



TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIAL LIFE IN TURKEY: 1930-1936

Türkiye’de Sosyal Yaşamdaki Dönüşüm:1930-1936

Assistant Prof. Dr. A. Baran DURAL

The University of Trakya, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,
Public Administration Department
b_dural@yahoo.com

Abstract

Turkish Republic, which started its way with empire remnants from Ottomans, had managed working life, which is among primary necessities of social life, in accordance with its political-ideological goals. “*Populism-Statism-Nationalism*” principles of 6 Arrows were road map to be followed in determining social relations. Kemalist leadership, while aiming the country to reach at developed civilizations’ level by completing modernization process, was also wishing to minimize the intensity of class struggle during transition from Ottoman's social structure divided into status groups to new world’s social structure organized as classes. On the other hand, forming a domestic bourgeoisie in Western terms in order for Turkish Republic to attain economic independence and strengthening entrepreneurship in order to make this class grow were among goals to achieve. So 1930-1936 period is the time slice, when national bourgeoisie could not perform the awaited explosion and state executed “*statism*”, and “*national economy*” choices in order to establish economic independence’s foundations.

Keywords: Corporatism, labor relations, statism, populism, nationalism, CHP, PEEs.

Öz

Türkiye’de çalışma ilişkilerini dönemlere ayırdığında, 1923-1936 yılları arasında kalan zaman dilimi başlı başına bir bölüm olarak değerlendirilmelidir. Gerçekten de 1930’dan itibaren ülkenin siyasal ve iktisadi alanına ağırlığını koyan tek partili dönem, 1936’ya kadar yaptığı düzenlemelerle ortaya koyduğu ana kalkınma hedefi olan “devletçilik” siyasetinin toplumsal, siyasi ve iktisadi altyapısını oluşturmaya çalışmış ve devletçilik modelini hayata geçirmiştir. Dönemin en önemli belgesi olan 1936 tarihli İş Kanunu da, modeli çalışma ilişkileri bağlamında somuta indirgemıştır. Bu bağlamda enflasyonist politikalardan ve Türk parasından dövize kaçış yaşanmasından korkan CHP’nin, iktisat politikasının temelini denk bütçe ve sağlam paraya dayandırması sürecin iktisadi bağımsızlık mücadelesini etkileyen boyutuydu. Nitekim, uzun yıllar emisyon hacmini de arttırmayan devlet, 1931’den itibaren dış fazla vermeyi başarmıştı.

Anahtar kelimeler: Korporatizm, çalışma ilişkileri, devletçilik, halkçılık, CHP, KİT’ler.

INTRODUCTION

History of Turkish Republic should not be taken as a radical break off from Ottoman State. In fact, when it is noted that Strike and Lockout Law and Associations Law dated 1909 continued their existence for a long time within young Republic, it is easily seen that this relation took place as a soft transition, even “*taking over the inheritance*”. So this issue should be considered when 1930–1936 labor relations are investigated, but it should be noted that economical, political and social relations developed and got complicated continuously.

Makal, dividing labor relations in Turkey into periods, has evaluated the time slice of 1923-1936 as a period in itself and noted that radical changes did not start as soon as Republic was declared, but that period carried the signs of radical changes to come. Makal deems especially 1936 Labor Law as the most important step of these changes. (MAKAL, 1999: 31-32) As a matter of fact, one party period, which put its weight on the country's political and economical areas starting from 1930, tried to establish the social, political and economical infrastructure of “*statism*” policy, which it brought forward as the main development goal, and realized statism model with its arrangements up to 1936. The most important document of that era, Labor Law dated 1936, was materialized the model in terms of labor relations. In fact, statist policy was first used by Ismet Inonu at Sivas Railroad opening in August 1930. Mustafa Kemal mentioned statism in 1931, and 1932-1933 were important turning points in operating this policy, when industrialization was accelerated, a statism depending on populism was anticipated and an agreement with private sector was attained through “*Sumerbank solution.*” Passing of Ministry of Industry from Mustafa Seref Bey to Celal Bayar is another important development of that period.

When labor relations of 1930-1936 period are examined, concepts that marked the period shall be tried to be explained first. These are elements such as populism, statism, corporatism and expression change that governed CHP. Besides all these, it must be noted that another important development that marked economic program at the beginning of 1930-1936 period is the establishment of Central Bank (June, 11 1930) with the 10 million dollars fund obtained by providing lighter-match privilege to an American company in 1930 and nationalization of ports and railroads at the end of the same year.

It will be useful to mention the aim of anti-inflationist policies performed until mid-1930s. CHP, fearing inflation would rise and an escape from Turkish currency to foreign currency would take place, based the foundation of its economic policy on “*Equal budget and robust money.*” State, which did not increase emission volume for long years, managed to

produce foreign extra as from 1931. In the same year Turkey, connecting to French Franc as England gave up on Gold System, managed to lessen its debt burden. Again decrease in raw-material prices and cheap labor force provision for industry due to economic depression started in 1929, enabled aimed economic policies to be kept.

1 TRANSITION FROM OTTOMANS TO TURKISH REPUBLIC

Since Turkish Republic had an aim of statism depending on industrialization, the most important problem that state faced at early 1930s was the lack of qualified labor force, in other words urbanized professional workman group. Business transfers at factories, constant renewal of worker personnel, and villagers' preference to stay as little land operators and gain less in 1920s and 1930s are the most important evidences for this situation. But industrialization need and the problem of creating necessary labor force cannot be regarded as a problem accumulated in front of Republic only. State's effort for industrialization goes back to II. Constitutional Monarchy. Cavdar claims that the number of workers during Ottoman State's last years were 50-75 thousand and notes that majority of this number were consisting of minorities and foreign workers coming to Ottoman country with migration. (CAVDAR, 1974: 129-132)

"National economy" and *"development"* efforts, which became established in the country with factories founded after *"Young Turks Movement"* got in charge, went on during Republic and they were tried to be established with a series of transformation. Those who examine this period stress that *"national economy"* policies, which were *"liberal"* until 1930, were treated again with a *"statist"* structure. (MAKAL: 39)

"Liberal" understanding, which influenced first years of Republic, brought up domestic capital's weakness, even indifference, in performing rooted projects and peasants' tendency to become workers also appeared, and state embraced a populist policy towards industrialization. Statism policy, which was executed together with populism, enabled the primary employer of labor relations to be the state and a process, in which a transition from *"peasant-worker"* to a decent worker happened, came forward. In that respect, the most important factor of business transfers mentioned above is peasants' adoption to work in factories at a worker status in specific periods of the year or for short-terms in order to pay their taxes or provide fringe benefit and to go back to their villages after that. For that reason, the worker profile faced was named as *"worker-peasants"*.

1.1 Populism:

The first concept that influenced 1930s labor relations and economic dimension was "*Populism*". In fact populism, which was conceptualized as "*people=nation*" during the War of Independence, and then industry was expected to form domestic entrepreneurs with liberal policies and national bourgeoisie was created and class distinction was refuted, has changed in its content after 1930. One party approach that dominated the governance after Free Party experience in 1930 strictly ignored class distinctions and presented populism as an ideological reason for this preference. In fact populism has been one of the dominant elements of Ataturk's nationalism and statism policies as a concept that opened "*convincing people that they are a nation*", which is the foundation for building nation-state, or a concept that was non-existent before to common acceptance of society. (MARDIN, 1995:65)

Hobsbawn's "*Common interest against individual interest*", "*Common benefit against privilege*" thesis, which became basic principle for statism, again shows how close populism-statism and nationalism triangle is within one another. (HOBSBAWN, 1993:36) Founder elites in Turkey has also showed the operation of nation-state unified on populism ground, in which state is the main employer and divides common interest instead of class interests, as the main goal. Feroz Ahmad defines the process as, "*Kemalist economy-politics' goal was, first of all, to create a nation that has a class structure peculiar to a modern society. When this goal was attained and class conflict occurred after that, state was going to intervene and act like a referee.*" (AHMAD, 1985: 258)

Adaptation of Populism in the new process has some pragmatist aspects as well. Ataturk, talking about Statism only once in 1931 at Izmir, pointed out public's structure and noted that society expected everything from the state, so it was a necessity for the state to put its weight on economy. Again Ismet Inonu at his speech concerning how statism is perceived, while indicating "*moderate statism*" based on populism is adopted, has not pointed out nationalism-statism-populism triangle.

2. STATISM:

In the former section, it was noted that statism principle depending on populism gained weight at economy after 1930 and the year 1932 was the most important turning point for statism. But another interesting date for statism is 1931. CHP had political program for the first time with the CHP 3rd General Assembly in May 10, 1931, and preferences concerning

economical policies were becoming crystallized with this program. Approach to society, political shaping together with economical policies was wished to be programmed in that assembly. (KURUC, 1988: 141)

In that assembly, CHP was accepted to be Secular, Populist, Statist, Nationalist, Reformist, and Republican Party and class distinctions were clearly refused. It was indicated in this program, which told that the nation consisted of small farmers, small industry experts and tradesmen, laborer and workmen, self employed and industry experts, big business owners and merchant groups, that those groups did not constitute separate classes. But the program, which took strength from Gokalp's solidarist ideas influenced by Durkheim sociology, caused problem in terms of populism since it added big industrialists to a structure identified with small manufacturers and workers, and it was occasionally criticized for that matter. (MAKAL: 113)

Populism evolved after this definition and its use was utilized in order to clearly remove class distinctions and prevent class struggles. (KURUC, 1987:77) Parla explains economical approach of that period evaluating this new content of populism and the speech of General Secretary Recep Peker, in which he claimed that class struggles became "*passionate and fanatic*" struggle method and it prevented national unity and development, and caused unnecessary fights, as follows:

"This corporatist populism, which refutes interest conflicts and the very existence of classes, let alone their political struggle, and declares that the interest unity of work branches or profession groups is represented together and harmoniously under single party roof, is both an anti-liberal and an anti-socialist populism, as the program clearly indicates." (PARLA, 1992: 42)

2.1 Industrialization efforts:

Statism stands out as principle applied parallel with industrialization. As a matter of fact, State Industry Office was established in the second half of 1932, after the program was declared in 1931. Primary aim of Industry Office was to establish facilities. Meanwhile, Industry Loan Bank was going to provide loan for office. Office would give account to TGNA through Economic Ministry, and the bank would provide loan for private sector and the state. Hence, resources allocated for small capital in 1927 would also be used for big industry investments from that time on.

In the meantime, private sector's displeasure brought demands to go back the old system forward. Celal Bayar, who became Minister of Economy in 1932, executed Sumerbank model in 1933 spring and managed private sector to assent to new statist policies. Thus interoperability of the economy would continue with operating "*Economy Ministry + Sumerbank + National banks + 1927 model*". While continuation of 1927 was the main reconciliation point, Sumerbank would become the establishment center and bank of state industry, and national banks would be integrated into system by share ownership. State Industry Office would operate within Sumerbank at that point.

In May 1932, Ismet Inonu sent a technical committee abroad in order to be trained in foreign countries and one fourth of the budget was allocated for financing. Within that process and after 1936, engineers and technical workers were sent to foreign countries and obtaining qualified labor force policy continued. Industrialization accelerated as the foundations of a textile factory were laid at Kayseri in 1934. At 1935 General Assembly, which shall be examined below, goals of statism and economical development program were tied to political certification.

2.2 1935 General Assembly:

At CHP's 4. General Assembly, which was gathered at Ankara in May 9, 1935, although the part in 1931 program concerning enabling "*state to be physically interested in areas where nation's and country's interests are in question*" was repeated though individual enterprise was considered as important, it was said that, "*Duty of the state concerning economical matters is to be constructive as well as encouraging individual enterprise and arrange and inspect the ongoing ones. ... If a business, which the state decided to perform physically, is in the hands of an individual enterprise, taking it depends on making a law each time*" (CHP, 1935: 59)

This statement shows that, nationalization would be initiated at *Turkey* "*if considered necessary*". Although private enterprise was tried to be not startled in the same statement, it is important in the sense that it was understood state decided to be the primary actor of economical life and labor relations. When approaches concerning the refusal of classed society and class struggles, which were present in 1935, are looked, it is possible to see interesting comments on that issue as well. According to a widely held belief, point arrived was not available for a wide, big class potential that would enter an interest conflict. So CHP was just explaining the situation generally. (AYDEMIR, 1968: 225) But it is clear that although the situation's summary was such, wide class struggles that could arise from USSR's revolution export to Anatolia in the long term were feared.

2.3 Corporatism:

Another leading concept of that period is “*corporatism*”. In its general sense, corporatism is “*a representation method, special model or ideal type of institutional arrangement which connects civil society’s organized interests with state’s decision-making structures.*” (MAKAL: 127) First existence condition of corporatism is the presence of a syndicate organization which represents the majority of salaried workers at the country. But this syndicate organization has highly problematic at Turkey.

Developments that gave rise to corporatism go back before 1930-1936 period. For instance 1923 Izmir Economy Congress, establishment of Trade and Industry Offices in 1925, Economic Assembly studies in 1927 and Ziya Gökalp’s views were important turning points for corporatism's development.

A study was proposed for Izmir, which was selected as “*pilot area*”, in 1930-1936 period. When it is considered that economy and salaried workers of that time were mostly gathered at Istanbul and Izmir, it can be understood why Izmir was selected as pilot area. CHP, acting in order to attract worker group to its side and control them in 1930s, established Business, Workers, Merchant Organizations and Self Employment Office in 1931 and tried to bring workers at Izmir under a single association by applying indispensability principle. This study, which succeeded for a time being due to forcing and criminal law sanction, was dissolved in 1946.

Similar goals and statements were also indicated at 1935 General Assembly. CHP General Secretary Peker, in his speeches, noted that they would focus on worker organization more in the future and was not able to desist from saying that aim of the organization was to make “*Nationalist Turkish worker*” an aide element of Kemalist Revolution and program execution. (MAKAL: 159)

Outer factors of the period should be considered when corporatism is evaluated. Especially fascist governments that came into power at Italy and Germany regarded corporatism as a savior in order to prevent class struggle and to tie salaried workers to anticipated objectives in harmony. Free Party experience, which took place in 1930 and supported at coastal cities where especially salaried workers and industry was developing, leded single party power establishment and caused to become stronger. Successful economic results of fascist governments of that period in their first years was creating an admiration effect on strengthening CHP authority and governing elites were increasingly wondering Italy and Germany’s economy policies.

CHP management, who viewed CHP as nation's single party, was counting all citizens as CHP members and they were not indifferent to economic development-nationalism-state-party-society harmony at fascist countries. Moreover, loans taken from Italy, improvement of intense trade relations with Germany, and building export-import balance solely on Germany in those years are deemed as important outer factors of corporatism program. Aksin, who examined political structure of that period, notes that CHP was always hand in hand with totalitarian approaches in order to preserve itself, but it avoided being seized by these views in the last run. (AKSIN, 1996: 189-190)

3. LABOR RELATIONS AND STATISM:

In the first years of the Republic, labor relations had a problematic structure. Most important reason was indifferent approach of peasants, who was gathered at small business enterprises, towards professional workmanship, and the fact that agricultural part, within which small enterprises were majority, consisted 90% of employment. The fact that private sector had no serious enterprise towards heavy industry and average number of workers at industrial organizations was 4 is useful to understand that service sector was at a potential higher than industry in terms of employment.

According to a report issued by SSI (State Statistics Institute) in 1973, large land properties were 3,70% of general agriculture and small land properties smaller than 125 acres consisted 86.34½ of all lands in 1930s and 1940s. Those peasants, who had an average of 15 acres of land, were not willing to settle at cities and work as worker at industry, and they preferred to stay at their villages, even if it meant gaining less and having tax problems. The most important problem in and after 1932, when directed-protective-statist industry was put into practice, besides financing investments was, to say the least, persuade those named as "*peasant worker*" and create conditions encouraging workmanship.

When it was understood that private sector could not meet Republic's goals, in other words it could not take the burden of industrialization, governor elites understood the necessity of building the structure, primary elements of which were statism and state's labor relations. (KURUC, 1993: XXXVII – XXXVIII) 1. Five Years Development Plan, which was prepared in order to reach the goals of statist economy and came into effect in 1934, was among general results of this necessity. This plan, which Kuruc describes as "*Sectors Plan*" (KURUC: LVIII), anticipated investments to be made in accordance with country's needs' provision and required raw material to be obtained domestically.

Although 2. Industry Plan, which was converted into a report in 1936 after 1. Plan that was executed for approximately 33 months, was more detailed than the first one and came into effect in 1938, it could not endure against war economy's characterization. 2. Plan was deliberating more about mid and investment goods' production than consumption goods.

3.1 PEEs:

Functions of State Industry Office, which was established in 1932, were mentioned before. But at this point, another characteristic of the institution should be reminded, because that institution is the first PEE of Turkey. Sumerbank, which was established in 1933, replaced both Turkey Industry Loan Bank and State Industry Office as state's industrialization center and bank.

Sumerbank made several investments beginning from 1935, which were mostly at textile-fabric sector. For instance, Turkey Sugar Factories Inc. is an important organization, which was established by Sumerbank, independent from fabric sector, with private sector's participation. Etibank, which was established to operate at mining and energy fields in June 14, 1935, and electric Research Management and MIS (Mine Investigation Search), which were established in the same year, should be remembered. Real Estate and Orphans Bank, which was established in 1926, was transformed into Turkey Real Estate Loan Bank in 1936.

A series of legal measures were applied in order to strengthen statist policies in the period after 1930. Turkish Currency Protection Law, which was accepted in February 20, 1930 was followed by Law concerning Prohibition of Debase in Trade and Inspection and Protection of Exportation in the same year. Among legal regulations other than these three laws, Law concerning Tea, Sugar and Coffee Import Management in Single Hand in February 2, 1932, Loan Money Law in 1933, Law of Control and Determination of Industrial Goods Manufacture and Sales Prices.

3.2 Improvements in industrial sector:

Improvement in industrial sector can be mentioned with transition to statism. Turkey industry lived its most rapid development speed during 1933-1939 period. Improvement rate in industry at 1923-1929 period was calculated to be 8,5%, whereas the same rate was 10,2% during 1933-1939. (BORATAV, 1990: 50-55) It is interesting to note that 74,19% of managers and owner entrepreneurs of private industry organizations established in 1930-1940 period, when statism was at its peak, were of bureaucrat origin. (MAKAL: 251)

Primary factor that accelerated industrialization during 1930-1936 is decrease of production's material equivalent. Agriculture products excess was combined with other crisis

elements after 1930, and decrease in stock market and share certificates highly affected agriculture products. Decrease in national currency value in 1929 and lessening of arable lands were the element making transition from agriculture to industry easier. Small agriculture manufacturer stayed dependent and had difficulty in paying taxes on the face of interest increase. It was explained in former sections that these manufacturers, though staying at their villages for two-three months, often visited cities and participated in industrial production as “*peasant worker*” in order to pay taxes and interest, though for short periods. Thus dependency on land relatively decreased and labor force was provided for industry. Meanwhile food cost decrease connected to agriculture affected worker cost and price mechanisms operating against village made workmanship attractive.

State also made some studies in order to make workmanship attractive. Housing, food and cloth support was provided for newly established industrial centers, expenditure such as electric, fuel and water were not taken by workers, and attractiveness of industry sector was tried to be increased with social and sportive activities. This system, which gained functionality mostly in 1940s, was put into practice in units like Tuzla, which were “*considered to be developed as soon as possible*” on housing and food basis, large and clean dormitories were prepared for workers with shower facility. Moreover, Sumerbank was obliged to train students for Economy Ministry and to open courses for sending students abroad and training workers with a law accepted in June 3, 1933, and worker class was tried to be created and qualified labor force was tried to be formed with Professional and literacy courses opened at factories. (MAKAL: 262-274)

Despite all these attempts, 1930-1936 could not escape from being a transition period. Despite increase in production and worker population at industry sector, “*peasant workers*” were ineffective in abandoning old habits, aimed goal at worker population was not attained, and frequent change of mind of those stuck between land and workmanship caused production to be lower than expected. Social, cultural, fee and housing rights materialized in 1940s and providing large gardens for housed workers in order to remove anomy made workmanship a more attractive choice. Still, 1930-1936 period is a noticeable period when positive developments towards providing Professional permanent labor force and investments towards future were made and steps were taken. Although production level lower than expected due to lack of employment in worker personnel seriously increased the cost of industry investments, state managed to dwell upon directed industrialization Project stubbornly.

Again the number of workers worked at Turkey during 1930-1936 is a problematic issue. The fact that most business units, which were unwilling to be within Labor Law accepted in 1936, employed small amount of workers and showed every stage of production as a separate production unit in order to stay out of law scope makes estimating number of workers impossible. (MAKAL: 303-306) For instance, according to a research performed by Izmir Commerce and Industry Chamber in 10 cities centered Izmir, it was claimed that 73.297 workers worked at 6.621 workplaces, whereas there are information indicating that at least 200 thousand workers worked only in tobacco industry branch at Turkey in 1930. Makal shows the total number of workers in the country between 798 thousand and 960 thousand as of 1935. In fact, it is more likely to find healthier data concerning the number of workers at Turkey for periods after 1937.

Most solid data coming from 1931-1938 to now are among State Statistic Institute reports. According to these numbers, worker rate seemingly increases at least in public sector. SSI indicates that a 25% increase was observed at public employees during 1931-1938. According to this 99.919 of labor force potential, which was determined to be 6.699.006 in 1931, was employed at public sector. Same number increases to 125.186 within a labor force number of 7.718.422 in 1938. (SSI, 1959: 34) It will be useful to examine legal arrangements that influenced the period in the later sections of this study.

3.3 Public Sanitation Law:

1930 Public Sanitation Law, which reflected on labor relations in terms of health, can be evaluated better when conditions of the period are examined. There were 3 million trachoma patients at Turkey as of 1920. 50% of the population was suffering from malaria in 1925 and 13% of deaths every year were due to tuberculosis outbreak. Total health personnel in 1923 was only 1655, 4 of which were nurses and 65 of which were pharmacists. (ÖZKAN, 1982: 197)

Sanitation Law was focused more on regulations protecting women and children workers' health instead of affecting all working life. It was declared in the law, which gave 6 weeks of birth vacation to woman, 3 week of which was before birth and after birth, that children under 12 could not be employed at industry and mine sectors, children between 12-16 ages could not be employed at night and these groups could work at most 8 hours in a day. Moreover, no worker could work more than eight hours at night and workers working underground could work only for 8 hours a day. (TALAS, 1961: 100) Again with the same law workplaces with more than 50 employees were being kept responsible for their employees' health controls, infirmaries were

anticipated to build at workplaces with 100-500 employees and health units to be built, with a bed for very 100 employees. (MAKAL: 343-344)

3.4 Law Concerning Arts and Services Allocated for Turkish Citizens at Turkey:

Law Concerning Arts and Services Allocated for Turkish Citizens at Turkey numbered 2007, which was accepted in June 11, 1932 was first proposed to assembly with Prime Minister Ismet Inonu's signature in 1929 and entered into effect as it was issued in Official Gazette in June 16, 1932 after long discussions. Law's aim was to bring prohibition to non-Turks from working at specific art and industry branches and to construct a national labor force potential.

It was clear that majority of private enterprise belonged to non-Turks in the transition from Ottomans to Republic. The fact that majority of the population after world war were Turks was forcing new authority to think less of foreign rights and to solve approaching "Turk problem". (TANYOL, 1990: 112-114) Moreover, preferring foreign workers escaping from Russia after revolution and coming from some neighbor countries especially in order to work at companies with foreign capital over Turkish workers can be showed among elements that caused the law.

It is hard to say that there was a density at public organizations after 1927, but state was fearing of unemployment level, which was approximately 3% in 1920s and raised to 4,5% in 1932. According to statistical data, number of foreign employees working at public organizations was 433 in 1932, 454 in 1933 and 435 in 1934, but the fact that an important portion of those foreigners were foreman or master workman caused problems in salary policies.

For instance, while foreign foremen were paid between 410 and 730 piaster, Turks doing the same job were paid only 250-530 piaster at Ereğli Coal District. (MAKAL: 347-348) It was hard for 2500 Turkish painter and engravers at Istanbul to find jobs still after the law came into effect, since there was a mass mostly consisting of Hungarian, Italian and Bulgarian plasterers at Istanbul and foreigners were slightly preferred over Turks. (KURUC: 1993)

The justification of the 1932 Law Concerning Arts and Services Allocated for Turkish Citizens at Turkey numbered 2007 accepted in June 11, 1932 was, basically, to leave management and performance of jobs in some industry branches that could be easily done by Turks to Turks' management. Jobs to which foreigners were prohibited to perform within this law can be listed as follows:

“Layman salesmanship, musicianship, photography, hairdressing, typesetting, brokerage, cloth, cap and shoe manufacture, stockbrokerage at stock markets, sale of goods

subject to state monopoly, interpreting and guiding tourists, construction, iron and wood industry workmanship, permanent and temporary workmanship at water and illumination and heating and engagement works by means of public transportation, loading and discharging job at land, chauffeuring, assistantship, general workmanship, watchman's duty at any establishment and apartments, maintenance man, attendant, man or woman servant at hotel, inn, Turkish bath, dancing, bars and night clubs, bar acting, singing, veterinary and chemistry." (MAKAL: 351)

As the law came into effect majority of Hungarian, Greek and Soviet foreigners had to leave Turkey. 800 White Russians were added to 6 thousand Greeks, who left the country at the first place. Number of Hungarians who left the country because of the law until 1935 is about 15 thousand.

CONCLUSION:

Turkish Republic, which started its way with empire remnants from Ottomans, had managed working life, which is among primary necessities of social life, in accordance with its political-ideological goals. "*Populism-Statism-Nationalism*" principles of 6 Arrows were road map to be followed in determining social relations. Kemalist leadership, while aiming the country to reach at developed civilizations' level by completing modernization process, was also wishing to minimize the intensity of class struggle during transition from Ottoman's social structure divided into status groups to new world's social structure organized as classes.

On the other hand, forming a domestic bourgeoisie in Western terms in order for Turkish Republic to attain economic independence and strengthening entrepreneurship in order to make this class grow were among goals to achieve. So 1930-1936 period is the time slice, when national bourgeoisie could not perform the awaited explosion and state executed "*statism*", and "*national economy*" choices in order to establish economic independence's foundations.

In that respect, late "*national industrial revolution*" of Turkey, which was almost completely an agricultural society, happened in the same years. Years between 1930 and 1936, when country's rural population was tried to be channeled through industry, are an interesting historical section when labor relations at Turkey were tried to be established on the most possible solid foundation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHMAD, Feroz (1985), From Unionism to Kemalism (Kaynak, Istanbul)
- AKSIN, Sina (1996), Turkey's Near History with Main Lines (İmaj, Ankara)
- AYDEMİR, Sevket Sureyya (1968), Second Man-III (Remzi, Istanbul)
- BORATAV, Korkut (1990), Turkey's Economic History: 1908-1985 (Gerçek, Istanbul)
- CAVDAR, Tevfik (1974), Economic Roots of National Struggle (Kuz, Istanbul)
- HOBBSAWM, Eric (1993), Nations and Nationalism (Ayrıntı, Istanbul)
- KURUC, Bilsay (1987), Economy during Mustafa Kemal Period (Bilgi, Ankara)
- KURUC, Bilsay (1988), Turkey Economy Policies with Documents-I (AUSBF, Ankara)
- KURUC, Bilsay (1993), Turkey Economy Policies with Documents-II (AUSBF, Ankara)
- MAKAL, Ahmet (1999), Labor relations in Turkey during Single Party Period 1920-1946 (İmge, Ankara)
- MARDIN, Serif (1995), Turkish Modernization (İletişim, Istanbul)
- PARLA, Taha (1992), Ziya Gökalp and Corporatism at Turkey (İletişim, Istanbul)
- TALAS, Cahit (1961), Social Economy (AUSBF, Ankara)
- TANYOL, Cahit (1990), Cankaya Drama (Altın, Istanbul)
- (1935), CHP Program (CHP, Ankara)