization of the *dopolavoro* circles and the formation of the national institution of OND, it is important to note the existing social structures in the Italian case. In this regard, following the First World War in Italy, it can be seen that the laborers of the rural areas, as well as the factory workers are gathered with their families in sporadic “*case del popolo*”, people houses at the peripheries of the cities, “easing the split between urban and rural life.” However we see that such circles remained partly autonomous during the so-called “red-years.” Remarkably, as argued by De Grazia, they formed paradoxical spaces, such as having a “national” character at a time in which politics were highly personalized, having a “democratic” character at a time in which most Italians were even excluded from votes, having a “popular” character at a time when the public and the private institutions of the liberal state were highly bounded by class lines and exclusive. (De Grazia 1981: 9)

On the other hand, during the times of reaction, such circles turned out to be meeting places for the workers of the neighborhood. In this sense, the Italian labor movement had its social and cultural organizations such as “the consumer cooperative, the recreational hall, the popular library, the uniformed gymnastic and bicycle squads.” However, consequently such organizations

formed the first targets, which the fascist bands, groups approached violently. Definitely it could be asked, if a more disciplined club life would be able to resist the violent oppression faced by the bandits however, such question remains hypothetically to explore. Consequently after such attacks, by the time of 1921, following the “lorry against the *case del popolo*” the provincial possible centers of socialist gatherings were in ruins. Meanwhile it is important as well to note that following the sporadic violence by the *squadristi* groups towards *case del popolo*, and their closures, the remaining participants of such organizations did continue to gather in several meeting points and associations. In this regard, De Grazia notes the “resistant” groups gathering at the peripheries of the cities, such as Fiesole in Florence, and in organizations framed as “non-political”, such as football sport organizations, anti-alcoholic associations and associations of physical education can be noted. (ibidem: 10)

Following such acts aiming to the disorganization of several already existing social realities, from the mid 1920's and on, one can observe the fascist officials considering the organization of the labor force, in a manner which could go above the class identities as well as the class antagonism that would result from this. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this marks the moment in which the fascists move towards “bringing the masses into the state”, conditioning the individuals' or groups' legitimate existence only within correlation with the “national interest” promoted by the state.

4.2.1.2. “*Dopolavoro*” and the Path to OND

In this context, the idea of institutionalization of leisure-time of the workers via *dopolavoro*³⁵, in Italy was introduced by Mario Giani in 1919, who was a former manager at the Westinghouse

³⁵ Literally translated as “afterwork”.

Corporation's subsidiary at Vado Ligure. However, later in the fascist context, the early policies promoted “productivism”, which was prioritizing the workplace. The main idea that the fascist officials relied on was to gain allegiances of workers and concentrate the necessary forces to discipline them by these union organizations. However, there was literally very little attention given to the organization of the workforce outside the factories or off the fields, and actually the idea of *dopolavoro* was exactly filling this gap.

Regarding such sociopolitical reality, De Grazia's brief explanation on this matter is fundamental for us to grasp the role of the planned corporatist institutions and the regime's “late-arrival” to the field of “leisure-time organization” highlighted in this thesis. As it's also helpful to correlate the theoretical approach developed in the previous chapters with the cultural practices, I reserve the following space to De Grazia's framing of the paradoxical corporatist position, and its way to resolve the question of “worker-class' leadership” at the early twenties. De Grazia's argument follows as below:

“The combination of political aspirations and economic demands in the socialist labor movement had confounded the ingenious minds of the proletariat, leading it to make demands that the struggling Italian economy could not possibly sustain. To end this confusion, the fascists called for a new leadership for the working masses that would demonstrate the operations of what the syndicalist leader Rossoni called the “*dinamica produttiva*”[productive dynamics]. It would instruct workers in a simple lesson to the effect that nothing could be gained by causing Italy lose her competitive edge in world markets and much could be won by supporting her economic aggrandizement through self-discipline on the job, moderation in demands, and whole-hearted

cooperation with employers. In the corporate bodies that, for the fascists, would ideally replace parliamentary institutions as well as the organizations of an autonomous labor movement, labor and capital – the “active forces of production” - would finally obtain their direct and accurate representation. This corporatist model did not, however, take into account that only a fraction of the population was actually employed in the industrial-type enterprises to which it was adapted, nor the many nonsyndical social and economic functions of the pre-fascist working class movement. But so long as there was no immediate prospect of implementing the corporations, as was the case in the early twenties, the fascist movement could ignore the complexity of working class associational life, together with a more fundamental dilemma: Insofar as any production-based organizing reflected the real economic interest of workers, it was inimical to capital; to the extent that it reflected those of business, it was odious to many workers.” (ibidem: 10-11) In this context the idea of nationalized *dopolavoro* could be regarded as a “brilliant invention” or an idea “out of context” by the authorities. In reality its institutional trajectory passed from both of these stages, as seen below.

4.2.1.3. Mario Giani's Evolving Proposal

Thus firstly Giani's idea enterprise was not valued by the fascist syndicalists or other official ranks. Therefore until March 1923, his approach stayed very narrow. His small institute found in Rome in 1919, which published the journal “*Il Dopolavoro*” could be seen as a limited act in this sense. However in March 1923 one observes a turning point among the development of Giani's position. As being invited to contribute to syndicalists' newspaper, Giani very strategically changed his language in order to meet the language of the movement. Therefore Giani himself modified the idea of “company personnel department” into a “center of uplift” for the workers.

According to his ideal such national leisure-time organizing institution fundamentally had to be self-financing. It could be integrated within the companies themselves, however in the countryside they would be open-to-all residents who would be willing to pass their times in a “healthy”, “praiseworthy” way, conditioned by the activities structured by “the criteria of practically, efficiency, and enlightened modernity.” The main stimuli of this movement, as quoted by Giani was to persuade the working classes, that their salvation could be achieved “not by struggle against capitalism, but by individual self-betterment.” (Giani 1923a, 1923b, De Grazia 1981: 26) Such a proposal suited, in that particular context to the corporatist ideals characteristically to the totalitarian model outlined in the previous chapter of this thesis: as class collaboration, increased labor productivity and the control of the workers' leisure-time for the greater “national interest.”

On 5 May 1923, fascist syndicalist and ex-revolutionary socialist Edmondo Rossoni embraced the idea of *dopolavoro* circles, proposed by Giani. Furthermore Giani was invited to the ranks of the fascist Confederation, to become a co-editor of their monthly journal *La Stirpe*. More importantly, Giani's institute advocating the *dopolavoro* became integrated to the fascist syndacalists' Confederation, as a “Central Office on After-Work.” However according to Rossoni's point of view on *dopolavoro*, such center was primarily imagined as a platform for the moral, physical and intellectual improvement of its members. Furthermore, the idea of “sacred work”, (which is attributed in the previous chapter via the Labor Charter as well), was highlighted. Such “sacred work” should be evolving the “great duty” towards the nation and to the workers themselves. Thus, one can see the paradoxical conflict that the syndicalists were

grabbed into with this position. The idea of *dopolavoro*, imagined as a “center of uplift”, always connoted a pacifying notion to such ears. On the other side of the coin, such center could as well be used for organization and for the mobilization of a further syndicalists' “revolution.” (De Grazia 1981: 27, 28)

In this regard, apparently from June 1924 and onwards Giani started to push for his proposal in the formation of a government legislation on a national body which would be capable to organize such institution in a single entity, as an agency. Following the assassination of the secretary-general of the Socialist Unitary Party Giacomo Matteotti, the syndicalist confederation now proposed the government to suppress all the anti-fascist labor movements. In these circumstances Edmondo Rossoni, sided with Giani; presented the resolution of creating a nation-wide agency capable of organizing the all leisure-time activities, to employ “a complete set of measures for re-educating the laboring masses of all Italy” in November 1924. Following the Council of Ministers' approval of the bill regarding the agency on 21st of April 1925, Mussolini had the decree signed by the King, authorizing the establishment of the national agency *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro (OND)* on 1st of May 1925. Thus following its foundation, Mussolini named the Duke of Aosta, Emmanuel Philbert who was the cousin of the King as its first president, and Mario Giani was appointed as the executive officer of the organization until April 1927. (ibidem: 32, 33)

One could as ask why Giani, among the founder figures of the organization would have served only two years in OND? This fact can be explained in two factors. (1) Personal: Different perceptions towards future of the organization that Giani and the policy-making officials at the

governmental ranks hold. (2) Institutional: Party's reaction against the rising power of Edmondo Rossoni with the Syndical Laws of 1926. These are briefly put in context below.

Firstly, Giani's priorities for the organization was on the “social-engineering” aspect rather than an incompatible multiplication of the institution's branches. In this sense he was criticized to “slow down” the pace of the organization's dissemination among the society with his requirements. Thus regarding the applicant organizations to join the rank of the institution his calls for a “technical” selection and a close attention to the “moral and political credentials” of the future joining associations, participated in this process of disengagement. Furthermore Giani's requests regarding more acknowledgement for the institution – such as his request to use military property for athletic activities, or even to have an official anthem for the organization itself- from the ranks of the state was destined to dismissal at the time, directly from Mussolini. (ibidem: 37)

On the other hand, such disengagement had an institutional aspect, as an indirect case. One year after the foundation of OND, Syndical Laws of 1926 are employed. This made Edmondo Rossoni's *Confederazione nazionale delle Corporazioni sindacali fasciste* /General Confederation of Fascist Syndical Corporations gain further power among the forces of labor. As the organization was well organized and numerous – membership to the organization amounted to 2.800.000 in 1927, which was more than doubling the size of the Fascist Party- ; OND turned out to be a critical component of this inter-institutional power struggle. With its strong potential of dissemination among the society; its sporadic local extension it attracted the attention of the Party's officials specifically that of Augusto Turati, its secretary. Within this background,

Mussolini as well seeking to limit the power concentration at a single organization appointed the Party secretary as the vice-president of OND; aiming for further influence on the organization. Following this appointment Turati firstly ordered the provincial *federali* to take “political responsibility” for the organization. (OND 1927: 39) Thus at the time Giani was still active in the organization, and was supported by the president Duke of Aosta. Thus firstly, Mussolini approached the Duke regarding the “tangibly-perceived” political circumstances. Only following this act, when Duke of Aosta resigned from the presidency Giani was left out of the institution in 1927. (De Grazia 1981: 38) This brief trajectory marks the inter-institutional dynamics that condition the future of the organization: further Party influence on OND as a reaction to the “infrastructurally perceived threat” of organized labor.

4.2.2. Analyzing OND

4.2.2.1. OND Working Structure

In this socio-political background, the year 1927 marks a turning point in the history of the OND. With the resignation of Giani, under the administration of Augusto Turati, OND is transformed into a “full-fledged auxiliary of the Fascist party.” Previously, decision-taking mechanisms divided among president, counselor-delegate general director and administrative council were centralized, and this role was handed to Turati as the “special commissioner.” In this period, one observes a highly hierarchical structure within the organization, a rationalized bureaucracy. The organization was particularly occupied with the following four program departments:

- a. Instruction (divided between popular culture and vocational training),
- b. Artistic education (with subsections for amateur theater, music, cinema, radio, and folklore),

c. Physical education (including sports³⁶ and tourism),

d. Assistance (concentrating on housing, consumer affairs, health and hygiene, social insurance, and company recreational facilities). (ibidem: 38)

Regarding the activities organized in the circles, one can note occasions such as outings, tours, sports activities, pastime occasions, choral singing and theatre presentations. The motivation of such organized activities were clear: to “instill in the workers a consciousness of the nation, a sense of duty, and a desire of harmony between labor and capital.” (Lavoro d'Italia 1924a; 1924b; 1924c; De Grazia 1981: 29) Such organizations came in very different forms; they included mass sports activities, national campaigns dedicated for special days or promotions to participate in cultural activities via reductions.

An example to this kind can be given with OND's participation on the “*sabato teatrale/* saturday theater.” Together with the Ministry of Press and Propaganda the institution collaborated in this for further “culturalization” of the citizens, via attending plays at the professional theater houses with reduced ticket prices. As reported with this regulation, -coincided with the Ethiopian campaign; turning out to be a well propaganda tool for the policymakers- in January 1936 the tickets were affordable by many; from 1 lira for balcony seats to 3 in orchestra; with the distribution of the free seats to the family members with relatives in East Africa. (De Grazia 1981: 161)

One can as well observe the campaign of “*treni popolari/* popular trains” in this cadre together

³⁶ Appointed OND special commissioner in October 1930, and National Fascist Party's secretary in December 1931; in Achille Starace's words, the very motivation of OND in sports activities sought the moral and physical upbringing of the working masses, together with getting ready for a greater, national cause; “for the fatigue of work, and if necessary, that of war.” (De Grazia 1981: 173)

with OND's participation in this national campaign. In August 1931, the prices of the trains were lowered for up to 50 percent for group travels. As reported only between 2 August and 20 September 1931, more than 500.000 people benefit from the campaign; whom in majority were coming from the urban centers of Northern Italy. This included as well the transport of the workers and employees to Rome for the 10th anniversary of the fascist assumption of power, in 1932. Thus in many cases their costs were contributed by their very employers. (ibidem: 181)

Sports activities as well contained a great potential for the institution capacity to further its connection among the society. Following the First World War, Italian society saw the increasing the interest of the working class in diverse sports via soccer clubs, *bocce* circles, cycling societies exc. At the period such activities were often supported by political agency as well, such as the Socialist and Communist parties, Catholic Popular Party. In this context, OND entered to the field of sport promotion from 1926 and gradually proceeded via its associations. In these activities team competitions were highly supported. Such organizations positioning the very workers compete for their “colors” of their association, office, factory or workshop that they are employed in can be regarded as an indirect result, a rhetorically attempt to build the so-called “supra-class identity.” As it is well put by De Grazia, in such context the fascists grasped that for the formation of an “overriding national identity”, the inter-class relations played a magnificent role, as the relations between the mass citizens and state. (ibidem: 151-173)

On the other hand, in the rural areas OND was positioned to contribute to “a more pleasurable life” by providing certain amenities and educational opportunities. Furthermore ideally it would work as an institution at the rural area, which would change the perception of the citizens

regarding the state. In this way, as an example, the governments' image at the countryside via *carabinieri* officers, tax collectors or military personnel, was aimed to alter with the new image of the *dopolavoro* uplift operator. (ibidem: 42)

Furthermore we see that following the government's decision to employ such intermediary organizations, already-existing institutions were taken into consideration to bypass a standardizing process. This is the main reason that in practice, as mentioned in the archives and secondary sources in Italy, first standardized recreational centers were actually the new replacements for the old socialist clubs of the neighborhood. In this sense, the *squadristi* who were attacking the *case del popolo* years before, came to be depicted as “were now dedicating themselves to social work and worker education and presided over cultural, educational, and welfare associations of singular importance.” (Il Dopolavoro 1923a; 1923b; De Grazia 1981: 28; Candeloro 1996: 353)

Regarding the realities of these leisure-time circles, one should as well consider the differences which they have reflected, according to already-existing circumstances of each region, territory of Italy. In this period, one could note the diverse procedures regarding the membership on different circles. As an example to this kind, Genova *dopolavoro* circle's membership was only reserved to syndicalists, while the other members could only ask for temporary cards. Piacenza and Novara circles in fact replaced pre-existing socialist circles, by force. On the other hand Naples *dopolavoro* circle was “the new institution expressed the desire for social camaraderie among a petty bourgeoisie constituency that was at least partly made up of war veterans.” Furthermore its founding principles were even in parallel with proposals reminding a Masonic

oath such as aiming to “impart an admiration for Beauty, a love of Righteousness, the need for Truth, and the discipline of Justice.” (De Grazia 1981: 29)

4.2.2.1.1. Institutional Hierarchy

As it is argued above, such turning point of the *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro's* to be a “full-fledged auxiliary” of the National Fascist Party dates to April 1927. However before this, one sees Mussolini's approach in not concentrating political power and decision-making capacities in one group only, via the appointment of the Fascist Party secretary Augusto Turati to the vice-president position of OND. Just following his appointment, Turati orders the “political responsibility for the organization” to the provincial *federali*, which could be seen as his first act of influence in the organization. Thus, as De Grazia notes as well, the complete takeover to be realized by the party, required also the resignation of Giani, who was the ultimate ideal proposer of the organization from the beginning. Therefore, in early April, firstly we see the Duke of Aosta resigning from his position of the president of the institution. Moreover the government appoints Augusto Turati to his position. Following this change, losing his support from the Duke, Giani as well resigns from his position of executive director of OND, within six weeks. At this point, the organization experiences the start of a term of increasing rapprochement with the party ideals and its structure. (ibidem: 37-38)

Regarding the structure of the organization there was a strict hierarchical pattern which the activities were based on. Firstly, in each provincial capital there was a party *federale*, connected together the representatives of the fascist employer and syndical associations with public authorities. While the work of administration was given to the salaried secretary officials or the

president who was appointed by the party secretary; formed “technical commissions” proposed events regarding the activity program of the institution.

Furthermore in the hierarchy there were the provincial boards who were in charge of following and advising the activities of the local leisure-time organizations. Their advising mission covered the *dopolavoro* organizations at the rural provinces, as well as the ones at the urban neighborhood established by the OND. Furthermore, following the regulations on membership to OND, it included the other associations which were applied for OND membership (by force or with own will) and were included as an OND circle in this way.

Finally, the last section of the hierarchy was formed by the local *dopolavoro* circles. The organizing commissions of the local circles were formed by different components. These commission boards gathered the town secretary, the municipal medical inspector, the elementary school teacher, the fiduciary of the women's *fasci*, and representatives from the local fascist unions and employers' association. According to the settlement of the circle, at the rural settings the commissions would include members from the “travelling school of agriculture” and the forest militia. Thus, in both cases they were supervised by the secretary of the local *fascio* and administered by a “fascist-appointed” president. (ibidem: 40)

4.2.2.1.2. Enrollment Process

As in the case of *case del popolo*, several circles faced direct violence or were able to navigate in the process of adaptation. As De Grazia notes, in this manner, several club directors were also threatened to be closed down by the fascists, or they were “advised” to apply for membership to

OND network, if they wanted to continue with their presence. As to join the OND network, circles had to proceed with the application, this could be interpreted by the regime as a sign of “enthusiasm” to join the ranks. In this regard on the already-existing circles' enrollment to the OND network, the circle administration had to pass from a process which could be named as standardization. Once they were enrolled within the organization, their statues and their symbols were disgraced. According to the regulations of the institution, *federale* of the locality or the secretary of the local *fascio* was responsible in appointing the new president to the circle. In this sense, it is important to note that with this appointment, there was no election process in action, so the new presidents were directly responsible to the *federale* or the secretary; and not to the participants/public of the circles in question. Following the acceptance of enrollment, the circle was to be re-opened with a new ceremony, marking kind of its standardization with the regime. Furthermore symbolization process was in action as well. Within the “new” circle, there used to be a large tricolor flag with the seal of the state accompanied by the OND's own logo, including a Savoyard eagle and fascist lictors, on a background of fields and factories. Finally it is important to note the presence of the local clergy and the public authorities in this re-opening ceremony of the circle, with its new regimented face.

With this enrolling method, OND was able to reach several thousands of circles by the end of the 1920's. According to the statistical data, in 1929 *Dopolavoro* circles, including municipal and neighborhood fractions were numbering 5,010. Company *dopolavoro* were present with 1,670 localities, which were promoted by private employers, state-run services and industries according to the company in question. These institutions' responsibilities were outlined as personnel management. Dependent associations which passed from the enrollment process

described above were numbering 4,221 and women's *dopolavoro* circles were present in 183 localities. (BLPS 1930: 161, De Grazia 1981: 48-50)

4.2.2.2. Approaching OND

4.2.2.2.1. Maximizing Production

According to its foundation *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* was established as an “*opera*”, as a paragovernmental foundation. It meant that such an organization was not under the authorities of the Fascist Party nor the Fascist syndicates, and it had a “quasi-autonomy” from the State administration, in theory. The accentuated mission of the organization was noted in its statutes as “promoting the healthy and profitable occupation of workers' leisure hours by means of institutions for developing their physical, intellectual, and moral capacities.” However, there was one more glorified characteristic of the institution, its role in the “apolitical” and “productivist” organization of worker leisure. (De Grazia 1981: 33-35)

Exactly at this point, within the theoretical framework supplied in the previous chapters in this thesis, one can note the fundamental approach of this particular strand corporatist imagination towards the social reality, anti-liberal however not anti-capitalist. The so-called “apolitical” and “productivist” character actually connotes the promotion of the non-conflictual organizations (“apolitical”) and the enforcement of non-class identities (“productivist”) in social organization. In this sense, it can be noted as a response to the organizations based on class belongings in the field of leisure-time. However, as it is theorized before, such a response did in its essence (infrastructural motivation) promoted the reinforcement of the capitalist mode of production to its limits. Therefore even in this field of so-called “off-work” there was another terminology of

“leisure” covering the basic mindset of the organization: maximizing production, in a state-monitored capitalist economy.

Therefore in this sense, the organization's goals reflected the motivation of the bourgeoisie in investing even in workers' leisure-time to construct the structure for a rising surplus. However, as it is theorized again in the previous chapter, such initiatives were not simply established by the bourgeoisie seeking profit as one could expect in a liberal capitalist society, marking the seeds of the civil society. Contrary to this, the organization of *opera* should be regarded in the cadre of the totalitarian corporatism, that the institution was situated in a capitalist society, as an “intermediary organization”, filling the gap between the State and the Society; however being strictly regulated by the state mechanism, and in correlation with the Fascist Party's policies, as among the limits of the State and the Party. We will be elaborating this point once again at the conclusion part of this thesis.

4.2.2.2.2. “People” as a Non-Class Unit

Following the economical depression and its effects felt during the first years of 1930's, the policy of the regime was apparently shifted to “reach out the people.” De Grazia describes such process in two levels, as the following. Firstly, distribution of bread and fuel to the public was accomplished by the organization of the party, “*Ente Opere Assistenziali*.” Secondly, the officials sought a “depoliticized activism”, aiming to get in touch with the general public, with visits to working class neighborhoods on regular basis for “physical as well as moral contact” with the proletariat. (ibidem: 52)

Another turning point marks in the history of the OND happened in 1930. On 18th of October, one sees the appointment of a new official, Achille Starace to the post of special commissioner, previously occupied by Augusto Turati. Following this Starace was appointed as the Fascist Party's secretary on 7 December 1931. During the period in which he occupied such position, the main idea of the organization promoted by the OND was to create a “party of a new kind.” In this way, the regimentation process would be accomplished via OND's activities: in a so-called “non-political” manner accessible for the “people” who would not be reactive to such ideological messages in another way.

For the officials governing and taking organizative posts of the *opera*, the idea of de-politicization of the masses were highly appreciated. In this regard, the already-existing class-based associations were stigmatized in theory and in practice. Therefore, apart from politicized class associations, workers' participation at leisure activities independent from the so-called “physical and social development” were also disgraced. Head of the 6000-membered Rome Transit Company of *Dopolavoro*, fascist consul Nicola Leuzzi defends on this aim with the following argument: “Even if they do desire, they no longer have the time to hang out in cellars or taverns, to allow themselves to be seen in places of ill repute or associate with pernicious types.” (Lavoro Fascista 1932, De Grazia 1981: 53, 54) Furthermore in this regard, the leisure-time spent outside of the working periods had to be compatible with the “productivist” ethics, still promoted by the regime. Following the “battles”³⁷, fostering such motive of participating in the production processes as in the maximum limits as possible for the benefit of the all, at the time OND inherited such ethos from the 1920's.

³⁷ With references to the “economic battles:” Battle of Grain, Battle for Land, Battle for the Lira and Battle of Birth.

In this regard, important point which was seen as so functional within the cadre of this institution was that its praise towards the “nonclass identities.” An identity form created with the amalgamation of the producer cult -with reference to the mode of approaching individual only its “productivist capacity” mentioned as well in previous chapter³⁸-, with its nationalist character, covered up by the attachment to the party was depicted as an ideal. However in this sense, such identity politics were strictly related to the reactions against the mass labor unrests just experienced at the early post-war years. In this sense *dopolavoro* as an institution was a result to this counter position towards the politically organized labor. On the other hand, within the cadre of organized capitalism, ideal workers were also imagined as the “disciplined consumers as well as diligent operatives” so, in this sense closely controlling and organizing their leisure time activities became very strategic for the regime.

4.2.2.2.3. A Corporatist National “De-Alienation”?

In practice this means that the organization had two important functions. One of them was related to their close-work with the Ministry of National Economy and other several parastate organizations who were engaged in the governance of small industries, national insurance, consumer information, and the domestic silk industry. On the other hand the OND was symbolizing kind of a “representational institution” between the state and the local society. Even though as it is marked in the theorization of the totalitarian corporatist model, and in the practice of increasing junction between the state and the organization, it was seen as having the function of “interpreting the needs, sufferings, and diffuse aspirations of the anonymous masses of the humble”, and via this interpretation seeking to “enlighten” the policies proposed by the decision-

³⁸ See discussion in 3.3.2. **Totalitarian State Approaching the “Individual”: Labor as “Social Duty” and the Producer Cult**, in this regard.

makers. (Gente Nostra 1928: 17) The same idea was present within the cadre of the limited tertiary, service sector as well. In this case as well, as it is planned so OND had the mission to “soften the degeneration of office work and bolster the shaky economic and social position of the petty functionary, not quite 'intellectual,' no longer 'proletarian.” (De Grazia 1981: 41-42)

It is as well important to consider the specific roles which were appointed to the organization in the industrial and rural areas. As it is noted above, the organization was strictly related to the non-confictual identities promoted by the state, which would be a response to the formation of the class-based organizations. Therefore, in this regard -in Marxist terminology- the process of “alienation” of the industrial workers triggered by the capitalist mode of production were perceived to be eliminated. However, as mentioned above this was realized in order to increase the productivity at the working-place, and foster the process based on the capitalist means of production. Therefore, even though the OND activities at the industries were presented as a miraculous mode of personnel management as an “antidote to the damaging effects of mechanization and the automation of the work process”, as it is noted in the previous chapter, the formation of OND proposed an imaginary change only via deviation from such problems, while on contrary its infrastructural function proceeded the suppression of the class-based social organizations, within the state-monitored capitalist economy. Indeed, in this regard its motivation of “de-alienation” of the workers reflected an anti-politicization of the class-based identities in the country. Therefore, as it will be once again elaborated in the conclusion part of the thesis; it is important to distinguish the ulterior motivation of such “de-alienation:” State's demand of conserving the infrastructural relations, based on the capitalist means of production, in a totalitarian corporatist manner.

4.3. HALKEVLERİ

4.3.1. Understanding the Sociopolitical Context- Turkish Case

4.3.1.1. Historical Background in Class Context

During the Greco-Turkish War of 1919-1922, one can analyze the economical class components which were crystallized in opposing ranks of the Ottoman government in Istanbul and the Turkish popular government in Ankara. As it is remarked by Şimşek, several social categories and interest groups were gathered in supporting these diverse ranks that were involved in the war for particular matters. In this regard, one sees the direct support of the Western European actors, Istanbul merchant bourgeoisie and several meta-feudal landlords of the Anatolia gathering around the Ottoman government of Istanbul. On the contrary, around the Ankara's popular government we note the support of the military and civil bureaucrats, landlords of grand estates and petit-bourgeoisie, manufacturers of Anatolia. In this sense, from the point of view of the ordinary Anatolian folk, the national war would be depicted as a conflict against the "foreign powers", invading their land. Therefore thanks to this fact and Ankara government's ability to raise support for this cause, we see general popular support for this camp. However, one also had to admit that in that case, it would be hard to argue that the Anatolian folk were consciously aware of the foundation of the new Turkish Republic, which would be guided by a set of westernizing reforms (in cultural fields), leaded by the principle of secularism. At such a situation, following the I. World War (1914-1918) and the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922), in such extraordinary circumstances, it is more rational to think that the popular opinion in Anatolia would give its consent to an authority that would lead the victory after a nearly-a-decade tragedy of wars. (Şimşek 2002: 4)

However as it is known, after the Greco-Turkish War, civil and military bureaucrats of the new regime of the Turkish Republic, followed a model that gradually introduced economical, technical and social reforms in diverse fields, realized institutional abolishment such as that of the Caliphate role of the sultan and “*Saltanat*” the Ottoman sultanate order. In this regard, it can be argued that such early-period institutional reforms focusing on the superstructural dynamics of the new state, neglected the so-called statual role of “social-engineering.” Such a situation lead the governing senior officials to particularly put up a project of social organizing methods that would help to build and create a social whole in a solidaristic corporatist manner that would be in correlation with the reforms implemented by the regime, and furthermore give its permanent consent to the state. (ibidem: 6)

Before focusing on the development of the People Houses project in Turkey to grasp the organizational circumstances, one should consider as well the organizations which can be viewed within a coordinate path focusing on the dissemination of certain ideological positions promoted or partly promoted, by the new regime in Turkey. These institutions can be regarded as institutions of “mass pedagogy”, prioritizing a particular theme, domain in their activities. One can note the Turkish Hearths (*Türk Ocakları*) of 1912, National Schools (*Millet Mektepleri*) of 1928, Society of Investigating Turkish History (*Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti*) of 1929 and Republican People Party Organization of Public Speechmakers (*CHP Halk Hatipleri Teşkilatı*) of 1931 within this cadre. (ibidem: 27)

Regarding our main concern of discussion on the People Houses, we are particularly interested in the institutional development of the Turkish Hearths as a cultural organization with an

institutional “ruptured continuity” with the People Houses. Furthermore as with the foundation of the People Houses, Hearths were abolished, integrated within the ranks of the Republican People Party and its properties were transferred to the People Houses, it marks a fundamental point to start our discussion and deserves a brief investigation in the ranks of this thesis.

4.3.1.2. *Türk Ocakları*/Turkish Hearths

Turkish Hearths was an organization dating back to the late Ottoman era, with its first branch's foundation in 1912, at the capital city of Istanbul. Following a period of pressure on the Empire by diverse nationalist movements, the Turkish Hearths turned out to be a reference point for Turkish nationalists, coming from diverse political backgrounds. It can be identified as a social organization, engaged in political affairs, as well as active in organization of meetings on social affairs, literature and culture, however keeping a “bipartisan institutional outlook.” The organization was also active in publication of its known journal “*Türk Yurdu*” (Turk Land). The organization was strictly supported by Turkish nationalists with diverse priorities, Turanists, conservatives exc., such as Ziya Gökalp, Yusuf Akçura, Hamdi Suphi Tanrıöver, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, Celal Sahir Erozan, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Halide Edip, Fuat Köprülü.

In such a social context, one of the interesting points which should be noted during the 1st World War is that unlike as expected, the organization continued to be active and was not concealed. Following the war, the organization as well participated in the Greco-Turkish war, and survived actively until the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. In these years the organization was able to organize at the national level in Anatolia. However, as it will be seen in depth below, the Turkish Hearths turned out to be closed down in 1931 and its properties, including its 257

branches were transferred to the ranks of the Republican People Party. Only after the foundation of the People Houses in 1932, the properties of the ex-Hearths were assigned to the new organization, People Houses. (CHF 1931; Arıkan 1999: 266)

Şimşek highlights the four points which could possibly explain the reasons behind the closure of the Turkish Hearths. Firstly, it may be argued that the institution generally had a closer tendency towards the *İttihat ve Terakki Fırkası*/ Party of Union and Progress (PUP) which even dated back to the *İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*/ Committee of Union and Progress during the Ottoman era. This made the Turkish Hearths in a relative ideological conflict with the Republican People Party of the newly-born Turkish Republic. However, here it is important as well to note that even though the Party of Union and Progress was closed down in 1923, the Turkish Hearths were let free to continue their activities in the country. Therefore, even though it can be interpreted that they symbolized an autonomous diverse political voice within the society, they should be marked distinct from the Party of Union and Progress. Thus it should be remarked as well that Mustafa Kemal himself also economically supported the Hearths with his personal donations.

Secondly, it can be proposed that the Turkish Hearths defended a more conservative position towards the Republican transformation and its reforms guided by the RPP. Thirdly, probably the most defensible one relies on the different “future projects” that some of the Republican senior officials and the instructors of the Turkish Hearths had in difference, regarding the international policy approach of the new state. While in the ranks of the Turkish Hearths Panturkist ideals, promoting the geo-strategical importance of contemporary Central Asia, amalgamated with the irredentist ideals glorifying the “Turkish origin” of these territories, the current governments in

power sought a more “in defense”, stable international policy in these period, between late 1920's and early 1930's. Lastly, it can be remarked that in reality the RPP actually sought to integrate the members of the Turkish Hearths within its ranks. Instead of proposing a new beginning, it continued using the structures left by the Hearths for the People Houses, and promoted the members of the Turkish Hearths to join these organizations. It should be as well noted that there were already members of the Turkish Hearths (also its high officials) in the Republican People Party (even as deputies). (Çeçen 1990; Şimşek 2002: 29)

On the other hand as a principle, the Hearths were formed as “bipartisan organizations.” In this sense, during the Ottoman era as well as in the Turkish Republic, they aimed to have a distance with the political party organizations in the country. Even though their nationalist and conservative positions remained, for example during the experience of PUP, and even after closure of the party they aimed to keep their autonomous position from the political party spectrum. However, we see that their such approach began to change in April 1927, during their institutional congress. In this congress, the Turkish Hearths administration introduced a new article in their internal regulation and declared their sympathy to the Republican People's Party in their state policies. In this regard, the administration used the following article:

“The Turkish Hearths that follow the ideals of the republic, the nation, contemporary civilization and populism (*halkçılık*), is together with Republican People Party in state policies which realizes these ideals.” (Üstel 1986: 448; Şimşek 2002: 35)

However such attitude as well can be identified as a part of the defense mechanism that is

maintained by the Hearths towards the ranks of the RPP. It was true that the RPP, as the founder of the new republic, symbolized stability in the political sphere. After the failed experience of PUP, it can be seen understandable that the Hearths administration preferred to guarantee its institutional existence and continue with its activities without having any internal clashes with the senior bureaucrats of the RPP.

4.3.1.3. Free Republican Party (FRP) Experience

On the other hand, the existence of the Hearths symbolized also in theory, the existence of a form of a social and political alternative in the country, which could still connote political and social autonomy from the state. This can be the reason why the second multiparty experience of the Republic with the *Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası*/ Free Republican Party (FRP)/ -which its foundation promoted by Mustafa Kemal himself- in August 1930 was animated with so many names who were active leaders of the Hearths. However, following the foundation of this party, the administration of the Hearths encouraged the de-membership of the subjects who were members of the RPP or the FRP. As it can be seen, with the change of the regulation in 1927, the status of the relationship between the Hearths and the Republican People Party came to be more and more complicated.

This instable situation got even more complex with the FRP's Izmir meeting organized in September 1930. Party's Izmir meeting was attained by thousands of people at an “unexpected rate” by the ranks of the RPP. In practice it turned out to be a public critic of the RPP, and the senior officials of the party were eager to welcome such public acts. The party attained the local elections of September 1930 as well and win majority in several districts, but then the election

results were criticized to be re-arranged for the RPP. During this period, the multiparty experience turned out to mirror the “unwelcomed” critics towards the government reforms and RPP. This created kind of a reaction in the RPP ranks and forced them to review their influence in the society and the outcomes of the reforms employed during the first years of the republic. Such circumstances lead to the second failure of the multiparty experience, (by the proposal of foundation and the abolishment of RPP officials), with the abolishment of the Free Republican Party on 17 December 1930. (Şimşek 2002: 37)

4.3.1.4. Menemen Incident

However, during the FRP's open-period the instable internal political atmosphere were not calmed yet. On 23 September 1930, the country witnessed a brutal event recorded in the history of the republic, as the “Menemen Incident” (*Menemen Olayı*). The event is known as a petit-rebellion of six to ten people started by a group of armed men, defending of religious order-sharia in the western province of Menemen. When the rebellion was encountered by the local military officials of the area, firstly the officials asked the man to stop the demonstration. Then, they used wooden bullets in order to passivize the demonstrators. However, as the wooden bullets did not affect the demonstrators, on contrary, at that moment, they started to gather around a sheikh, and glorify him as he was an “immortal being” which even soldiers' bullet could not kill him. In such confusion the armed man attacked the military personal which tried to calm them down and killed the commander of the group, Mustafa Fehmi Kubilay (1906-1930), who was a teacher, realizing his duty of military service at the moment; cut his head and place it on a pole with the green flag, that they have used during the demonstration. Furthermore, after the killing, demonstrators marched in the town with the green flag and the head of the commander.

Such event made a shock-effect on the Republican senior officials, and had major repercussions. Specifically the prime minister İsmet (İnönü) was questioning the “indifference” of the people who were present during the manifestation. (Plaggenborg 2014: 86). Indeed it was one of the events that structured the perception of a “superstructural threat” interpreted to menace the Republican reforms. Following the event, immediate reaction came from the government, and the demonstrators were sued, sentenced to life time prison, given death sentences in the martial courts put in order just after the incident. As Erik Jan Zürcher as well notes on this, Menemen incident plays an important role in the change we observe among government's act towards the employment of more authoritarian strand of social policies. (Zürcher 2004a)

4.3.1.5. Framing the Political Dynamics

4.3.1.5.1. Zürcher's argument of “transition”

In relation to the period covered in this paper, as the first decades of the Turkish Republic, following the 3rd Party Congress of the Republican People's Party in 1931³⁹. Zürcher notes a changing role of the RPP, a political tendency of a transition from authoritarian towards a totalitarian rule in Turkey. He argues that contrasting to its first six years (1923-1929) the RPP did not function as an “instrument for mass mobilization on the pattern of socialist or fascist parties in Europe.” However, Zürcher mentions that this picture started to be changed, and the party became much more active in education and propaganda in the 1930's.(Zürcher 2004a: 106) As People Houses foundation dates after such incidents, in 1932, it's important to consider Zürcher's position, as his problematic will be partly revised in the conclusion part of the thesis.

³⁹As mentioned before, marks also the introduction of the “six arrows” : “Nationalism, Laicism, Transformationism, Statism, Populism, Republicanism.”

Zürcher points out three reasons for such a political shift on the party's ranks. According to him, these are as the following. Firstly the world economic crisis producing a dramatic fall in the price of agricultural products seriously affected Turkish economy from 1930 and onwards. Such a change “created a demand for a more active and interventionist government policy.”

Secondly, the short-lived experience of the “*Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası*” (Free Republican Party) aiming to introduce the multiparty electoral system in Turkey in 1930, came out to be a mirror letting the officials of the RPP face the discontent in the country and the “unpopularity” of the founder RPP. Dramatic event of the murder of a junior officer in Menemen let the fear of a religious fundamentalist reaction to the modernization policies of the government, perceived as “counter-revolutionary”. These events let the party officials grasp the problem that their gospel of social and cultural modernization did not yet reach the mass of the population. In this regard more attention had to be devoted towards education and propaganda to minimize such gap.

Thirdly, Zürcher notes the seeming inability of the Western liberals in dealing with world economic crisis while the Soviet Union and the Fascist Italy had the impression of dealing with such a problem much more efficiently. In such an international context, “the very powerful secretary-general of the party” Recep Peker proposed to position the Republican People's Party to be in charge of the country. His proposal was rejected by Mustafa Kemal, preferring to continue with the bureaucracy apparatus. Thus at the period, Zürcher argues that the state and party functions were increasingly merged, reminding the similar authoritarian examples in Europe.(ibidem: 108)

4.3.1.5.2. Şimşek's argument on “institutional renewal”

At this point, one asks why then did the government administration totally abnegate the superstructural institutions that it inherited from the Ottoman era? As it is recalled by Şimşek firstly, it can be said that one of the main differences of legitimization between the Ottoman political administration and the Republican political power lied on their treatment towards the religious institutions. While the first one gained its legitimization from the religious context, that is based on the Islamic nucleus, the Republicans aimed to build their legitimization on the concept of secularism. Secondly, it must be noted that the Republican approach clearly intended to repudiate the Ottoman superstructure in its totality. As it can be noted from Mustafa Kemal's opening speech at the national parliament dating back to 13 August 1923, re-laid by İnan, he underlined that:

“Obviously, the basis that the Turkish State, this new entity is abided on, is different in its quality than the basis of the previous historical organizations. To mention it in one word, it can be said that the new Turkish State is the state of the people. Historical organizations were a one-person state, state of persons.” (İnan 1983: 23)

Thirdly, even though it has experienced territorial loss, the Ottoman Empire was still textured by a multi ethnic and religious societies. These social relations were managed under the monarchical organization of the state and the spaces of action administered to the such societies regarding their internal affairs. On the other hand, on contrary to this position, the Turkish state was built essentially as a unitary nation-state, which embraced a strong homogenizing and gathering approach towards these social dynamics. (Şimşek 2002: 2)

In this regard after grasping sufficiently the sociopolitical background of the era, and the theoretical explanations proposed on this evolution of the government policies, below we continue our discussion with references to the working structure of the People Houses. However, we will be turning back to the theoretical discussions mentioned above in the conclusion part of this thesis in order to frame such developments in reference to solidaristic corporatist model outlined in the previous chapter in this thesis.

4.3.2. Analyzing *Halkevleri*

4.3.2.1. *Halkevleri* Working Structure

In such a context triggered by the I.WW, the Greco-Turkish War, the social reforms implemented by the regime in the first decade of the foundation of the Republic, with two multi-party electoral experiences accompanied by popular reactions, one should consider to analyze the internal sociopolitical processes which led to the closure of the Turkish Hearths and the foundation of the People Houses in this background.

Therefore Turkish Hearths closure was proceeded with an institutional congress decision taken on 10 April 1931 in Ankara. This followed the institutional conglomeration within the ranks of the RPP on 18 April 1931 and the transfer of all of its properties and 257 branches. The acknowledgement of such conglomeration by the Republican People Party was realized on its Third National Congress on 10 May 1931. Following this process, the founding regulation of the People Houses was firstly presented to Recep Peker, who was RPP's secretary-general of the time, by the proposing committee headed by Ziya Cevher Etili. The committee was formed by senior officials such as Reşit Tarhan, Hasan Cemil Çambel, Münir Hayri Egeli, Cevdet Nasuhi,

İsmail Hüsrev Tökin, İshak Refet, Hamit Zübeyr Koşay, Behçet Kemal Çağlar, Sadi Irmak and Vildan Aşar Savaşır. (Çeçen 1990:110; Şimşek 2002: 60) What is more interesting is that, the meeting in which the committee discussed and decided on the founding declaration of the People Houses, was organized in the building of the ex-Turkish Hearths headquarter.

On 19 February 1932 People Houses were officially founded in 14 cities around the country at the same time. These cities which later functioned as the bases of the growing social influence of these institutions were Adana, Afyon, Ankara, Aydın, Bursa, Çanakkale, Denizli, Diyarbakır, Eskişehir, Istanbul, Izmir, Konya, Samsun and Van. As it can be noted the cities were chosen particularly in correlation with the geographical distribution of the institution among each direction of Anatolia.

Just after the foundation of the first 14 institutes of People Houses, the organization continued to open up new branches all around the country. In 1933 there were already 55 active branches of the People Houses, and the numbers continued to increase with 103 branches in 1935; 210 branches in 1938; 379 branches in 1940; 438 branches in 1945 and 455 branches in 1946. Furthermore, in 1950 there were actively operating 478 People House branches, with one branch being established abroad, in London, UK. (Çeçen 1990: 117; Şimşek 2002: 61)

Related to the specific period of time focused in this research, it is important to note that People Houses had the highest level of increase in branch size as well as the most frequent activity organization among these branches dates to the period between 1932 and 1940. Statistics note that during this period in all People Houses branches there were 12.350 theater plays performed,

9.050 concerts organized, 7.850 films projected and 970 exhibitions displayed. (Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, v.4: 882; Şimşek 2002: 61)

4.3.2.1.2. Branches and Organizational Activities

The activities of the People Houses were organized under nine branches, with the appointment to each branch a specific field of social and cultural responsibility. These nine branches were categorized as the following:

- 1- Language, history and literature branch
- 2- Fine arts branch
- 3- Theater branch
- 4- Sports branch
- 5- Social assistance branch
- 6- Public classes and courses branch
- 7- Library and publishing branch
- 8- Village development branch
- 9- Museums and exhibitions branch

Regarding their regulations, each of these branches had to follow the guidelines instructed in the People Houses regulations (*Halkevleri öreneği*) organized by the central body. (Öztürkmen 1994: 163) We can note the activities proceeded by these branches as the following, with regards to Öztürkmen and Çeçen.

First of all each of the nine branches in their activities had to be in correlation with the new reforms introduced by the government. To give several examples to this kind, one can note several commemoration days organized by the Language, history and literature branch, particularly on different Turkish artists, intellectuals and public figures framed as “heroes.” Another example to the activities of the Fine arts branch can be noted as the formation of choral groups, particular popular orchestras structured in the framework of their western contemporaries, specifically with using musical instruments common in Western classical music, and organization of concerts and presentations of pieces of Western classical music. In order to have an idea of such a framework, below a sample of a popular concert organized in Manisa People House in 1946 can be seen, documented in the archives of the very People House's journal, *Gediz*:

First Concert program:

National Anthem

Indian Lament

Vie Joyeuse

In Salah

Gavotte

--10 minutes break--

Cinguantin

Der Calif von Bagdad

Barcarolle

Carmen March

Second Concert program:

National Anthem

La Barcarolle

Solvejgs Lied

In Salah

Beethoven Monnet

--10 minutes break--

Der Calif von Bagdad

Toselli Serenade

Hungarian Dance

Valse Espagnole

(Gediz, 1946: 18; Şimşek 2002)

As it can be seen from this sample, the senior officials of the regime; active in People Houses organizing activities had a certain vision regarding the cultural development of the society. In this sense, the so-called “Western forms” played a magnificent role. Therefore even in music: as well as other fields; the ultimate aim was to realize the appreciated “synthesis” of “national cultural forms” with “Western civilization forms.” (Mizrahi 2013, 2016)⁴⁰

At this point, in order to grasp the bigger picture on the social life at the People Houses, one should as well note that such principles reflected the perceptions and attitudes of the organizers/officials towards the activities realized in the branches. Thus even on the archives of the Giresun People House journal *Aksu*, one can encounter that such processes of cultural promotion did not go smooth as it was planned so.

In February 1940 copy of the journal, one notes a critical stand voiced by the responsables of the People Houses against the citizens of the town regarding an issue with the music courses organized at the branch. It turns out that some of the citizens of the town do not participate in the music courses prepared at the People Houses settlement. However, on the other hand they request to have private lessons from the very same music teacher employed by the Giresun People House. In such a situation, the following sentences of the article appearing on the journal amplifies the position supported by the organizer branch:

“It is a mental disability that a citizen who avoids to send his/her child to People Houses, finds in him/herself the right to benefit from its very teacher.” (Aksu 1940:23; Şimşek 2002: 111)

⁴⁰ For more information on the musical aspect of this cultural project, you can see my previous publications dealing with the institutionalization of the Turkish Folk Music in Turkey during the first two decades of the Republic, with references to People Houses as well. (Mizrahi 2013, 2016)

In this particular case, regarding the material concerned, among the pages of the institution's journals -with reference to Paul Corner's terminology- one can notice the traces of evidences on a contradiction between the “popular opinion” and the “public opinion” promoted by the officials towards the very function of the institution's branches. (Corner 2009)

Furthermore, it is important to note that frequently the organizers aimed to stress the “national” characteristic, the “national” touch of their events. One of this kind was the presentations of the opera play *Mme Butterfly* in Ankara People House in 1941. As Öztürkmen quotes a critical author of the time Falih Rıfkı Atay's writing on this play, it shows indeed that the opera play *Mme Butterfly* was not played in its original form, but was re-presented in a “national fashion”, portrayed as a “Turkish opera.” Even more, Atay was arguing that actually the Western music was the “real Turkish music” and referring to the greater debate on the “national music” of the new Republic, based on the theoretical distinction proposed by Ziya Gökalp at the early years of the century, between the culture (*hars*) and civilization (*medeniyet*), previously mentioned in this thesis.⁴¹

Continuing with the branches activities, the Theatre branch of the organization as well was responsible of organizations of presentations. They participated in the programming of the activities such as drama courses, focusing on the arts of cinema and particularly public speaking courses, which was such an important form of idea-diffusion method of the time. As a large scale of the population lacked the literary skills to read and write texts yet, particularly in the countryside, it is important to remember the role of the public speakers, and the theatre plays in introducing the “proper interpretation” of the Republic reforms, and its mode of approaching the

⁴¹ See 3.4.1. Revisiting Social Thought of Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)

society and history.⁴²

Another important branch registered in the People House structure was the Village Development branch. Their fundamental role was portrayed as the organization of the relations between the villages and the cities in the country. Furthermore, they were as well involved in the solution-finding processes of social and infrastructural problems posed to them from the countryside. A similar task of development was assigned to the Social Assistance branch of the organization as well. In this sense they would organize charity activities for the necessary re-distribution of wealth and further organize medical polyclinics needed in these settlements. The task of public education was divided among the two branches of the organization as Public Classes and Courses branch and the Library branch. In this sense, while the first branch was responsible of the organization of public courses such as reading and writing literacy lessons, the second branch served as a structural base in organization of reading material of the institution, and furthermore preparation of book exhibitions. (Çeçen 1990; Öztürkmen 1994: 164)

Apart from their activities regarding their specific branches, these sections were also fundamental in the diffusion of the reforms employed by the central government to citizens of the cities and towns of the country. In this regard the government followed a practical plan in assigning specific dates to introduce and celebrate the reforms and regulations approved by the state. To remember several of these festivities one can note the “Language Day”, “Land Day”, “Sports Festival”, “Maritime Day.” The glorification of such special days and festivities can be tracked in the pages of the People Houses magazines of the time. In this sense, the evolution of

⁴² Esra Dicle Başbuğ's work on theater plays in People Houses, on “Official Ideology on the Stage: The role of the People Houses theatre plays during the construction of the Kemalist Ideology” should be noted as a well documented publication in this regard; in Turkish. (Başbuğ 2013)

these specific days as well notes an important aspect on the perception of the senior officials regarding the new regime's policies.⁴³

4.3.2.2. Approaching *Halkevleri*

Turning back to the contemporary sources of the time, regarding the purposes of founding such an institution, diverse opinions were discussed in public sphere. As an example, a poet and an intellectual of the period, Behçet Kemal Çağlar, with his numerous contributions to Ankara People Houses journal *Ülkü*, argued that there were mainly three motivations in structuring such an institution in this very particular time. He argued that the first motivation was fostered from the side of the Republican People Party and the intellectuals. He proposed that this group had the necessity to get in touch with the “people” and practically get to know “the country.” Secondly, this group furthermore had the need and the will to proceed with the diffusion of the Party's principles within the society. Even more they also had to introduce the reforms which were already put in force by the government to the citizens. Thirdly, he pointed out that such senior officials of the regime had the motivation to build an integrated society, and particularly a youth that would be treated as a mass, ready to be molded according to their will. (Çağlar 1936; 1933; Şimşek 2002: 68)

4.3.2.2.1. Ideological Motivations

Another important point regarding the Turkish experience of nation-building is that, as it is mentioned by Öztürkmen in her article, “efforts aimed at the making of Turkish nation, however

⁴³ One of the remarkable cases on the history of the festive days in Turkey can be noted by the introduction of 19 May as the “Atatürk Day” with regulation dating to 24 May 1935. According to the official state historiography 19 May 1919 marks the day of the “start of the Independence War” with the arrival of Mustafa Kemal to Samsun. However from the date of 20 June 1938 the day was continued to be celebrated as the “Youth and Sports Holiday” among the country. Finally the current regulation in Turkey dates back to 1981 (after the 1980 coup d'etat) and it is named as the “Holiday of Commemoration of Atatürk and Youth and Sports”

coincided with the period following the establishment of the Turkish nation-state.” Therefore in fact this noted the distinctness of the Turkish nationalist ideals from the Turkist nationalist movements during the late Ottoman era. This distinction among the late-Ottoman Turkish nationalism and the Early Republican Turkish nationalism forms the main division of ideological paths promoted by the Turkish Hearths and the People Houses organizations during the first decades of the republic. As it is once again mentioned by Öztürkmen, briefly these differences can be noted with considering the expansionist and the pan-Turkish elements of the Turkish nationalism of the previous era. (Öztürkmen 1994: 159)

In this process which lead to the formation of People Houses, such institutions were imagined to fulfill the function of “mediating the ideas, reforms and images promoted by the new regime.” However, it is also important to remark that these institutions were not imagined to accomplish a one-way function, they were also seen as organizations which would help the senior officials of the Republican Party to be able to interact and sympathize with the population in the country. At this point, it would also be argued that these “reencounters” ended up with such officials' paradoxical “emotional attachment” to the countryside, with their will to transform such peasant culture for their modernizing ideal. (ibidem: 161)

In this regard, it can also be mentioned that the foundation of the People Houses marked the “failure of the Turkish Hearths to support the new regime.” This connotes the different national ideals promoted by the supporters of these two organizations. To give an example to this, one can note the fact that the Turkish Hearths were actually had their references in the Ottoman-Turkish tradition of 1910's, which would make some of the Hearths to oppose such reforms promoted by

the Republican government. One can note their opposition to the reforms of the usage of Latin alphabet in place of the Arabic script, and the dress reforms promoted by the government. Furthermore supporters of the Turkish Hearths were also present in the ranks of the Free Republican Party, and this also created a division between such political figures and the ones who determined to support the policies promoted by the Republican People Party, such as Recep Peker. (ibidem: 162)

In practice People Houses reflected the functionalist vision of the solidaristic corporatist social policies. It had the mission to “create a mass society, which in turn would serve to create a true nation” according to the RPP elite. (Karaömerlioğlu 1998: 69) With its abovementioned nine departments People Houses project served this purpose during 1932 and 1951.

Another characteristic of the institution was the strong role of the Republican Party played at the organization of People Houses structures and programs. This did not promote the autonomy of the institution but positioned it as a close organization to the party's principles. Structurally this can be seen as when the founder bureaucrats did not prefer to form a legal “central office” for all the People Houses in the country, but preferred to keep them local. (Şimşek 2002: 92) In this sense the values promoted in these institutions had to be in correlation with the party program and its particular “national ideal.” As one could guess, the closure of these institutions came after the elections and with the rival of the Democrat Party in Turkey on 14 May 1950. Following this political change, People Houses around the country were closed down following a regulation published of the official newspaper in 1951.

4.4. CONCLUSIONS

It can be expected that foundation of nation-state governed socio-cultural organizations mostly aim to proceed with the indoctrination of the “national ideals” via conditioning of everyday lives. Contextualizing it with the theoretical framework outlined in the first chapter of this thesis, one can remark the approach built by Peter J. Williamson's model of an authoritarian-licensed corporatism with several variables. Even though his work mainly focuses on the economical relations of the model (based on the intermediary licensed institutions coordinating the labor, capital and the state) his final point hints at cultural policies in such model: “Around the licensed associations will be established institutional structures that by purporting to encapsulate certain ideological premises-such as social solidarity, justice and the national interest- are designed to legitimize the order, particularly the disciplining of labor” (Williamson 2009: 131)

However in light of the explanations taken place in this and the previous chapter, the components of such “national ideals”, differed in inter-war Italy and Turkey. This differentiation argument is supported with references to two points. Firstly it is because of the diverse infrastructural relations conditioned by the crisis of distribution and the crisis of accumulation respectively. Secondly, even though taken place at the same period of concern of the years following the I.WW, such infrastructural circumstances conditioned different social textures, for this reason the motivations of the cultural policy reactions, governed by the state mechanisms differed, explored in this chapter.

In the Italian case, with the policies promoting the regimentation of the “leisure-time” activities of the citizens, one sees the essential promotion of standardization of the non-working time

activities with those of the working time, framed in a “productivist” manner. Therefore, with the new circles, with the standardization of the already-existing social circles, and with the dependent circles, OND organization was a result of this totalitarian corporatist policy. This is the reason that it was reactionary to the class-based associations, however it still kept the stimuli to be present at the daily lives of its citizens. As a result the OND organizations in several cases were embedded to the companies and served for the relative workers, as well as the non company-embedded circles such as the ones in the neighborhoods and the rural areas.

In the Turkish case, the foundation of People Houses in 1932 sought the realization of two principle motivations. To grasp the role of this decision on its establishments, it's fundamental to consider the social transformation which was already in act in the country from the early years of the Republic and on, with the abolition of the Caliphate in 1924, *Terrakiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası*/ Progressive Republican Party experience in 1924-25, Educational reform in 1924, Clothing reform in 1925, closure of *tekke, zaviye and turbe*-religious lodges, sects in 1925, Latin alphabet reform in 1928, agricultural reform in 1929, electoral rights to woman in 1930 and the starting for the preparations for the Turkification of the *ezan*, the religious public prayer in 1931/32.

In such a context of transformation, the experience of the economical crisis leading to the devaluation of the agricultural products in the country in late 1920's, together with the Free Republican Party experience of 1930 and the reactionary incidents such as the Menemen incident explained in this chapter; pave the path for the establishment of the People Houses. Therefore closure of the Turkish Hearths and the establishment of the institution marks a compatible policy

with the dissemination efforts of the social reforms previously introduced in the country. Furthermore such process is facilitated with the abovementioned ideological differentiations that created the dispute between the Turkish Hearths and the pro-reform Republican officials. In this regard as it can be seen from the branches and the activities conducted by the People Houses such organization aimed firstly to create the idea of national belonging and the support for the governmental reforms introduced around the country.

Therefore it can be argued that the main idea with the People House project was to create the “ideal national citizen”, loyal to the regime and its reforms. As it is noted in the previous chapter, this had the reference to one of the six RPP principles, “populism/*halkçılık*”, which reflected a solidaristic corporatist, “harmonious” social imagination. However, differentiating from the OND in the Italian case (in an advanced capitalist context) attacking directly to the class-based associational life in the country; the People Houses policy in Turkey (in a developmental capitalist context) aimed at a general instruction and social involvement in the reforms put in action by the government. Therefore in this context People Houses were imagined as solidifying policy of persuasion by the governmental ranks, as a response to the superstructural perceived threat of a “counter-revolution” leaded by an anti-Republican opposition; which did not regard a worker's “class warfare” whatsoever. On the other hand, in the Italian context, OND was a result of a passivization policy against an infrastructural perceived threat lead by the organized labor, “overthrowing the capitalist mode of production.” The conclusion part of the thesis will be turning back again to this analysis, for elaborating it furthermore with the theoretical platform built in the second and the third chapters of the thesis. The following chapter frames the inter-perception patterns of intellectuals and law-makers in each case towards “other's” policy-making

practices, conditioned by the crises thus seeking an anti-socialist, non-liberal however not anti-capitalist mode of survival.

CHAPTER 5. INTER-PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES: INTERWAR ITALY AND TURKEY

5.1. INTRODUCTION

In light of the discussions taken place in previous chapters, it is argued that interwar Italian and Turkish contexts were structured by the dynamics of two crisis respectively; crisis of capital distribution and the crisis of capital accumulation. In this sense it is observed that political agencies reacted to such crises with prioritizing the sustainment of the capitalist mode of production; and their socio-economic and cultural policies followed totalitarian corporatism in Italian context, and solidaristic corporatism in the Turkish context. Thus in eyes of the contemporary intellectuals and law-makers, their such policies reflected an “un-observed alternative” to liberal capitalist and socialist managements of socio-economic relations. Therefore in an international context, seeing the “other” agency meant contemporaneously thinking about one's self position as well. Commenting on the socio-economic policies of the “other” agency meant questioning the validity of one's policy-making practices itself.

Following this premise, in this chapter intellectual perceptions and attitudes in inter-war Italy and Turkey towards eachothers' policies are investigated. For this reason, qualitative discourse analyze is proceeded with references to several articles and news that stand up from a set of 225 articles found in six different sources⁴⁴ dealing with the issues of corporatism, economical policies, social policies; including discussions with references to Italy in the Turkish sources, and references to Turkey in the Italian sources; as well as misunderstandings and quarrels among the

⁴⁴ *Kadro*, *Cumhuriyet* and *Ülkü* in the Turkish case, *Oriente Moderno*, *Il Popolo d'Italia*, and *Gerarchia* in the Italian case.

authors in these sources. Therefore in order to give a comprehensive context of the intellectual and journalistic voices raised at the platforms of public opinion, interactions and inter-perception patterns are explicated with references to the evolving international relations between these two countries.

For this reason, in the first main section of this chapter named as **5.2. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: EVOLVING PERCEPTIONS**, a narrative on such perceptions is constructed in correlation with the international incidents that conditioned the relations between these two countries. Thus going beyond a descriptive account on foreign policies; constant references are given to a set of representative archival material (news and commentary articles) which are argued to be grasped as “evolving perceptions” within the “big picture” of alternating relations between the two countries. Therefore the first main section follows a chronological narrative built on four parts as **5.2.1. 1922-1927 Period: Distance**; **5.2.2. 1928-1932 Period: Rapprochement** and **5.2.3. 1932-1939 Period: Diverging Agendas**; integrated with the relative analysis of the archival sources concerning the issues on international affairs. In **5.2.4. Remarks**, results of this analysis is recalled before proceeding with the next section.

In the second main section of this chapter, named as **5.3. INTERNAL POLICIES: ANALOGICAL THINKING AND DIFFERENTIAL THINKING**, archival material that deals with the themes concerning the domestic policies of these two countries is highlighted. The materials analyzed in this part are grouped under three titles as the following: **5.3.1. Cultural Politics in Dual Perspective** focuses on the standing out material on Turkish discussions on cultural policies with considering the Italian policies. Then **5.3.2. Socioeconomics in Dual**

Perspective illustrates the Turkish discussions on socio-economic policies, which are argued to embrace an attitude of “differential thinking.” This part thus highlights a specific case of a quarrel between Ettore Rossi and Burhan Asaf on theorizing Turkish and Italian political transformations in comparison. Additionally in regards to the previous discussions, among the Turkish authors we observe the assumption of “fall of liberalism”; questioning Turkey's place comparatively within the “changing world order.” Furthermore **5.3.3. RPP 4th National Congress of 1935** explores Recep Peker's discourse in the Republican People's Party's national congress and analyzes the coverage it received in an article appeared in *Oriente Moderno*, demonstrating us a pattern of “analogical thinking” that comes up as the main characteristics of the narrative adopted by the Italian authors on Turkey, such as Ettore Rossi and Ubaldo Faldati. Finally at the conclusion part brief arguments are supported in light of the material analyzed in the chapter; which are recalled at the general conclusion chapter of the thesis.

5.2. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: EVOLVING PERCEPTIONS

Analysis of the international relations between Turkey and Italy in the interwar era can be divided into three periods of 1922-1927 which is dominated by distant relations without remarkable approaching tendencies, 1928-1932 which marks a period of rapprochement between the two countries and 1932-1939 which illustrates a gradual disengagement leading to a “frost.” Dilek Barlas approaches to identify the first period dominated by an ambiguous relation between these two actors. Thus in this period Turkey's security concerns were still in its agenda just after the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922). Furthermore previous Italian occupation of Tripoli and Dodecanese islands in 1912, followed by Italian engagement in the Sevres Treaty in 1920 contemporary with the Greek occupation of Smyrna, contributed to this ambiguity. (Barlas 2004:

232)

In this cadre, Barlas summarizes the conditions of the second period, which shaped the relations between the two as Ankara's need for foreign economic support -for its development, to pay the part of the Ottoman public debt- and Turkey's attempt to overcome international isolation. Therefore these two factors conditioned the Ankara government to “seek rapprochement” with the great powers, and endure its status as a nation-state. Hence following the year 1932, the relations between the two countries experienced a phasic disengagement. (ibidem) Below the evolving perceptions voiced in the public opinion generally by policy makers or the intellectuals close to respective regimes are followed. This is proceeded by encountering their articles in the journals, studied in parallel with the alternating relations between the two countries.

5.2.1. 1922-1927 Period: Distance

In this regard to have an idea on the “starting point” of such evolving perceptions at the Italian side, analyzing Benito Mussolini's and di Marzio's articles, published respectively on 1922 and 1924, approaching Turkey in its international context is enlightening.

In the article of Benito Mussolini, “*La Luna Crescente/ The Crescent Moon*” published in *Gerarchia* in 1922 December, Mussolini particularly analyzes Turkey, its experience after the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922) and describes it as an “European actor” which survived the war. Thus it should be reminded that such a historical context is just before the Peace Treaty signed in Lausanne in 1923. It is particularly important to note such position of Mussolini in 1922, which actually pre-marks a starting point, a cadre to approach Italian-Turkish relations, with treating

Turkey literally as a country “that turned to Europe.” In order to grasp such position of Mussolini, his discourse is quoted below as:

“Turkey turns to Europe, whether at its extreme angle. All the attempts to push it back in Asia have fallen; sign of an unbeatable historical law that pushes Turks on the European shores of the Marmara Sea. Hence Turkey is what it is, as it possesses Constantinople: as it is between the two seas; as it can serve as a ring between the European and Asian worlds. Constantinople is a grand quadrivium of land and sea. Expulsed from Constantinople, Turkey dies. Not to die so, it needs to turn back. During the war and even in the official documents, there were many mediocre literature on Turkey and its incapacity of a civil development. The reality is different, though not with falling into the literary exaggerations of Pierre Loti.” (Mussolini 1922: 478)

Furthermore, following this argument, Mussolini stresses on the “definitive Turkish victory” in Anatolia. However within the cadre of the international relations, one sees that Mussolini's such “sympathy” towards the Turkish victory could also be his cautious step towards a possible rapprochement between Turkey and Russia. It can be the reason that in the following page, he condemns the Russian influence in Asia and frames such an argument in a religious cadre too: “The religion separates irreparably the Russian mentality from the Islamic one. Tsar’s Russia could not do with its Asian politics, and it even had furthermore possibilities than that of Lenin's Russia.” (ibidem: 479)

In the article “*La Turchia di Kemal/Kemal's Turkey*” in *Gerarchia's* number of September 1924, written by Cornelio di Marzio, one firstly sees the common attribution -that is also observed in

the other Italian journals- of identifying the Turkish experience of Turco-Greek War and the foundation of the new Republic with the very personality of Mustafa Kemal. Therefore, back from the time of 1924, we can clearly notice the potential tendency to equate the reforms and institutional changes introduced in the country with him. Similar to the article of Mussolini, after two years -this time after the Peace Treaty of Lausanne- di Marzio as well approaches the Turkish-Russian relations and describes it as the following: “It is becoming more clear that so-called Turkish-Russian block which tries to embrace the people of the both countries, against the European bourgeoisie is becoming more of an ephemeral one.” (di Marzio 1924: 120) Therefore the observation regarding the current situation in Turkey and the recommendation for Italian politics is not delayed; di Marzio mentions that there would be only one future of modern Turkey, with its nationalist policies. In this regard Italy should be attentive and cautious towards “its neighbor and Mediterranean Turkey”. (ibidem)

However until the first Italo-Turkish Pact of 1928, the public opinion in Turkey was dominated by a cautious approach towards Turkish-Italian relations. It can be said that Fiume and Corfu incidents of Italian politics as well conditioned the Ankara government to consider defending itself against being a possible next target of “Italian expansionism” in the Balkans. In fact Barlas mentions the telegram sent by the Italian Embassy in Turkey to the Italian Foreign Minister on the advantages of Italy leading colonial goals in Southeastern Turkey, suggesting to focus on Adana instead on Antalya coast. However the very telegram notes the year 1927 as a critical year as the new regime in Turkey starts to be more stabilize internally as well. (Barlas 2004: 234-236)

5.2.2. 1928-1932 Period: Rapprochement

5.2.2.1. Repercussions of 1928 Italo-Turkish Treaty

In this context the year 1928 marks an important turn between the relations of the two countries. From the year before and on several communications were made in order to organize a Turkish visit in Italy. Consequently in April 1928 the undersecretary of the Italian Foreign Ministry of the time, Dino Grandi met the Turkish Foreign Minister Tevfik Rüştü Aras in Milan.

Barlas interprets the reason of such rapprochement to several factors such as the evolving politics in the Balkans: In the fall of 1927 France and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes proceeded with an alliance. Furthermore Belgrade parliament refused to approve the Convention of Nettuno, which was prepared with Italy on 20 July 1925. In such a situation, it can be argued from the point of view of the Italian foreign policy that, Turkey turns out to be an actor to consider partnership in the region. Therefore finally on 30 May 1928 two sides signed the Treaty of Neutrality and Reconciliation. According to the treaty both sides agreed not to engage in political and economical designs against each other and to remain neutral in case of a third party's threat. (ibidem: 238-240)

Therefore in this regard, following the Italian-Turkish Pact of 1928, in the Italian public opinion one observes the rising tone of treating Turkey not only with “attention” but also as a potential partner of “cordiality.” This is directly clear from the opening sentence of the article “*La Turchia Kemalista e Il Patto Italo-Turco/* Kemalistan Turkey and the Italo-Turkish Pact” published in January 1929 in *Gerarchia*, signed by Ancyranus: “Kemalist movement since its birth received the sympathy and respect of the Italian nation.” (Ancyranus 1929: 1)

In the article, there is even a tendency to empathize with the Turkish transformation with mentioning that Italy also has passed from a similar path in its past as Turkey, with defending of its integrity towards abroad and its “deep internal transformation.” However the discourse of the article does not proceed only with the glorification of Turkey and its relation to Italy. There come the scapegoats, the foreign actors who want to create a distance between these “two passionate people [of Italy and Turkey] who are attracted to each other”: France and Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom. (ibidem: 2)

Furthermore the author blames the French and Near Eastern press to publish news of an “unfounded” Italian expansionism towards the Anatolian coasts. The author describes the war experience of the Ottoman Empire as “close in time but far away and dead in facts.” (ibidem) Therefore at the end of the article there is a glorification towards the Turkish governments' policies in building Ankara as the “nucleus of the civil life” in the country, and the Italian-Turkish relations because of the Turks' will to make economical contact with Italy, thanks to its industrial, transport and commercial facilities. (ibidem: 4-6)

In April 1929 number of the same journal, Turcologist Ettore Rossi's article “*Il Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pascia/ Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha*” follows the same discursive path towards Turkey after the signing of Italo-Turkish Pact. One once again observes the identification of Mustafa Kemal with the independence of Turkey and the transformations lead by the Ankara government. As in his other articles, Rossi generally follows a descriptive discourse on the historical processes leading the first years of the republic. However his comment on the popularity of

Mustafa Kemal abroad is distinctive in this sense: “His [Mustafa Kemal's] prestige was great among the people of the Orient and specifically among the Muslims during the years of the Anatolian war; now the laicist reforms have alienated their sympathy little; but his name is still a symbol for the ones in Oriental countries seeking renovation or independence.” (Rossi 1929: 303) In this regard, one sees from the Italian ranks the treatment to the Turkish experience of independence and political transformation as an act with potential international repercussions, among the Asian countries. Therefore in this period, in the public opinion it is not depicted only as a “Mediterranean, European partner” but also as a reference point in order to approach the other Asian countries with Muslim majorities, in this case such as Iran.

5.2.2.2. 1929-1930: Relations in Regional Perspective

Turning back to the international relations aspect contextualizing the discourse of “rapprochement”; another factor of advancing Italian-Turkish politics could also be interpreted with the Italian initiative to act as a partner in ameliorating Turkish-Greek relations, via playing the role of an influential actor in the region. In this period, while Turkish policy makers were aiming to propose Athens a treaty that would be signed reciprocally only with Greece, Italian political leaders were not welcoming such maneuver. Indeed in their meeting in Milan, Italian officials asked to the Turkish side on why they would keep Italy out of such process. (Barlas 2014: 241-242)

In contrast to this, the rapprochement had also an economical, strategical aspect: in 1929, in case of a possible Turkish order, Italy turned out to financially guarantee up to 70 percent of the value to the Italian shipbuilders. Barlas interprets this as “by helping Turkey to modernize its navy,

Italy found an appropriate way to compete with France, its main rival in the Mediterranean.”
(ibidem)

Finally on 24 May 1929, the tender was made public for the Italian shipbuilders, in order to build the Turkish naval order. In this context the supply of the Italian warships to Turkey made a significant difference on the atmosphere of relations between these two actors. However, it is fundamentally important to remark that such a policy did not simply change the balances between Turkey and Greece, as Italy continued to supply naval arms to the Greek navy in this period. Furthermore October 1929 marks the year of Greek order of the two destroyers from the Italian producers. (ibidem: 242-243)

One could ask if wouldn't this further create more tension in the region which could threat Italy's existence in the Dodecanese as well? Barlas' explanation of Italian policy towards Turkey and Greece is convincing: “The impact of improved relations with Ankara and Athens was evident in the Italian navy's strategic war plans for 1929-1931. In case of a war against Yugoslavia and France, the Italian navy assumed Turkish and Greek neutrality in the eastern Mediterranean.” On the other hand in 1930, a friendship treaty signed between Turkey and Greece is remarkable as well. Thus, following the signature of the treaty, the circle closes; and the Turkish Foreign Minister even thanks to the Italian Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs for their efforts on the Turkish-Greek reconciliation. (ibidem)

This time Turkey turns out to be keener to proceed with a reconciliation with the other countries of the Balkans. However on the other hand a tri-partite coalition including Turkey, Greece and

Italy becomes continuously discussed publicly in Italy. Even at an interview of the Turkish Foreign Minister given to *Il Popolo d'Italia*, in November 1930, he was questioned on the position of Turkey on a possible tri-partite coalition. However Minister Aras' answer was cautious when he mentioned that these three countries were already bound to each other with friendship treaties, so there was no need of another tri-partite act. (ibidem: 244)

5.2.2.3. Climax: 1932 Turkish Committee's Visit to Italy

Thus the relations between the countries were also tied financially. Following the effects of the 1929 world crisis, one sees the Turkish government seeking economic aid for its navy as well as its national industry. In this context in 1930, the *Banca Commerciale* in Italy agrees to loan 500,000 pounds sterling to the Turkish government. However in 1932 Turkey seeks further credit from different sources. In this regard İsmet İnönü, Prime Minister of the Republic makes two important visits. Firstly in April 1932 he travels to Moscow for this reason and receives Soviet Union's proposal to offer a credit of \$8 million to Turkey. In order to strengthen its negotiation position, following this trip, İnönü continues his visit in May 1932 to Rome with the same purpose.

This is the context in which several Turkish as well as Italian newspapers cover the event of Turkish committee's visit to Rome. Such coverages contained glorifications such as “*Kemalist Türkiye'den Faşist İtalya'ya Selam!! Salute from Kemalist Turkey to Fascist Italy!*” on Turkish newspaper *Cumhuriyet's* 22 May 1932 copy, accompanied by the figure of a *fascio* in front of a Turkish flag with a narrative of Italian policies. From the Italian side, the event received a coverage from *Il Popolo d'Italia* on 29 May 1932 published with the headline of “*Verso una*

sempre più attiva cooperazione fra i due Governi per l'incremento dei comuni interessi nel vicino Oriente/ Towards an ever more active cooperation between the two governments for the increasing common interests in the Near East” accompanied by an illustration of an Italian-flagged ship navigating towards a Crescent Moon. (Cumhuriyet 1932; Il Popolo d'Italia 1932)

However, in total contradiction with the newspaper coverages of the Turkish-Italian talks in Rome, following the meeting in May 1932, the relations between the countries enter a new phase of “cooling down and frost” as accentuated by Barlas. At the meeting, the officials discussed Turkey's possibility to receive a loan of 300 million Italian liras. Nonetheless while Italy was asking 6.5% interest rate for this loan, Soviets' proposal of \$8 million loan was asked without any interest rates. In such a bargaining position Turkey proceeded with accepting Moscow's proposal. While regarding the Italian offer, even though such loan was generally going to be used for the naval arms and aircraft order from Italy, “Rome turned out to be unwilling or unable, or both to release the cash portion of the credit...” (Barlas 2004: 245) Anyway in 1932, two countries decided on the renewal of Turkish-Italian Treaty of 1928 for another five years; though a new period of gradual disengagement would have begun, with its parallel repercussions visible in the archives of the journals consulted in this research.

5.2.3. 1932-1939 Period: Diverging Agendas

In July 1932, one observes a strategical change at the Fascist cabinet in Italy. Foreign Minister Dino Grandi was dismissed by Mussolini. Furthermore the appointment of Fulvio Suvich, Italian diplomat originally from Trieste to the under-secretary of the Foreign Ministry and Baron Pompeo Aloisi as the chef de bureau were remarkable; marking a period of strengthening Italian

interest in the Balkans. (Barlas 2004: 246) On the other hand, in the Turkish agenda, foreign ministry was seeking paths of further integration in international diplomacy. Then when Turkey's membership to the League of Nations was discussed the same year, Italy's position turned out to be in opposition to a Turkish membership. Evermore Italy's agenda was busy with seeking an alternative pact of cooperation. This was accomplished in July 1933 with the Four-Power Pact including Italy, Britain, Germany and France.

In such a context, following the world economic crisis, which actually deepened the economical gap between the industrialized and non-industrialized nations, Italy's negation of Turkey's membership to the League of Nations, with issuing the Four-Power Pact only charged the Turkish-Italian relations negatively. Moreover Turkish foreign affairs office was seeking rapprochement within the Balkans. The accomplishment of the Balkan Pact in February 1934 should be read in this sense. While the Pact was signed by Turkey, Greece, Kingdom of Yugoslavia and Romania; Albania as well as Bulgaria were not present in the pact, which could be interpreted by the effect of the Italian influence on foreign affairs in these countries. (ibidem)

Within this circumstances, repercussions from the Turkish side towards Mussolini's discourse of 18 March 1934, describing Asia and Africa as the “historical objectives” of Italy, only refreshed the cautious approach it had towards Italy before the year of 1928.⁴⁵ It could be possible to

⁴⁵ Mussolini's abovementioned expression belongs to his discourse's following part, given at the Second 5th-year Assembly of the Regime, in Rome on 18 March 1934: “Italy's historical objectives have two names: Asia and Africa. South and East are the cardinal points which have to raise the interest and will of the Italians. To North there so little or nothing to do, to West as well: not in Europe nor across the Ocean: these our objectives have their justifications in geography and in history. Among all the great powers of Europe, Italy is the closest one to Africa and Asia. Few hours of sea navigation, even less by air is enough to join Italy with Africa and Asia. No one should misunderstand this centuries-old task that I assign to this and tomorrow's Italian generations. It is not regarding the territorial conquests, this should be understood by close and far neighbours; but it is a natural expansion that has to bring the collaboration between Italy and the people of Africa, between Italy and the nations of Near and Far East.” (Mussolini 1934)

describe such change in Turkish foreign policy, in explaining the reasons of Turkish rapprochement with Britain and France at the time. In this regard, just one year later, in 1935 when Italy proceeded with the invasion of Ethiopia, it received sanctions from the League of Nations. Thus at that moment, as a member of the organization Turkey agreed with the application of the sanctions, therefore furnished a British guarantee against any Italian threat that it could receive from such application.

Therefore in a context of rapidly changing international relations of the post-1932 period; it is crucial to read the news and commentaries published in the journals with references to such circumstances. In this regard, in the articles published in *Gerarchia* following this year, it is possible to encounter the tone of Italian criticism towards Turkish foreign policy. The article “*Turchia 1935/ Turkey 1935*” appearing in *Gerarchia*, in June 1935, by Francesco Bertonelli should be definitely read in this background. Following a detailed narrative on the foundation of Turkey, its agricultural, commercial, military policies applied during the first decade of the republic, Bartonelli proceeds to analyze the foreign policy applied in the country and symbolically gives us an idea how the Balkan Pact of 1934 is approached from a pro-regime perspective voiced at the Italian public opinion, as a “non-justified distrust against Bulgaria and Italy.” Bartonelli's paragraph summarizing this position against Turkey's such move in the Balkans is as follows:

“Balkan Pact signed in Athens on 9 February 1934 between Romania, Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia with an anti-revisionist goal, proposes mutual security of Balkan frontiers and its secret part imposes military obligations with a precise character of alliance. This pact accentuates

the Turkish orientation of a non-justified distrust against Bulgaria and Italy; but the experience shows that the political combinations in the Balkans may not be long-lasting; and the time will put light to exhibit on which side are the Turkish real interests.” (Bartonelli 1935: 498)

Furthermore in Bartonelli's article there are also references to the upcoming talks regarding the situation of the Straits of Bosphorus and Dardanelles. Following a general historical description of the “mutation” of the city of Istanbul and its name; -named as “New Rome”, “Constantinople”, “Istanbul”⁴⁶-from the times of the Byzantine to the Ottoman Empire and to the Turkish Republic; Bartonelli notes the Turkish position towards the abolition of the demilitarized status of the Straits according to the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. As at the time of the article, 1936 Treaty on Straits was not yet signed, Bartonelli stays with only warning the difficulties that could arise from such a process:

“Mediterranean nations could hardly accept an unilateral solution regarding the straits. Italy, which has its roots of life and its promises of future at the sea, by now, has reached to a necessary political prestige for the completion of its high mission at the Eastern Mediterranean, in virtue of the maritime and air forces established in the Aegean. Italy is assigned to intervene, so that the question of the Straits have a just solution in harmony with the general Mediterranean interests.” (ibidem)

In a series of such incidents, considering the Italian presence at the Dodecanese Islands in Eastern Mediterranean- whether the delimitation of territorial waters between the Southeastern

⁴⁶ Bartonelli's sensitivity on inaccuracy of naming the city historically as “New Rome” is remarkable:

“It was called New Rome, but it was void of meaning. No one in the world could and ever have a profound, definite, unitary concept as Rome, and no one ever has imposed it with an implacable energy. The city of Constantine was instead Byzantine in its spirit.” (Bartonelli 1935: 498)

Anatolian coast and the Dodecanese were agreed between Turkey and Italy with the 1932 Convention- Turkey informs the League of Nations and the sides of the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923, on its proposal for the remilitarization of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits. When in 20 July 1936 this proposal turned out to be the realization of Montreaux Convention Regarding the Regime of the Straits, Turkey was able to gain the consents of UK, France, Japan, Romania, USSR and Yugoslavia. Thus Italian response to such revision of the situation of the straits was straight clear: objection.

In this context, in 1936 August, one month after the declaration of the Montreaux Convention Regarding the Regime of the Straits, in the same journal, the issue is re-highlighted in the article “*La Politica Navale/ The Naval Politics*” by Leopoldo E.Checchi, with a louder critics pointing the disapproval of the foreign policy governed by the Turkish government, leading to an argument which could be just out of context four years ago while signing the 1932 Italo-Turkish treaty: “Turkey doesn't want to believe in Rome's friendship.” Checchi's discourse on the issue is as the following:

“It was evident that Turkey wanted the presence of Italy in Montreux from the words spoken by influential personalities, as well as by the persuasion work carried out addressing us by the Turkish press, which among many arguments has argued that the re-armament of the Straits is in the best advantage of Italian security: what is probably correct if Turkey's independence was stronger than the antagonistic temptations of the East and the West. Turkey does not want believe in Rome's friendship.” (Checchi 1936: 582)

In this regard Checchi's critics are aimed at two points. Firstly Turkey's idea of revisioning the Lausanne Treaty is not welcomed as it would definitely condition the geo-strategical balances in the Mediterranean. Secondly, even though Turkey's proposal for remilitarizing the Straits and exercising full control during the peace times could be understandable, according to Checchi, Turkish diplomacy and military supply is not yet sufficient to act independently on the issue. Therefore it is destined to enter into the influence of “East”, which Checchi probably connotes USSR in this context as a signatory state of the Montreaux Treaty and the “West”, noting probably the UK and France, as the other signatory states of the treaty.

Thus following the period after this article, one sees furthermore a gradual “cooling off and frost” of the relations between the countries as argued by Barlas. The level of such frost even ends up in framing the Turkey and its international politics as “Anti-European.” In this context such process of disengagement arrives to one of its ultimate points with the Italian withdrawal from the League of Nations, in 1937. (Barlas 2004: 247)

5.2.4. Remarks

Therefore, before proceeding to the next section focusing particularly on the archival material regarding the articles and news on internal policies of two countries; it could be useful to briefly recall the “evolving perceptions” that are specifically highlighted in this section. As seen above, among the resources analyzed, issues approaching international relations between two countries are abundant in Italian sources; while Turkish sources are more engaged with the internal policies in Italy, as it is demonstrated in the next section.

Furthermore, it can be said that there is a direct correlation with the diplomatic affairs realized between the countries and the discourses encountered in the journals analyzed. From 1928 and onwards, as seen in the documents analyzed above, there is a positive mutation towards Turkey, in the Italian public opinion. This is particularly seen in Ancyranus' (1929) and Rossi's (1929) articles. This mutation as well received repercussions from the Turkish side, and as manifested above with the polemical headline of *Cumhuriyet* newspaper regarding the 1932 Turkish committee's visit to Italy. However following this visit, one can follow a process leading to “cooling off”, and the coverage of Turkey and its foreign policy as “unfaithful, which puts general Mediterranean interest at risk.”

Therefore it is argued that the changing international context between the years 1922-1927, 1928-1932 and 1932-1939 definitely conditions the coverage of Turkey in Italian sources and the mutation of its perception from “a European power with and unfounded paranoia against Italian expansionism” to “a Mediterranean partner of cordiality and sympathy” and into a Turkey that “doesn't believe in Italian friendship” respectively. In the following section we will be specifically highlighting the inter-perception between two countries' intellectuals towards their internal policies. This will lead us to observe the patterns of “analogical thinking” among Italian authors and “differential thinking” among the Turkish authors that engage in analysis of Turkish and Italian policies respectively.

5.3. INTERNAL POLICIES: ANALOGICAL THINKING AND DIFFERENTIAL THINKING

In this second main section, several articles from the sources analyzed that engage with the questions relative to the internal policies in these countries are explored. In the first part of the section **5.3.1. Cultural Politics in Dual Perspective**, two articles are analyzed, which are symbolic in demonstrating us a specific intellectual position encountered in the Turkish sources: recognition but not adaptation.

In the second part of this section **5.3.2. Socioeconomics in Dual Perspective**, three articles from Turkish and Italian sources are highlighted engaging in discussions on socio-economical politics with references to Turkish and Italian experiences. Later in this part a particular discussion between Ettore Rossi and Burhan Asaf is remarked on comparison of Turkish and Italian domestic policies. Similar to the results encountered in the previous part, among the Turkish authors an attitude of “recognition but not adaptation” is observed while highlighting the differences between the two countries, defined as “differential thinking.” Thus Rossi's article stands as an evidence of the pattern of “analogical thinking”, observed in the Italian sources analyzing Turkey, detailed in this part.

In the third part of this section, **5.3.3. RPP 4th National Congress of 1935** two archival materials are read in correlation regarding the 1935 Republican People Party Congress in Ankara. These articles voice characteristic notions encountered in Italian and Turkish sources analyzed in that exact period, developing attitudes of thinking two cases together but autonomously; and of a protective approach respectively.

5.3.1. Cultural Politics in Dual Perspective

5.3.1.1. “Revolution Ideology: Youth Generation Issue” by Şevket Süreyya Aydemir (1932)

Şevket Süreyya Aydemir's article “*Inkılâp İdeolojisi: Gençnesil Meselesi/ Revolution Ideology: Youth Generation Issue*” found in *Kadro* journal's number 1932/4, gives a symbolic frame of a group of intellectuals within the Turkish ranks on their approach to Italy and their proposal for a renovation for the Turkish society. In this regard, three main characteristics stand out in Aydemir's article.

Firstly, an attitude of acknowledgement and appreciation of the so-called “Western modes” -as explained below- of application on social and economic policies is present. Secondly, the uniqueness of the Turkish sociopolitical context is emphasized and the “impossibility” to compare it with the Italian case is accentuated. Therefore the resolving policies for the country's problems are argued not to be the simple adaptation of the Italian policies. Thirdly, in regards to the possible methods to solve such problems, the “uniqueness” of Turkish case is blended with the nationalist position of such intellectuals, with their respect toward international modes (connoting the “*medeniyet/civilization*” in Ziya Gökalp's readings), however their non-acceptance of the so-called “cosmopolitanist” vision and the danger of degeneration that is argued it contains within. (Aydemir 1932; Gökalp 1923: 94-95)

In this sense, Aydemir's article on the “Youth Issue” starts such discussion with citing a brief conversation between an Italian Fascist leader and a *Balilla*. The conversation is like the following:

“A Fascist leader in Italy asks a Balilla:

-What is the grain policy of Duce?

Balilla directly answers the question of the Fascist leader:

-Duce's grain policy is to render Italy, which imports some part of its eating grain from abroad into a land, which cultivates its own grain. Because the Fascist Italy can't accept to take its eating bread from the others' hands!

After this, the Balilla lists the articles of this policy program, including drying of marshes and opening up bushes.” (Aydemir 1932: 5)

Following this introduction, Aydemir puts emphasis on the efficiency to raise such a generation of youth, which is well conscious of the policies applied by its government. In this sense, he questions the current situation in Turkey, and argues that if today one asks a question on the policies applied by the government on railway development, to different children from Izmir and Sivas; he/she would receive different answers. In this cadre Aydemir underlines the importance to raise a youth, which is well connected with the reforms and transformations in process in its country. Thus he refers to the Italian example and recognizes it. However as it is mentioned above as the second characteristics of his position, following this recognition, he accentuates on the “uniqueness” of the Turkish case and the inapplicability of the Italian modes to it. Thus he develops such position as the following:

“Youth age is not the age of interpretation. The information of life and society are given to the people of this age, as an already-established system. Maybe, taken in its absolute, the Balilla in Italy would not be the ideal type. But Balilla is the type that is necessitated by the Italian society, by the social and natural circumstances that Italy finds itself in today. In fact, Turkish nation

dislikes imitation and envy. It has a hereditary spiritual state, product of the long historical periods that it experienced. This characteristic that can be named as 'believing in its own power' is by now a psychological moral sensitivity; thus it immediately feels in its body a reaction towards a foreign human type that is introduced to it as an example model.

One should not damage this hereditary spiritual state, coming from the nation's originality and its personality; and the idea of giving Balilla as an example model to Turkish children doesn't even pass through our minds. However we need a youth generation in each province of this Turkish land from Ararat to the Mediterranean, that answers the question of 'What are the state's policies on a such national issue?' with a law, crystallized at least in three phrases; and let it be known that may all youngsters in each territory of the Turkish land answer this question in this mode.”
(Aydemir 1932: 6-7)

Following this proposal on the uniqueness of the “Turkish spirit” with its questioning stand of anything coming from “abroad” as an example model, Aydemir accentuates on the importance of developing a national policy that would be a product of mobilization, a binding action of all the “positive ideals.” Therefore, in this nationalist cadre, differentiating itself from other international examples, however with considering their efficient modes of application; Aydemir's antidote to such a sociocultural policy follows as below:

“In the issue of training the youth generation, the point which is generally agreed on, is the concentration of the notions for education within a single movement. While all the films, journal pictures, radio sounds, life stories we read, are entraining us to Cosmopolitanism, moral levity;

simple moral suggestions made at the close-room environments are destined to be insubstantial... Against the substances addressing the youth negatively; as within the affairs of the films, stories in the books and the form of proper life on the street, we are forced to mobilize such substances for constructive and equivalent instilling... Now the youth generation needs societal life and evermore a societal life that includes a school. An organizational circle is needed, one that works with all the procedures for the preparation of a youth according to the needs of the society. Thus the preparation of the youth within the principles of the revolution, as a helper of the revolution's avant-garde and as a successor power is a contemporary cause.” (ibidem: 7)

Therefore the discussion that Aydemir raises ends up with references to the mass mobilization of the people, and particularly the youth in the country, and connecting them with the reforms applied by the central government. Only in this cadre, he ends the article with references to People Houses and to a conference organized in the institution on the instruction of youth in the country. Therefore, in January 1932, one notices Aydemir's voice on highlighting the importance of instruction of youth within a single organization, that is present at the each angle of the country, which leads the youth with “the same dress, the same movement rhythm and the same view.” (ibidem: 9)

However, the crucial point in relation to the Italian case must be made clear. Even though, as significant attention is paid to the Italian model of social institutions-in this case with the youth organization-, as well as to other Western models, in this characteristic discourse there is always a resistant stand against the adaptation of the “foreign” social models within the Turkish society. This is continuously remarked in a mythical cadre, with such references to “the

historical processes that the Turkish nation passed through” or its “strong national characteristics standing against imitation.” Over more as it is mentioned above, I argue that such position on cultural and social organizations attacking particularly “Cosmopolitanism” as a degenerating insight, shows us the intellectual kinship between the positions of Aydemir in 1932 and Ziya Gökalp in 1920, even though their *parcours* of coming from totally different political positions while keeping their nationalist core.⁴⁷

5.3.1.2. “Popular and Youth Organization in Italy” by Selim Sırrı (1933)

In the People Houses' journal *Ülkü*, among the numbers analyzed regarding the period concerned in this thesis, one sees several articles on the youth and adult organizations in Europe. In one of these articles corresponding to the Italian case, titled as “*İtalya'da Halk ve Gençlik Teşkilatı/ Popular and Youth Organization in Italy*” authored by Selim Sırrı, dating to number 1933/3, one observes the well detailed description of the activities rendered by *Balilla* and *Piccole* organizations for youngsters and the *dopolavoro* institutions for the adults' free time activities. The article stays mostly as a descriptive one, however authors' further several comments are present.

Sırrı firstly explains the Italian youth organization in reference to the Bolsheviks' similar organizations for instruction. However he argues that the mission of the Italians is far more

⁴⁷ On observing such conceptual lineage between Aydemir's article of 1932 and Gökalp's *Turkism's Principles* firstly published in 1920, one should consider latter's following passage, touching the argument of anti-cosmopolitanism: “A nation is the sum total of individuals who share a common culture, while internationality is the sum total of nations which share a common civilization or what can be termed a civilizational group. There are men, however, who do not accept that definition, asserting that there are no separate civilizations and that all mankind comprises a single civilization group which contains not of nations but of individuals. A person holding this view is called a cosmopolite. Cosmopolites are mondialists who say, 'My nation is mankind, my fatherland is the earth.' Their views on the civilization group cannot be reconciled with patriotism, because nationalists hold that mankind is the human species which is studied along with other zoological species in the science of zoology, whereas human beings, in the sense of social individuals, live as nations. Turkism cannot include cosmopolites, since it cannot be reconciled with any system that rejects the principle of nation.” (Gökalp 1968: 72-73)

difficult than the ones of the Bolsheviks' because they are concerned to please different social classes, contrasting to the Bolsheviks. Furthermore following this distinctness, he remarks that “with considering these differences the works accomplished by the fascists, products that they formed deserve appreciation. The main reason of the perfectness of this great work should be sought in love for fatherland and in the union of national emotions.” (Sırrı 1933: 241) Following this commentary, Sırrı continues his description with the organization of leisure time in Italy via *dopolavoro* institutions. After giving a detailed outline of its departments and activities, he mentions that one of the biggest accomplishments of the organization is to free the workers from saloons and taverns. (ibidem: 243)

As it can be seen in Aydemir's article as well, with Sırrı we note the consideration of the Italian social policies from the Turkish intellectual ranks. However, considering the existence of similar articles published in *Ülkü* regarding the youth, adult education organizations in different European countries, it remains again crucial to note that there is no whatsoever proposal to adopt such methods applied in the Italian contexts in Turkey; thus there is a consideration of these achievements promoting the “love for fatherland and the moral union of national emotions” in Italy. Bearing this data and the brief argument, we will be turning back to the characteristics of such attitude “recognition but not adaptation” in the conclusion part of this thesis.

5.3.2. Socioeconomics in Dual Perspective

5.3.2.1. “Fascism in the Near East” by Ettore Rossi (1932)

Rossi, in his article “*Il Fascismo nel Vicino Oriente/ Fascism in the Near East*” appearing in *Gerarchia* in 1932 October treats the question of “fascist notions” in the “Near East Asian”

countries. In this sense he touches several countries in his discussion, including Turkey and Egypt. In the part related to Turkey, one once again encounters the common argument contextualized in the previous section of “hypothetic danger of Italian expansionism” in interpreting the public opinion. As mentioned in the previous section, when it comes to describe Turkish domestic policies, Rossi develops a language based on “thinking it together” with the Fascist transformation in Italy, however being cautious again not to make direct analogies between Turkey and Italy. Therefore he doesn't miss to add that “resemblances and analogies are to be treated in large sense; one can't speak about the real similarities, even less about direct imitations, considering the diversity of the situations.” (Rossi 1932: 845)

Furthermore, he even mentions his previous quarrel on this issue of comparison with a Turkish author of *Kadro* journal, Burhan Asaf, who wrote the article “*Faşizm ve Türk Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi/ Fascism and the Turkish National Salvation Movement*” published in *Kadro's* in August 1932, as a response to Ettore's previous article on Turkey “*Recenti aspetti della rivoluzione turca/ Recent aspects of the Turkish Revolution*” published in *Giornale di Politica e di Letteratura*.⁴⁸

In this regard, contextualizing it with the international aspect given in the previous section, following the Italian Turkish Pact of 1928, it can be argued that in the Italian public opinion, there is a tendency to treat the Turkish policies in relation to Italy, framed as a “Italian sympathy towards Kemalism” or as “Mediterranean neighbors” so-called proximity against the “French influence in the region.” However as it is seen in Rossi's discourse, there is a particular position

⁴⁸ See section “3.4.3.2. *Kadro's “National Liberation Movement and Critique of Italian Fascism”* of this thesis for a detailed analysis in of Burhan Asaf's response to Ettore Rossi via abovementioned article appearing on *Kadro* in June 1932; developing a theoretical account on the political and economical policies realized by the Turkish and Italian governments.

to underline the limits of such proximity. When such tendency leads to think together the Turkish and Italian policy experiences, frequently one observes the need of the Italian authors to stress on the differences of these two regimes, or enter into a quarrel with their colleagues and policy-makers ready to analyze Fascism, however with stressing its differences from the Turkish case. I call this tendency “analogical thinking” which will be elaborated further in the conclusion chapter of this thesis.

On the other hand, among the Turkish authors the tendency of highlighting the differences between the two cases is frequently visible, as demonstrated below. This can be as well noted in policy makers' writings such as that of RPP General Secretary Recep Peker's course notes of “Revolution History” of 1933/1934, analyzing Fascism as “re-incarnation of Caesarism in the 20th century” with a distant approach stressing the “un-comparability of the Turkish experience with that of Italy”⁴⁹; as well as in Asaf's response to Ettore Rossi, theorizing the three differences between Italian and Turkish experiences based on historical and economical explanations.⁵⁰ (Peker 1984; Asaf 1932a)

⁴⁹ Specific part on Recep Peker's his analysis of Fascism, in his notes on “Revolution History” is as follows:

“Therefore, fascism is a political path opposing the class struggle, internationalism and the political believes belonging to the other classes, while rejecting democracy, parties and the parliamentarism brought by the freedom revolution. The reality that the leader of such a tendency is not coming from a dynastic or a royal family, but from the people can be the difference distinguishing this regime from absolutism. Following the centuries of understanding on the European territory, this consequence can be explained in one word, in a similitude: fascism is the re-incarnation of Cesarism in the 20th century.” (Peker, 1984: 50)

⁵⁰ As a reminder these differences were given in three different points by Asaf, briefly:

(a) Fascisms' aim to save a meta-capitalist Italy (a) with the regime of corporations while Turkish nation had a non-classified society at its point of departure,

(b) Fascisms' colonial aspirations notes a paradox within itself, while Turkey as an anti-colonialist actor rejects contradiction towards classes and nations,

(c) As Facism is an expression in a meta-capitalist society, it can't be adopted by capitalist or non-capitalist societies; therefore it is inapplicable to the Turkish case. (Asaf 1932a)

5.3.2.2. “Turkey in the Changing World Relations” by Vedat Nedim (1932)

In the context of the intellectual climate of these years following the economical crisis of 1929 and onwards, it would be useful to highlight the below articles published in *Kadro* journal with several references to Italy, giving an insight of the tone of analysis of the international economical and political circumstances. In this regard, in the sources analyzed, even on discussing about domestic policies, one continuously encounters the topic of the fall of liberal values in the economic sphere. The opening sentence of Vedat Nedim's article “*Değişen Cihan Münasebetleri İçinde Türkiye/ Turkey in the Changing World Relations*”, dating to 1932/5 number of the journal is summarizing such position in a sense: “Liberalism's final fronts at the international world of commerce are left out as well.” (Nedim 1932a: 13)

Following this base argument, one reads Nedim making a general description of the economical models based on the principle of autarky. While he defines such a system, he argues that today each country manages its own affairs “inside an iron cage” and they effectually try to “build or sustain their freedom” within this modality. Therefore regarding the Turkish economical policies, he proposes the need of the state mechanisms in fostering the industry, by their own means. In this regard he makes a distinction between the petty manufacturer industries and the state owned large industries. Thus his argument for the industrial development of the country lies on the mission of the state to come up with an “industrial plan”, with taking the responsibility for the capital management for investments on diverse sectors, such as textile and sugar industries.

It is important to read certain articles discussed in such platforms of public opinion, in regards to the economical policies applied in the country. Vedat's article was published in May 1932,

meaning that it was approximately two years before the 1st 5-Year Industrial Development Plan (*Birinci Beş Yıllık Sanayi Planı*) -prepared with technical references to Soviet experts- accepted in 17 April 1934 and further applied. Such plan was prioritizing the state's role in industrial investments, focusing particularly on the industries with local raw material funds. After recognizing this mindset based on the assumption of the “fall of liberalism”, demonstrated symbolically via Nedim's article, below such intellectuals' approach towards Italy on socioeconomic policies can be grasped in this proper context.

5.3.2.3. “How and Why the Regimes are Changing?” by Burhan Asaf (1932)

Within this set of arguments defending the fall of the liberal economic management, Burhan Asaf approaches such explanation with references to the concept of democracy as well. Asaf argues in his article “*Cihan İçinde Türkiye: Rejimler Nasıl Niçin Değişiyor?*” Turkey in the World: How and Why the Regimes are Changing?”, dating to 1932 December published in *Kadro*, that firstly following the I. World War, common idea among the intellectual circles was based on the assumption of the “fall of democracy” with references to Russia and Italy.⁵¹ However, he argues that actually the main “corrupted” concept should be sought within the infrastructure; and only after this recognition, several countries could discover and discovered the problems of liberal capitalist management prioritizing private investments.

In regards to Italy, Asaf evaluates Mussolini's policies up until then, in direct controversy with democracy. Thus he argues that with the economical crisis of 1929, Fascists put aside their occupation on democracy and started to focus directly on the economical management in the

⁵¹ Asaf's quote is the following: “Someone got really ill following the war. This ill was the democracy. From one side several books were written explaining the reason of its illness; on the other side regimes sell off democracy in fact like Communism in Russia and Fascism in Italy.” (Asaf 1932b: 27)

country. Asaf's rhetorical question attends as the following:

“Doesn't it show that; firstly with the application of regimes of corporations, and its expression with the Labor Code, then its will to form a political-moral movement with furthermore étatist interventions based on control of private property, based sometimes to its limitation and sometimes to its abolishment; Fascism is not the first-day's Fascism of an only political and administrative movement[?]” (Asaf 1932b: 29)

In this regard Asaf ends up arguing that previously the Fascists aimed to mediate the interests between the classes, but currently with the regime of corporations, they imagine the State above the classes as a superior entity regulating the economy, not staying in the political administrative sphere only. Therefore his explanation of the corporatist policies directs the reason of such developments to the fall of the liberal economic management.

5.3.2.4. “Non-Classification and Economy Politics” by Vedat Nedim (1932)

As it was mentioned previously in Chapter 3 of this thesis, issue of creating a “classless society”, in the sense of meaning the stimulant of a non-communist order without class conflict was up-to-date in the intellectual platforms in Turkey. This time Vedat Nedim exactly points his observation on the Turkish transformations' economic end in his article “*Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti/ Non-Classification and Economy Politics*” in *Kadro* 1932/11. Nedim argues as the following:

“Our aim is to be a classless and contrastless nation. However, we are not a classless and contrastless nation yet. Thus in us, the class distinctions are not so enlarged to play a dominant

role in politics. That is to say Turkish State is not a class state. Turkish State is far away from being an operating machine working for the interest of a financial oligarchy, an industrial capital, a large estate ownership, or of a worker group, as in Europe and America.” (Nedim 1932b: 17)

Within this cadre, one can observe the authors of *Kadro* journal, situating the Turkish transformation in a position that is not yet theorized, and it’s longing to be theorized. Therefore once again, this time in the writing of Vedat Nedim one observes this stand, situating the Turkish transformation in parallel to Russian and Italian examples with evaluating all of them as new, not-yet-theorized particular sets of economy politics. As it is analyzed in Chapter 3 with Asaf’s response to Ettore Rossi arguing on the differences of political transformations in Turkey and Italy; Nedim as well points out specifically the distinctness of the Turkish policies. In this regard, Nedim's position quotes as the following:

“The main principle of Turkey's economy politics, to be regarded even as instinctive, come to shape by its own: Etatism. Turkish etatism is a principle so specific to the Turkish revolution, so that it doesn't have a space nor in history nor in the books. Turkish revolution is going to exhibit its creative force with its determination on economy politics as well. As the Russian economy politics' inexistence nor in history or in books before the Bolshevik revolution; and as the contemporary Italian economy politics were inexistence in history or in books before the Fascist revolution; We are obliged to form the national politics specific to our Turkish revolution by our own.” (ibidem: 21)

5.3.3. RPP 4th National Congress of 1935

An event, which received contemporary coverage both in Turkish and Italian sources, is Republican People Party's 4th National Congress organized in 1935 in Ankara. Illustrating the coverage within these two sources do help us to capture the Turkish pattern which is specifically strengthen after 1932, on “differential thinking” and the Italian authors' persistent pattern of thinking Turkish and Italian -in this case also with Russian- transformations together; however autonomous from eachother; an approach of “analogical thinking.” These positions will be studied in brief below and in detail at the conclusion chapter of this thesis.

5.3.3.1. “R.Peker's Discourse” (1935)

In this context, another source pointing out the discussion on this issue of “classless society” is present in the journal of the Ankara People Houses, *Ülkü*. Recep Peker's speech at the Party Congress on the new program of the RPP is published as one of the leading articles “*R.Peker'in Söylevi / R.Peker's Discourse*” following the discourses of Atatürk and İnönü. In this discourse, Peker particularly points out the “national essence” of the new program in its economical as well as cultural sectors. Firstly he attacks the idea of existence of classes in the Turkish context and negates any social organization that serves the interests of a particular group. His argument of “In Turkey there are no classes, no species, no privileges. District interest, feudalism, landlordship [*ağalık*], family, community interest don't exist” is built in this context. (Peker 1935: 249)

Moreover in this base he accentuates the principle of *Halkçılık*/Populism that rises as one of the founding principles of the party program. In his idea, this principle forms such a building block

for the national solidarity. Similar to the writings one encounters in *Kadro*, in Peker as well we see the emphasis on the particularity of the Turkish experience, blended in a nationalist discourse with respecting the “Turkish workers and craftsman” however with strict negation of any organization that is working “against the interest of its own co-citizens.” (ibidem: 256) Therefore in this sense, Peker reminds the importance to be cautious against diverse forms of “alien” propaganda including fascists: “Anarchist, Marxist, Fascist propaganda and similar ones can all pass over from us. Against all these, Turkey should only embrace strongly the nationalist faith that it will protect itself against such poisoning waves.” (ibidem)

Within this protective mindset, Peker furthermore criticizes the liberal state model as well. He thus argues on the failure of the liberal state model in many countries around the world; with the construction of diverse types of state management. In his account on industrialization, he argues that such a process could form a further working class, however the Turkish workers will not be passing from the processes of class antagonism, which was a result of “the situation of liberal order open to all-terrible-movements.” Therefore such a stand criticizes the liberal model together with the class-based politics positioning against Fascism thus approaching to “Nation-state” with a state-monitored economic development as an antidote to these. (ibidem: 252)

5.3.3.2. “Kemalist' Program of Republican People Party” by Ubaldo Faldati (1935)

The same congress took place in Ankara, 4th Republican People Party Congress of 1935, is reported in the journal *Oriente Moderno* in Italy, in the journals' section on news from Turkey. One of the sub-titles of this news set, named as “*Programma 'Kamalista' del Partito*

Repubblicano del Popolo/'Kemalist' Program of Republican People Party” worth giving a reference to. In regards to the speeches made at the congress, Peker's position outlined above is as well noted with a reference to his non-liberal position. Another important point mentioned in this news is that the party program outlined in this congress is described in brief reference to fascist and communist programs. Thus visibly, while Peker's usage of the term “fascist propaganda” is ignored in the text; there is even an argument towards an analogy between the two cases. The news' particular paragraph follows as below:

“The program which is being discussed at the general congress of the Republican People Party, currently gathered in Ankara, deals with series of political, social, economic and cultural questions. It does not contain newness or surprise, but it is an expression of the policies actually being realized by the government of Turkey. Until now, it was said that their policies were made according to the circumstances, but now it became a doctrine, which has numerous characteristics of fascist and communist taste. For example, individual liberty and property are guaranteed only if they are not in contrast with the public good; sovereignty belongs to the people, which exercises it by the Great National Assembly; class differences are abolished, man and woman have equal rights; religion is an individual affair, and eventually the State will assume all the activities of public utility, and not only, it will exercise supervision on private enterprises.” (Faldati 1935: 258)

As it can be seen from the quotation Faldati does not argue on whatsoever “imitation” or “influence”, but on a “taste.” Thus as in the case of Ettore Rossi in *Gerarchia*, this news as well has the tendency to “think together” of the Turkish transformation with the political developments in Italy and in Russia; but still keeping them autonomous within themselves.

Therefore with references to Faldati and Rossi, I argue that this is an attitude frequently visible among the Italian sources analyzed in this research, which I define as “analogical thinking.”

5.4. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter aimed to illustrate the patterns of inter-perception between the Turkish and the Italian authors of the inter-war era, with references to the archival material gathered from six sources. The news and articles consulted are analyzed in two sections. The first section approached particularly on articles that are engaged in the foreign policy, therefore they are analyzed in the context of the international relations. According to the analysis of this data it is argued that the discourses of such articles are in high correlation with the degree of the rapport between the two countries. Therefore firstly, it is argued that the data encountered to be published between 1922 and 1927 turned out to mirror the ambiguous relation between the two countries, without any significant rapprochements. Secondly, contrasting to this as demonstrated in Italian and Turkish sources, following the 1928 Italo-Turkish Pact, the inter-perception observed in the data mirrored the rising rapprochement of the foreign policies between the countries. Thirdly, 1932 is argued to be the climax of this rapprochement before the separation. Thus particularly the polemical headline of Turkish newspaper *Cumhuriyet* on 1932 Turkish visit in Italy is argued to be grasped only in this context. On the other hand post-1932 period is followed by a phasic disengagement. According to the archival consultations, it is argued that the Italian data found in the journal archives reflect this disengagement -following the 1934 Balkan Pact and 1936 Montreaux Convention Regarding the Regime on Straits- via depicting Turkey as the one that “doesn't believe in Italian friendship.” Therefore as a conclusive remark for this section, the data is interpreted as to contain “evolving perceptions” which are in high correlation

with the diplomatic relations between the two countries; categorized in three stages mentioned above.

In the second section of this chapter, articles and news which engage with the internal policies within these countries are highlighted. In this regard Italian data with references to Turkish internal policies and Turkish data with references to Italian internal policies are analyzed; and the data is explored in three categories. In the first part articles concerning the cultural policies are studied. Secondly, the articles concerned with the socioeconomical policies are analyzed. Lastly the data found in Italian and Turkish sources, engaged with the very same congress of the Republican People Party organized in 1935 are evaluated. In light of these analysis as a conclusive inspection two different discursive attitudes are observed. It is observed that among the articles of the Turkish authors the tendency of emphasizing the differences between the two countries is present. This discursive attitude is conceptualized as “differential thinking.” Therefore it is seen that the recognition of the Italian policies by the ranks of the Turkish authors is present, however there is a stand against the adaptation of such policies in the Turkish case. This is well documented by the data supplied above, such as via Sırrı (1933) and Asaf (1932b). Furthermore, the assumption on the “fall of liberalism”, and the tendency to question Turkish socio-economic policies comparatively with this assumption is observed. On the other hand among the data found in the Italian sources on Turkish policies, the tendency of thinking the Turkish and Italian transformations together is noted; however such attitude is frequently followed by mentioning the differences between the two cases. This attitude is conceptualized as “analogical thinking” present in the Italian sources. However as the data shows us these diverse attitudes lead to quarrels between the authors too. Therefore, Burhan Asaf’s (1932a) responding

article to Ettore Rossi (1932), on the differences of Turkish and Italian policies is read in this sense.

6.CONCLUSIONS

During the intellectual investigation developed in this thesis, we engaged in a discussion on socio-economic and cultural policies regarding the inter-war period in Italy and Turkey; with finally contextualizing our considerations via interaction and inter-perception patterns observed between the intellectual figures and law-makers in these two countries.

In this regard, our discussion is developed in correlation with the four main chapters that have appeared in this thesis. Following the Introductory Chapter, in the 2nd Chapter, in order to build a theoretical background for our further discussion we have reserved a place for the analysis of the corporatist social theory, outlining a specific model of approaching the “social.” This analysis is developed in three layers. In the first layer, Howard J.Wiarda's micro-narrative -building an introduction for us to engage in the literature- the corporatist approach is contrasted with Liberal-Pluralist and Marxist approaches. In the second layer, with references to Peter J.Williamson three models of corporatism developed in his argument are noted as “Consensual-Licensed Model”, “Authoritarian-Licensed Model” and “Contract Model (Neo-Corporatism).” In this regard, his second model is approached as a mid-narrative which demonstrated us the general characteristics of corporatism, commonly observed during the inter-war era, and it is treated as a set of ideas as well as policy reflections of such ideal positioning. In the third layer, the micro-narrative of Taha Parla is analyzed, which contextualized the application of the corporatist social and economical policies with the experiences of two diverse crisis faced in different phases of the capitalist development, identified as “crisis of capital distribution” and “crisis of capital accumulation.”

In order to grasp the theoretical background on corporatism, which served as a platform for further comparison between two of our cases abovementioned sources are studied deeply. However after such analysis, several points of these approaches are criticized and further developed.

One of these points of opposition was towards an argument mentioned by Wiarda on the non-applicability of the corporatist theory in discussions regarding the contexts in “Non-Western” societies. His such argument was denounced due to its orientalist and essentialist position. This counter-position was supported with the evidence of the existence of the Ottoman lodge system in organizing different sectors of production in the society. Furthermore it was later strengthened with Schmitter's approach as well, towards the application of the corporatist theory, not-only in the political cases regards to the Mediterranean region.

Another point of separation with the abovementioned sources was regarding the theory outlined by Taha Parla. Parla's argument on the invalidity of the “3rd Way” proposal of the corporatist theory was recognized. Moreover his position in contextualizing the corporatist policies as reactions to two abovementioned economical crisis was studied as well. However, departing from Parla's position, interchangeable application of different corporatist policies in different capitalist crisis was denounced.

In the 3rd chapter of the thesis, departing from the opposition towards Parla's position, (1) totalitarian and (2) solidaristic corporatist models in regards to socio-economic policies were theorized and later contextualized with the (1) Italian and (2) Turkish cases respectively. Thus in

regards to the (1) crisis of capital distribution and (2) crisis of capital accumulation, our distinct argument followed. The position supported in the thesis was based on the differences of infrastructural relations of production described as (1) advanced capitalist setting and (2) developmental capitalist setting conditioned the development of particular corporatist policy models.

It was argued that with references to the theorization of the corporatist model outlined in the 2nd Chapter of the thesis, corporatist socio-economic policies connoted the main characteristics of being anti-socialist, non-liberal however not anti-capitalist. Therefore, it was argued that such policies were based on the idea of the survival of the capitalist relations of production, via sustaining/constructing a society “void-of-conflict”, frequently noted as “harmonious society.” However it was argued that such component was only a part of the larger set of infrastructural dynamics.

In this regard it was argued that at an advanced capitalist setting conditioned by the crisis of capital distribution, with the antagonistic, well-developed organization of the labor and capital in action, and furthermore the economical and social instability triggered via disciplined action of such classes (such as via organizations of strikes, lockouts, occupations); in order to conserve the capitalist means of production and its process, the state mechanisms are conditioned to approach totalitarian corporatist policies. Therefore it is argued that at such circumstances state policies which could reserve an autonomy to organized interest groups out of its regimented structures would put on risk the capitalist mode of production. As a result, in order to proceed with the capitalist mode, the suppression of the already-existing class-based organizations were aimed at;

therefore the policy applications mirrored the totalitarian corporatist model theorized in the 3rd chapter of this thesis. It was argued that this scheme reflected the Italian context engaged in this research.

On contrary, it was argued that the solidaristic corporatist model theorized in regards to the infrastructural relations and to the application of socio-economic policies was key in explaining the Turkish context explored in this research. It was argued that at a developmental capitalist setting, conditioned by the crisis of capital accumulation, lacking a “compatibly-perceived”, “national” bourgeoisie class that could foster industrial investments, state's socio-economic policies that are oriented to install a capitalist industrial development are conditioned to leave an autonomous space to the badly-needed “up-coming bourgeoisie.” In this regard, policies has to evolve via its solidaristic corporatist variant, which did not reject liberal political practices unconditionally as in the totalitarian model. It is argued that it was this very reason of the interwar Republican policies in Turkey, via two failed multiparty electoral attempts with Progressive Republican Party of 1924-1925 and Free Republican Party of 1930.

In order to clarify their differences, thinking them in contrast with the Italian case is argued to be enlightening. The experiences of Italian electoral reform to plebiscite, and the formation of “Chamber of Fasci and Corporations” as the lower house of the legislature replacing the “Chamber of Deputies” in 1939 while conditioning representation to corporations of trade and industry are argued to show us the totalitarian corporatist policies in application in the Italian case. As it is mentioned above, these policies did reflect the state tendencies against the creation of any autonomous space that could be perceived as an “infrastructural threat” to the corporatist

order. Moreover it is argued that it was this totalitarian corporatist position that explained the regimented structuralization of the syndicates; and further non-institutionalization of corporations as private bodies which at another case could indicate an autonomy in the socio-economic sphere.

Following this analysis, in the 4th Chapter of the thesis cultural policies in these two countries are discussed with references to the foundations of two mass organizations *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* in Italy and *Halkevleri* in Turkey. In order to contextualize their significances before analyzing each institution, in chapter's relative sections the processes that lead to their foundations are explored in depth. Following this analysis it is seen that in the Italian case, the formation of OND connoted the state's policies on “passivization” of a perceived infrastructural threat that came into being with the class-based organizations of workers. Therefore as mentioned in the chapter, the process that led to the embracement of Mario Giani's proposal of a creation of “a center of uplift”; indeed contained the main stimuli of such policy idea: persuasion of the working class that their salvation could be achieved “not by struggle against capitalism, but by individual self-betterment.” (Giani 1923a; 1923b; De Grazia 1981, 26) Thus in this very chapter it is also approached that OND in fact was realized as a “apolitical” and “productivist” organization. However it is argued that such “apolitical” position of the organization in fact suited its role within the corporatist cadre as a “non-conflictual organization”; while its represented characteristic of “productivism” was actually the reinforcement of “non-class identities” that the social policies promoted. In regards to its structuralization, differentiating from the People Houses, several OND centers were engaged within companies. Therefore in fact this partly demonstrated the policies' “target audience”, of accessing the worker groups without

approaching them as “workers.” Such activities of the organization was framed via the concept of “productivity.” While approaching its foundation via corporatist theoretical discussion given above, it served as a so-called “off-work” organization that sought the compatibility of the “off-work” activities with the “working” activities. Therefore as it is mentioned in the chapter the term “leisure” contained the basic mindset of the organization: maximizing production in a state-monitored capitalist economy.

On the other hand in the same chapter the socio-economic circumstances that lead to the foundation of People Houses in Turkey are demonstrated as well. In this regard, an important institution in the history of the People Houses, The Turkish Hearths are analyzed in depth. Furthermore in order to grasp the socio-political climate of the period several events such as the foundation and closure of Free Republican Party in 1930 and the Menemen Incident the same year are noted. Later aiming to frame such political dynamics Erik Jan Zürcher and Sefa Şimşek's works are studied. In this contextual background, further, the working structure of People Houses are analyzed with its branches and organizational activities. Following such analysis it is argued that in fact the foundation of People Houses reflected a cultural policy against a perceived threat aiming at the superstructure, described by the pro-governmental Republican camp as: a “Counter-revolution.” In this regard with the activities organized by the institution it is demonstrated that People Houses were highly engaged with the dissemination of the reforms employed by the government among the society.

Therefore its motivations remained strictly ideological. In order to comprehend it in its complexity, it is argued that it was not a product of a “passivization against class antagonism” as

in the Italian case. However it can not be as well described as an agent of “civil society” in its liberal form. Thus it was exactly a product of a developmental capitalist context, without the presence of a structured “compatibly-perceived” capitalist class; however via state policies seeking for such structuralization via solidaristic corporatist policies. Therefore, People Houses was an ideological response of the Republican government, against a “threat perceived to be menacing the superstructure.”

It is argued that such infrastructural difference conditioned the socio-economic and abovementioned institutional policies applied in these two cases. Therefore in the Italian context the “compatible community” reflected the gathering of individuals and groups under the regimented structures of the state. OND as an intermediary institution served for such regimented, passivization motive. While analysis of the Turkish case reflects a context with the lack of a structuralized class antagonism, that was not perceived to threaten the infrastructural relations of production, cultural policies of the Republican government reflected the solidaristic corporatist model. This was achieved via promotion of a compatibly-perceived “national community.” Therefore People Houses as an intermediary institution served the motivation of a creation of such a “nationalized community”, recognizing the enactments employed by the government relating to the superstructure. Comparison and contrast of these two intermediary institutions, together with considering the particular socio-economic contexts that paved the path for their foundation provide such an analysis.

Up until this point, in the thesis the discussions were lead via primary and secondary sources on intellectuals' and law makers' positions towards the application of policies in their own respective

countries. However, following this analysis, in the 5th chapter, in order to fully comprehend the intellectual's and law-makers' positions via an international optic, their interaction and inter-perception patterns towards each other are questioned in this context. Therefore primary sources including articles and news from journals and newspapers published in inter-war years, concerned with Turkey in Italian sources and with Italy in Turkish sources are explored in a cross-investigation.

Following this examination, the material found in the archives are reported in two main sections according to their theme of engagement. These are categorized as (1) International Relations, as the material concerning the diplomatic relations between the two countries, and (2) “Internal Policies”, as the material concerning the socio-economic policies applied in these two countries visioned from the “other side.”

In the first section, specifically on the Italian sources analyzed, it is observed that the opinions voiced by the authors were in high correlation with the evolving diplomatic relations between the two countries. Therefore such findings are narrated in correspondence with the international context. In this regard this narrative is divided into three parts, described as “Distance” in the period between 1922 and 1927; followed by a “Rapprochement” in the period between 1928 and 1932; finally leading to “Diverging Agendas” in the period between 1932 and 1939. Analysis of the archival material revealed out the following points:

Firstly, starting with the period following the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922), the recognition of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk among the Italian sources with policies governed in the country is

remarkable. This was demonstrated with the articles concerning Turkey as “Kemal's Turkey” (di Marzio 1924) as well as articles written just on his very personality in relation with the reforms applied in the country as in “Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha.” (Rossi 1929)

Secondly it is observed that the signing of the 1928 Italo-Turkish Treaty marked a turning point among the perception of each other in the two countries. It is argued that such “Rapprochement” as well conditioned the inter-perceptions positively until the Turkish diplomatic committee’s visit (at the Prime Minister level) in Italy in 1932. In this regard the controversial headlines of Turkish newspaper *Cumhuriyet* and Italian newspaper *Il Popolo d'Italia* are interpreted in relation to the international context conditioned by the Turkish visits in Moscow and in Rome for seeking economic credit, together with the second five year Italo-Turkish pact planned to be signed in Rome and previously made accords regarding the Turkish naval ship orders from Italian producers. However it is argued that such visit turned out to be the climax of the relations between the two countries before the disengagement and specifically influenced how Turkey was covered in the Italian sources.

Thirdly, it is argued that Turkish acceptance of the Moscow's economic proposal without interest rate, Turkish entry to the League of Nations in 1932, Italy's proceeding with Four-Power Pact in 1933, signing of the Balkan Pact in 1934 followed by the signing of Montreaux Treaty on the Straits in 1936 and the Italian withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1937, portrayed a process of a phaseal disengagement between the two countries. In this regard it is defended that such evolving diplomatic relations conditioned the portrayal of Turkey in the Italian sources encountered, negatively. Such data covering Turkey as “Anti-European” or mentioning its

foreign policy as a “non-justified distrust” against Italy are particularly treated as outstanding in this period.

As it is explored previously, both of the cases are argued to be structured by two different crises of capitalism. Thus they both sought an alternative so-called “3rd way” development model that was an alternative to liberal capitalist and socialist managements; theorized as totalitarian and solidaristic corporatist models respectively in Italian and Turkish contexts. In this regard it is argued that their inter-perception patterns deserved investigation. Therefore, the second section of analysis demonstrated the archival material engaged in the internal policies applied in these two countries. Regarding this set of data, in the Italian and Turkish sources two different inter-perception patterns are observed and theorized as respectively: (1) analogical thinking attitude and (2) differential thinking attitude. This section's narrative was built according to the content of the archival material, thus it was reported in three categories.

Firstly the material engaged in cultural policies is demonstrated. In this part specifically the Turkish authors' attitude regarding the Italian cultural policies are conceptualized as “recognition but not adaptation.” This is explained via the recognition of the Italian policies by the Turkish authors, explaining them as a result of the Italian socio-economic circumstances, but strictly opposing their adaptation within the Turkish context; followed by an account on analysis of the Turkish social and historical circumstances' particularities. This is observed specifically in articles reported in *Kadro* journal. Furthermore such attitude of the writers are explained with references to Ziya Gökalp's approach on “culture/ *kültür*” and “civilization/ *medeniyet*” with keeping its anti-cosmopolitanist position evident.

Secondly the material dealing with the socio-economic policies are focused at; several articles in Turkish and Italian sources are highlighted. In this regard, a specific case of quarrel between the Italian Turcologist Ettore Rossi and *Kadro* author Burhan Asaf is reported. Rossi's primary article comparing the Turkish and Italian policies, which received a harsh reply from Asaf, followed by Rossi's mentioning this at another article is noted. Thus it is argued that such "differential thinking" pattern observed in the Turkish sources mirrored the nationalist position of the authors, treating the Turkish circumstances unique, as described above.

Thirdly, a particular case regarding the coverage of the very same event- Republican People Party's 4th National Congress- is reported from two different sources, *Oriente Moderno* in Italy and *Ülkü* in Turkey. As the previous part, this analysis as well confirmed the observation of the inter-perception patterns as "analogical thinking"- an attitude of using a language of analogies when describing the Turkish policies- in the Italian sources dealing with Turkish policies; and the "differential thinking" -an attitude of stressing the particularity of the Turkish social circumstances and policy applications- in the Turkish sources dealing with Italian policies.

Following such this sum-up of the arguments raised in this thesis, finally testing of the working hypothesis remains essential. The working hypothesis was identified in the 1st chapter of the thesis as the following:

"The formation of *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* and *Halkevleri* as institutional policies employed by interwar Italian and Turkish governments, is the product of a reactionary response to a 'infrastructurally perceived threat' leading to social disintegration."

In this regard, the hypothesis is partially rejected. Interpretation of the data in light of the corporatist theory; analysis of the processes leading to the foundation of OND and its trajectory of the period concerned; with references to the above information on *case del popolo*, *dopolavoro*, Mario Giani's evolving proposal, nationalization of the very institution following 1926 Syndical Laws and the institution's working structure confirmed the statement that “the formation of *Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro* reflected a reactionary response to a crisis of an 'infrastructurally perceived threat' leading to social disintegration.” Such threat was perceived to be the “organized labor” by the law-makers, threatening the relations of production. Therefore the governed policies sought at its passivization.

On the other hand, above interpretation of the data in light of the corporatist theory; analysis of the processes leading to the foundation of People Houses and its trajectory of the period concerned; with references to the information on Turkish Hearths, Free Republican Party, Menemen Incident and the analysis of the institution's working structure negated the statement that “the formation of *Halkevleri* reflected a reactionary response to a crisis of an 'infrastructurally perceived threat' leading to social disintegration.” Instead, this study evidenced that the formation of the very institution reflected a reactionary response to a crisis of a “superstructurally perceived threat.” Such threat was perceived to be the “counter-revolution” by the law-makers, threatening the superstructural social and political regulations employed by the government. Therefore the governed policies sought at further dissemination of these superstructural enactments.

As a conclusion, positioning this research in the framework of “Global and International Studies” is important for further research suggestions. The study aimed to bring a comparative approach in analyzing the socio-economic and cultural policies in inter-war Italy and Turkey. It is argued that the theory of corporatism served a suitable platform to build such comparative analysis; letting us to observe the generalities of concerned two cases and see in particular the differences in social approach and policy-making. Regards to the period concerned in the thesis, this study aims to integrate into the literature of inter-war era policy-making practices. Therefore further research suggestions would be towards comparative consideration of other inter-war era national cases as well; in order to highlight particular states' distinct responses to the economical difficulties raised in 1930's; and seek for the very reasons of employment of such socio-economic and cultural policies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adanır, Fikret. (2001) “Kemalist Authoritarianism and fascist Trends in Turkey during the Interwar Period”, in *Fascism Outside Europe: The European Impulse against Domestic Conditions in the Diffusion of Global Fascism*, (ed.Larsen, Stein Ugelvik), Columbia University Press, New York.
- Althusser, Louis. (1971) “Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (Notes towards an investigation).” In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, pp. 142-7, 166-76. Translated by Ben Brester, New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- Ancyranus. (1929). “La Turchia kemalista e il patto italo-turco”, in *Gerarchia*, vol.January, p.1-6.
- Anderson, Benedict. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, New York: Verso.
- Aralov, Semyon Ivanovich. (1967) *Bir Sovyet Diplomatın Türkiye Hatıraları*, Burçak Yayınevi: İstanbul.
- Arıkan, Zeki (1999). "Halkevlerinin Kuruluşu ve Tarihsel İşlevi", in *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, Ankara, vol.6, no.23, p261-281.
- Asaf, Burhan. (1932a). “Faşizm ve Türk Milli Kurtuluş Hareketi”, in *Kadro*, vol. August, p.36-39.
- Asaf, Burhan. (1932b). “Rejimler Nasıl Niçin Değişiyor?”, in *Kadro*, vol.December, p.27-32.
- Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal. (1997) *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri, I-III*, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Türk Tarih Kurumu

Basımevi.

- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya. (1932). “İnkılabın İdeolojisi: Gençnesil Meselesi”, in *Kadro*, vol.April, p.5-9.
- Barlas, Dilek. (2004). “Friends or Foes? Diplomatic Relations between Italy and Turkey, 1923-1936” in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.36, No.2, May, pp.231-252.
- Başbuğ, Esra Dicle. (2013). *Resmi İdeoloji Sahnede-Kemalist İdeolojinin İnşasında Halkevleri Dönemi Tiyatro Oyunlarının Etkisi*, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Bertonelli, Francesco. (1935). “Turchia 1935”, in *Gerarchia*, vol.June, p.494- 499.
- Bianchi, Robert. (1984). *Interest Groups and Political Development in Turkey*, Princeton University Press: New Jersey.
- Billig, Michael. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*, Sage Publication, Great Britain.
- Bottai, Giuseppe (1925). “I pochi e i molti”, in *Critica Fascista: Rivista quindicinale del fascismo diretta da Giuseppe Bottai*, 1 December 1925, in *Critica Fascista, 1923-1943*, anthology ed. G.de Rosa and F.Malgeri, Landi: Rome 1980, vol I, p.283.
- Bottai, Giuseppe (1928a). *Chiarificazione necessaria*, in “Critica Fascista”, 1 Maggio 1928, p. 162.
- Bottai, Giuseppe (1928b). Discussions at the Senate (31 May 1928) in Giuseppe Bottai, *Esperienze corporative*. Rome: edizioni del diritto del lavoro, pp.27-39.
- Bottai, Giuseppe (1933). “Antiliberalismo e democrazia” in *Critica Fascista Rivista quindicinale del fascismo diretta da Giuseppe Bottai*, 1 December 1933, Rome.
- Bozarslan, Hamit. (2013). "Kemalism, westernization and anti-liberalism" in *Turkey Beyond Nationalism: Towards Post-Nationalist Identities*, (ed.)Kieser, Hans-Lukas, New York: I.B Tauris& Co.Ltd.

- Cannistraro, Philip V. (1972). "Mussolini's Cultural Revolution: Fascist or Nationalist?", in *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 7, No. 3/4 July-October, pp. 115-139.
- Checchi E, Leopoldo. (1936). "La politica navale: La questione deli Stretti" in *Gerarchia*, vol.August, p.580-582.
- Çağlar, Behçet Kemal. (1933) "Ergenekon", *Ülkü Halkevleri Mecmuası*, no:1, Ulus, Ankara.
- Çağlar, Behçet Kemal. (1936) *Halkevleri 1932-1935: 103 Halkevi Geçen Yillarda Nasıl Çalıştı?*, Istanbul: Gökay Kitabevi.
- Corner, Paul. (2009). "Introduction" in *Popular Opinion in Totalitarian Regimes: Fascism, Nazism, Communism*, (ed.) Paul Corner, Oxford University Press, p.1-13.
- De Grazia, Victoria. (1981). *The Culture of Consent: Mass Organization of Leisure in Fascist Italy*, Cambridge University Press, USA.
- Di Casola, Maria Antonia. (1990). "Tra Fascismo e Kemalismo: Per una verifica delle relazioni italo- turche dal 1928 al 1934", in *Il Politico-Rivista Italiana di Scienze Politiche*, No.4, (Oct- Dec), pp.733-744.
- Durkheim, Emile. (1933). "The Preface to the Second Edition" in *On the Division of Labor in Society*, New York: Macmillan, pp.1-13.
- Faldati, Ubaldo. (1935). "Programma 'Kamalista' del Partito Repubblicano del Popolo" in *Oriente Moderno*, vol. June, p.256-262.
- Gellner, Ernest. (1997). *Nationalism*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Gentile, Giovanni (1982 [1927]). "Fascismo identità di stato e individuo", in Costanzo Casucci (ed). *Il fascismo – antologia di scritti critici*. Bologna: Il Mulino, pp.15-50.
- Gökalp, Ziya (1918) "Halkçılık", in *Yeni Mecmua*, No.32, Istanbul: Yeni Mecmua Matbaası.
- Gökalp, Ziya. (1923). *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. Ankara: Milli İctimiyat Kitabhanesi.

- Gökalp, Ziya (1959). *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization*, ed. and trans. Niyazi Berkes, London: G.Allen and Unwin.
- Gökalp, Ziya (1968). *The Principles of Turkism*, trans. Robert Devereux, Leiden: E.J.Brill.
- Giani, Mario. (1923a). “Il problema del dopolavoro” in *Livorno d'Italia*, 8 March.
- Giani, Mario. (1923b). “Per il dopolavoro” in *Livorno d'Italia*, 22 March.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1975). *Quaderni di carcere*, (ed.) Gerratana, Valentino. Turin: Einaudi.
- Griffin, Roger. (1991). *The Nature of Fascism*, New York: St.Martin's Press.
- Heywood, Andrew (2007). *Politics*, China: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hobsbawm, Eric & Ranger, Terence. (1983)ed. *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M.Asım. (1998). “The People's House and the Cult of the Peasant in Turkey” in *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.34, No.4, *Turkey before and after Atatürk: Internal and External Affairs*, October, 67-91.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M.Asım. (2006). *Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta: Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Köycü Söylem*, Istanbul: İletişim.
- Keynes, John Maynard (1952). *Essays in Persuasion*, London: Hard-Davis Publication.
- Lupo, Salvatore (2005). *Il fascismo: La politica in un regime totalitario*, Milano: Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Editore.
- Marzio di, Cornelio. (1924). “La Turchia di Kemal” in *Gerarchia*, vol.February, p.256-257.
- Marx, Karl. (1977). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers: Notes by R. Rojas.
- Mateescu, Dragos C. (2006). “Kemalism in the Era of Totalitarianism: A Conceptual Analysis” in *Turkish Studies*, Vol.7, No.2, p.225-241, Taylor&Francis.

- Mizrahi, Avi. (2013). “Constructing the 'Other' in Musical Policies: Comparative Analysis of Folk Music in Turkey and Rebetika in Greece (1920-1950)” in *It's Not All Black and White. Perspectives on Otherness* , edited by Nika Škof and Tadej Pirc, 285-306. Gornja Radgona: A priori.
- Mizrahi, Avi. (2016) *Stigmatized Melodies: Comparative Analysis of Turkish and Greek Policies Regarding “National Music”*, in F.Privitera, A.Remiddi, G.Cadioli, L.Moretti (Ed.), PECOB’S Volume: Selected MIREES Master Thesis. ISBN: 978-88-96951-19-4
<<http://www.pecob.eu/Stigmatized-Melodies-Comparative-Analysis-Turkish-Greek-Policies-Regarding-National-Music>>
- Mosse, George L. (1975). *Nationalization of the Masses: Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich*, New York: Howard Fertig.
- Mussolini, Benito. (1922). “La Luna Crescente” in *Gerarchia*, vol.September, p.477-479.
- Mussolini, Benito. (1934). “Il Discorso del Duce alla Seconda Assemblea Quinquennale del Regime Roma 18 Marzo XII” in *Giornale della Donna*, vol.April XII: Rome, Italy.
- Mussolini, Benito (1936). “La dottrina del fascismo” in *La dottrina del fascismo: dagli scritti e discorsi del Duce, Partito Nazionale Fascista*, La libreria dello Stato: Rome.
- Nallino, Carlo Alfonso. (1933). “Conferenza di Ettore Rossi sugli studi di Turcologia in Italia”, in *Oriente Moderno*, volume October, p.511.
- Nedim, Vedat. (1932a). “Değişen Cihan Münasebetleri İçinde Türkiye” in *Kadro*, vol. May, p.13-18.
- Nedim, Vedat. (1932b). “Sınıflaşmamak ve İktisat Siyaseti” in *Kadro*, vol.November, p. 17-21.
- Öztürkmen, Arzu. (1994). “The Role of People Houses in the Making of National Culture in

- Turkey” in *New Perspectives on Turkey*, Fall v.11, pp 159-181.
- Parla, Taha. (1985) *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp 1876-1924*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Parla, Taha. (1995). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları-Cilt 3: Kemalist Tek Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Ok'u*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Parla, Taha & Davison, Andrew. (2004) *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey-Progress or Order?*, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Peker, Recep. (1935). “R.Peker'in Söylevi” in *Ülkü*, vol.June, p.247-259.
- Peker, Recep. (1984) *Inkilap Dersleri*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Plaggenborg, Stefan. (2014). *Tarihe Emretmek- Kemalist Türkiye, Faşist İtalya, Sosyalist Rusya*, İletişim Yayınları.
- Polanyi, Karl. (2010). *Marx on Corporatism*. MS, Writings by Karl Polanyi (1907-1933). Concordia University Karl Polanyi Institute for Political Economy. *Karl Polanyi Digital Archive*. Retrieved December 13, 2017.
- <http://kpolanyi.scoolaid.net:8080/xmlui/handle/10694/700>
- Rocco, Alfredo (1938 [1918]). “Manifesto di 'Politica” in Alfredo Rocco. *Scritti e discorsi politici*, Vol. II, Milano: Giuffrè, pp. 536-542.
- Rossi, Ettore. (1929). “Il Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pascia” in *Gerarchia* vol.April, p.297-304.
- Rossi, Ettore. (1932). “Il Fascismo nel vicino oriente” in *Gerarchia*, vol.October, p.843-847.
- Santomassimo, Gianpasquale (2006) *La terza via fascista: Il mito del Corporativismo*. Rome: Carocci.
- Schmitter, C.Philippe. (1974). "Still the Century of Corporatism" in *The Review of Politics-The New Corporatism: Social and Political Structures in the Iberian World*, Vol.36, No.1,

- pp.85-131, Cambridge University Press.
- Sırrı, Selim. (1933). “İtalya'da Halk ve Gençlik Teşkilatı” in *Ülkü*, vol.March, p.241-243.
- Şimşek, Sefa. (2002). *Bir İdeolojik Seferberlik Deneyimi: Halkevleri 1932-1951*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Stolzi, I. (2014). “Private, public and collective: The twentieth century in Italy from fascism to democracy” in M. Madsen & C. Thornhill (Eds.), *Law and the Formation of Modern Europe: Perspectives from the Historical Sociology of Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stone, Marla Susan. (1998). *The Patron State: Culture and Politics in Fascist Italy*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tezel, Yahya S. (1982). *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi (1923-1950)* [Economic History of the Republican Period (1923-1950)], Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.
- Tolga, Osman (1949). *Ziya Gökalp ve İktisadi Fikirleri*, İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat ve İktisadiyat Enstitüsü, İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş Yayınları A.Ş.Basımevi.
- Ünver, Cennet. (2001). *Images and Perceptions of Fascism Among the Mainstream Kemalist Elite in Turkey 1931-1943*, unpublished M.A. Thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.
- Wiarda, Howard J. (1997). *Corporatism and comparative politics: The other great “ism”*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Williamson, Peter J. (2009). *Varieties of Corporatism: A Conceptual Discussion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zürcher, Erik Jan. (2004a). “Institution Building in the Kemalist Republic: The Role of the People's Party” in *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization Under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, (ed.Touraj Atabaki and Erik Jan Zürcher), London and New York: I.B.Taurus Co-

Ltd.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. (2004b). *Turkey: A Modern History*, New York: I.B. Tauris Co-Ltd.

ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS AND LEGISLATIONS

Aksu, (1940) no.17-11. February.

BLPS-Bollettino del lavoro e della previdenza sociale, (1930) 31 July-31 December.

CHF Üçüncü Büyük Kongre (10-18 Mayıs 1931) Zabıtları [RPP Third Great Congress (10-18 May 1931) Records], İstanbul, 1931, p279-280

Cumhuriyet, (1932) 22 May.

S. E. il capo del governo e Duce del fascismo, (1937) *Carta del lavoro: testo approvato la sera del 21 aprile 1927 dal Gran Consiglio Fascista*, Napoli: Pietrocola.

Gente Nostra, (1928). vol.2, nos.5-6, June-July.

Il Dopolavoro, (1923a) vol.1 no.1. (16-31 July)

Il Dopolavoro, (1923b) vol.1, no.14. (1-15 September)

Il Popolo d'Italia, (1932) 29 May.

Lavoro d'Italia, (1924a) 21 February.

Lavoro d'Italia, (1924b) 8 March.

Lavoro d'Italia, (1924c) 29 March.

Lavoro Fascista, (1932). "Una visita al dopolavoro tramvieri di Roma", 24 April.

OND-Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro (1927). Bollettino Ufficiale, vol.1, no.1. January.