

A DEBATE ON MASS COMMUNICATION THEORIES: KADRO JOURNAL AS AN EXAMPLE

Zeynep Ekin BAL

İstanbul Üniversitesi, Türkiye

zeynep.bal@istanbul.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3439-088X>

<i>Atıf</i>	Bal, Z. E. (2026). A Debate On Mass Communication Theories: Kadro Journal As An Example, <i>Yeni Medya Elektronik Dergisi</i> , 10 (2), 402-418.
-------------	--

ABSTRACT

The emergence of mass communication theories coincided with a historical period in which nation states were being formed economic crises destabilized existing political structures and new ideological movements reshaped public life. The 1930s marked by the effects of the Great Depression created an environment in which liberal democracy free market economics and traditional political institutions were widely questioned. For newly established states such as the Republic of Turkey this crisis was not only an external development but also a catalyst for redefining national identity economic policy and the communicative tools required to support modernization. Within this context the Kadro Journal 1932 1934 emerged as an intellectual attempt to conceptualize Turkey's development strategy and to articulate an ideological framework for the early Republic. Kadros appearance coincided with the transition from the Powerful Media Effects phase to the early discussions of Limited Effects. While many countries experienced propaganda-oriented mass communication during this period Kadro differed by positioning itself not merely as a publication but as a movement attempting to guide state ideology. Its writers many of whom had previously engaged with socialist thought proposed a third way between liberal capitalism and orthodox Marxism emphasizing statism national independence and the unequal global relationship between developed and underdeveloped nations. This placed Kadro at the intersection of political economy and communication where media served as both an analytical tool and an instrument for shaping public consciousness. Analyzing Kadro in this historical moment therefore offers a valuable perspective on how media functioned as part of nation

building projects. It demonstrates how communication platforms contributed to the formation of political agendas how intellectual elites acted as opinion leaders and how mass communication theories can be reevaluated through the lens of early Republican Turkey.

Keywords: *Kadro Journal, Statism, Mass Communication, Kadro Movement, Republic of Turkey.*

KİTLE İLETİŞİMİ TEORİLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR TARTIŞMA: BİR ÖRNEK OLARAK KADRO DERGİSİ

ÖZ

Kitle iletişimi kuramlarının ortaya çıkışı, ulus-devletlerin oluştuğu, ekonomik krizlerin mevcut siyasi yapıları sarstığı ve yeni ideolojik akımların toplumsal yaşamı yeniden şekillendirdiği bir tarihsel döneme denk gelmektedir. 1930’lar, Büyük Buhran’ın etkileriyle, liberal demokrasinin, serbest piyasa anlayışının ve geleneksel siyasal kurumların geniş ölçekte sorgulandığı bir dönem olmuştur. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti gibi yeni kurulan devletler açısından bu kriz yalnızca dışsal bir gelişme değil; ulusal kimliğin, ekonomik politikanın ve modernleşmeyi destekleyecek iletişim araçlarının yeniden tanımlanmasına yol açan bir dönüm noktasıdır. Bu bağlamda, 1932–1934 yıllarında yayımlanan Kadro Dergisi, Türkiye’nin kalkınma stratejisini kavramsallaştırmaya ve erken Cumhuriyet için ideolojik bir çerçeve oluşturmaya çalışan entelektüel bir girişim olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Kadro’nun ortaya çıkışı, Güçlü Etkiler döneminden Sınırlı Etkiler tartışmalarına geçişe denk gelir. Birçok ülkenin propaganda ağırlıklı iletişim biçimleri kullandığı bu dönemde Kadro, yalnızca bir yayın değil, devlet ideolojisini yönlendirmeyi amaçlayan bir hareket olarak kendini konumlandırmıştır. Yazarları — çoğu daha önce sosyalist düşünceyle temas etmiş kişiler — liberal kapitalizm ile ortodoks Marksizm arasında bir üçüncü yol önermiş; devletçilik, ulusal bağımsızlık ve gelişmiş–azgelişmiş ülkeler arasındaki eşitsiz ilişkiyi vurgulamıştır. Bu durum, Kadro’yu siyasal ekonomi ile iletişim alanlarının kesişim noktasına yerleştirmiştir. Bu tarihsel kesitte Kadro’nun incelenmesi, medyanın ulus-inşa süreçlerindeki işlevini anlamak açısından değerli bir bakış sunar. Medyanın siyasi gündem oluşturmaktaki rolünü, entelektüellerin kanaat önderi olarak işlevini ve iletişim kuramlarının erken Cumhuriyet bağlamında nasıl yeniden yorumlanabileceğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Kadro Dergisi, Devletçilik, Kitle İletişimi, Kadro Hareketi, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti.*

INTRODUCTION

Edward Hallet Carr, in 1941, defined the timeline between 1918 and 1938 as the period when the democratic system founded in 1789 and called social democracy today, went into crisis. This crisis was comprehensive in the political, economic, and moral fields. As a result of the political crisis, the idea of democracy that developed since the French Revolution was abandoned and dictatorships were established in most countries with a few exceptions. As a result of the economic crisis, the idea of the market was abandoned and statism practices were brought to the agenda. As a result of the moral crisis, the idea of equality of people was abandoned and racism was glorified.

As an effect of the Great Depression, probably one of the most serious crises of capitalism, countries worldwide tended to become more introverted and got into a search for “economically more protective” policies than ever before during the 1930s. According to Polanyi (2003), without any hesitation, this tendency should be considered as a result of more than five percent achieved development rates of the USSR, which had been followed by a great collectivization policy in those years. Obviously, the world encountered the current social democracy at first in those days, which gained rapid support.

Birdal (2009) mentions that 1929 as the starting year of the Great Depression was represented by indicators such as a prolonged and serious contraction in international production and trade, a deadlock in the central economies of world capitalism, and a rapid and long-term decrease in financial asset prices. However, the "size" criterion of the economic crisis did not mean to seek an alternative despite the emerging weakness of the capitalist system and the existence of the Soviet Union. In other words, the economic cause had not produced a political result. The seriousness of the crisis of the international capitalist system had led the recent policymakers to search for another system. Besides, this was the exact moment, when the debate of statism especially with the overemphasis on center-periphery dependency of the world system theorists, and with a contradiction to “class conflict”, came out.

As Karl Polanyi (2003) points out, the 1929 crisis collapsed the institutions of the 19th century and countries got introverted step by step to get closer to the protectionist statist policies. Turkey's first response had been in the direction of

more economic liberalization. Moreover, political liberalism had been brought to the agenda, as well, and a liberal party ‘Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası’ was built up right after. However, while the economies of the countries following liberal policies were rapidly shrinking, the idea of state intervention in the economy, whose intellectual foundations were laid by John Maynard Keynes in 1927, gained rapid support and economic protectionism came into the scene in the world. According to Hobsbawm, within the context of applied economic policies in the following period, social democracy (or the Rooseveltian New Deal policy in the American term) was found as a kind of marriage between economic liberalism and some permanent elements borrowed from the USSR (Hobsbawm, 1996, s. 23-24).

In the historical period when newspapers appeared, authoritarian rules of absolute monarchies prevailed throughout the world. Since private individuals as monarchical governments ruled this system, the press is seen as an ideological apparatus serving to support and develop the policies of the power. Journalists are not independent in this system or can be forced to obey government authority. In the basic principles of authoritarian theory, The Mass Media must always be dependent on established legal power, they must not oppose common political and moral values, surveillance and censorship are legitimate to enforce the above principles, and being against the authority is a criminal offense. Toprak (2020) gives Noelle Neumann’s argument, as an example of one of the advocates of the liberal theory that mass media should be protected against foreign political pressures. However, private property on mass media can only be accepted if these conditions, where the oppression was accepted, are met. Despite all these, “The first example as a propaganda tool of the Ottomans, *Takvim-i Vekayi* (Calendar of Events) of the Mahmud II, was not a newspaper blindly devoted to the government; rather it could criticize social and political events. In addition, this newspaper had a great influence in forming a public opinion for the 1839 Tanzimat Edict and advocated the transition from the traditional to the liberal structure”. Güngörmez (2002) in her work described the propaganda activities from the Ottoman Era to the recent times. The propaganda activities undertaken by the written press, changed according to the administrative structure of the period in the printing press history.

In his work on another journal ‘Forum’, Ali Somel (2010) considered 1930s’ Turkey as one of the special moments for the debate of Turkey’s statism and mentioned that in this historical phase, planning and statism were getting more important than all other debates during the establishment of the Republic. Accordingly, the growing importance was due to the lack of experience of the

1920s' Turkey in building, securing and consolidating an economy of a new Republic, respectively.

The first initiators of the debate were the former communist (excluding Şevket Süreyya Aydemir) and new Kemalist (including Şevket Süreyya Aydemir) Kadro writers. They argued that capitalism had not been well developed in Turkey. That caused capitalism to develop with the help of economic protectionism and state intervention, which could prevent the formation of classes and future class conflicts. On the other hand, "affairiste", the chiefs of İşbank, whose great capital establisher was Mustafa Kemal strongly opposed this view. He advocated the understanding of statism as a temporary economic policy that had to be implemented due to the circumstances rather than permanent statism.

In the first term of İsmet İnönü's presidency, the international policy was also reflected in the press. Europe was divided between democracies and fascism and similar differentiation was seen in the press. Tan, Vatan, Akşam and Tanin supported the front of democracies, while Tasvir-i Efkâr and other newspapers had taken a pro-German stance. Nazis in Turkey were engaged in intense propaganda with racist-nationalist ideas and had found too many supporters. Many times, the government banned newspapers for various reasons.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE KADRO JOURNAL

Şevket Süreyya Aydemir (Aydemir, 2016) explained the conditions in which the Kadro emerged as,

“Doctrinism prevailed in all Europe. Revolutionary Socialism or Communism in Russia, Fascism in Italy, Nazism in Germany and finally Reformist Socialism or reformist regimes in democratic European countries added to the struggle for communism. In other words, revolutionary socialism efforts were in motion in the nearby area. By the way, on the basis of all of them, there was doctrinism which did not have any strength in the young Republic of Turkey. For the starting point where Kadro came from, there was the question “What is the revolution?”

Kadro was known both as one of the preliminary political journals, and a serious contribution to the socio-political conjuncture of the young Republic of Turkey as an ideological framework. Aydemir (2016) stated that Kemalism was not an ‘ideology’. Due to the National Struggle process and the rapid reforms that

followed, there was not an opportunity to develop a whole ideology for the young Republic. At this point, the crew of the Kadro Journal took action to fulfill the role of developing a unique frame for the Republic and claimed that they themselves could be the actors in charge of it.

“A society that shies away from intellectual struggle is merely one that cannot find a mode of apprehending the world suitable to itself—in other words, a society incapable of producing its own IDEOLOGY.” (Kadro, 1932, p. 7).

Why Kadro had not only been a media instrument but a movement, is not an easy question and should be explained by the concepts of political economy in its unique historical circumstances. Kadro has been the source of a debate not only on an economic model but also on theories for how to develop.

Kadro does not conceptualize “planning” as a technical administrative tool but as a legitimate ideological intervention into the social flow. In its own wording, the question “is plan an external interference with the course of society, or a foreseen directive?” frames planning as doctrine rather than administration. (Kadro, 1932, p. 7).

METHODS

The time in which the Kadro Journal has been published was the phase between the two world wars accompanying the end of the Powerful Media Effects Phase and the starting of the Limited Media Effects Phase. The importance of this study comes from the fact that it allows the mass communication theories to be discussed.

Kadro was both a print medium and a political instrument closely tied to the social and historical conditions of the period. Therefore, making a mass communication discussion over it has brought us to the inadequacy of the cultural studies approach. However, a dialectical perspective within the historical materialism with political economy, especially for the effects of media phenomena during the specific historical time span is a necessity.

According to the Marxist media analysis in Arthur Asa Berger’s summary of ‘Media Analysis Techniques’, “the “base” represents the economic system found in a given society This economic system, or mode of production, influences, in profound and complicated ways, the “superstructure,” or institutions and values, of a given society.” In his discussion of superstructures, he emphasizes the public arts and media as institutions that many Marxists claim are essential to the understanding of how consciousness is determined, shaped, and manipulated. He

suggests using the Marxist concepts if they are useful for media analysis to explain things better than other perspectives (Berger, 1991, pp. 35–36).

It is not appropriate to handle this study with a single method as a context or an impact analysis. Additionally, within the scope of mass communication critical theories, cultural studies examines mostly the cultural phenomenon and the superstructure in general. Nevertheless political economy used to take up the issue from a fundamental point of view. Therefore it did not seem to be appropriate to break a ‘missionary’ journal such as *Kadro* from its historical context and interpret it with concepts of ‘ideology’ defined within the framework of the cultural studies field. This is why *Kadro* is taken with a historical or developmental perspective despite the cultural dynamics.

DISCUSSION ABOUT COMMUNICATION THEORIES:

Autonomous technology theory considered that technology has a dynamic within itself and it moves independently on its own. The period between 1830 and 1930 covered a period of Strong Influences concerning mass communication theories. In the mid-1930s, media scholars found some theories of Media Effects. The media sent the message directly to the viewer’s perception suggested to be passive in the meanwhile and recommended nothing. Due to the unhesitant reaction of the audience, the message was called the "Magic Bullet". It was assumed that the viewer directly accepts the message. Later in 1938, Lazarsfeld and Herta Herzog tested the ‘hypodermic needle theory’ during a popular comic radio broadcast, “The War of the Worlds”, by inserting a news bulletin which made a widespread reaction and panic among the American mass audience. Through this investigation, they found that the media messages should not be that much effective or may not be accepted directly. As Hardt (2001) mentioned, Lazarsfeld’s interest in methodology, combined with impact studies, contributed to the development of the field and influenced further studies.

Marshall McLuhan (2001) separated societies according to sense organs. According to him, before today’s Global Village, humanity was divided into four periods of history. For the first people living in the Tribal Age, the most important sense was ‘to hear’. With the discovery of the phonetic alphabet, the second stage, Literature Age had come and people started working with their eyes too. Then the Eye became the most important sense organ until the Age of Printing Press. In the age of discovery of printed press, first the social memory and then the public awareness seemed to begin to be built up. The society, which emerged with the printed press, seems to be the closest version of today’s means of

westernized and individualized society that evolved to an electronic society, and a Global Village, with the development of latest web technologies. Through his theory 'Medium is the Message', as a technological determinist, McLuhan (2001) considered that technology had serious effects on a fatal evolution to induce societies from the primitive forms like "tribe" to a westernized, modernized and liberal democratic nation states in history. The widespread use of shared books lost its meaning and the power of 'Eye' came to the fore, in terms of evolving into an 'individual' society where the society had been released from the dominant meaning of 'collectivity' as a social organization and people living in it got more and more isolated from the society.

In 1964, the school of cultural studies, directed by Richard Hoggart, was opened by the Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham. Stuart Hall (1999) then ran this school from 1968 to 1979. E.P. Thompson's work on British working-class culture and the evaluation of forms of resistance also formed British cultural studies. Williams, Hoggart, and Thompson explained the ups and downs of British culture as a reaction to industrialization and urbanization. Criticizing the excesses and fears of urban-industrial development, they evaluated cultural values and saw culture as a potentially positive drive that could elevate and improve people. They were anti-elitists who opposed conservative traditions of cultural criticism in England and according to them, culture was an important force of democracy. Seeing forms of cultural research as a vehicle for progressive social change, Williams and Hoggart became heavily involved in working-class education projects and turned to socialist politics. Their critiques of Americanism and mass culture paralleled, to some extent earlier criticisms of the Frankfurt school. Frankfurt school saw the working-class as destroyed and never seen as a powerful force in Germany and much of Europe during the fascist era. However, they considered the working-class, as a resource for emancipatory social change.

Adorno (1995) in his work, "Culture Industry", mentions that the cultural products of capitalism enslave people with their own consent and pleasure due to their acceptance of messages without any resistance. Adorno (1995)'s work Culture Industry and Adorno & Horkheimer "Dialectics of Enlightenment", support the theory of passivity based on the same assumption of mass media communication.

Althusser (2016) states that a certain social formation consists of three basic structures as "Economic Structure, Political Practice and Ideological Level". According to him, the oppressive apparatus of the State works by force but the ideological and oppressive apparatus of the state is not the same. They are

separate from each other. Representing the field of cultural studies, he mentions the aspect of ideological apparatuses of the state as products of popular culture, which were injecting the ‘receptor’ with and lead them to be in an exact ‘false consciousness’, as misdirecting society to be “consumer society”. As there is not any economic mechanism that needs to be survived, ideology had been taken as a neutral leading mechanism of the “powerful someone” from the discipline of ‘cultural studies’.

In the current sense, the media agenda can influence the public agenda by creating new values and influencing the opinions of the masses through opinion leaders, and the public agenda can influence the political agenda through interest groups. In other words, the media determines the public agenda and the political agenda, but from time to time it can be influenced by these agendas.

On the other hand, the scholars working on the effect of media in democracies and media ethics argue that media has the power for disclosure and is a seeking tool for right. According to that, considering the media as the fourth power, it is clear that this function is not a "truth-reflecting" function envisaged by liberal understanding or a "distorting tool" position as suggested by Marxist and critical studies. The function seen in this case is located within the spectrum of intermediary systems that play a role in the reconstruction of the socio-political structure in the axis of the projected society design and in the production of political change, in relation to the processing of the 'truth'.

Toprak (2020) compiled criticisms in the field of cultural studies in her work. She first states Garnham's critics about the power issue. The problem in this area is that the source of this power is generally uncertain. The cultural studies literature plays a lot with the word 'power'. This uncertainty regarding power, structures and practices of domination leads to the same uncertainty regarding resistance. Then, she emphasizes Stuart Hall (1999)'s work relates the lack of cultural studies to connect with history. Finally, Grossberg (1998)'s idea of cultural studies began to be valuable behind the rejection of historical materialism is highlighted.²⁷ Although the printed press has always been a source of debate on liberty, the problem when Kadro had emerged, was not the same. It was the time of the authoritarian regimes historically when Kadro was born, but Kadro should not be considered as a tool of existing oppression of that period. While the circumstances of emerging nation-states contain the use of authoritarian instruments in history, Turkey was in a struggle for ‘independency’ and, Kadro seemed like a tool to carry this struggle into the framework of ‘political-economy, as an actor of the young Republic of Turkey.

Toprak expresses her opinion about the method in communication studies via giving references to the explanatory Marxist, developmental and critical theories of mass communication, considering it with its differences from liberal theories, which are not sufficient (Toprak, 2020, s.30). In my opinion, we should handle these views in order to conduct a method discussion on the roles of the media in general.

For the specific time span where the Republic of Turkey was emerging as a nation-state with its new economy and production system to be established, the media served for the society to be transformed and the society to be evolved to a new shape. It includes the functions of the societal institutions, in specific economic institutions with the help of a specific media. Especially, in economic articles, they used to stress the differences of Turkey's conventions from both liberalism in first world countries and socialism in others. The most underlined fact that Turkey should not be a part of both two strict ideological sides, the idea of a third way, has origins from an idiomatic underdeveloped country nationalism, such as Galiev Ecole.

In the example of Turkey, on the other hand, Kadro was an actor for both reshaping the society and the economic institutions in it, during the systematic turn of the 'modes of the production's into a new integrated economy enabling a non-class society by the discourse on "third way". As a new definition of 'development' for Turkey, the 'third way', shaping the economy as a mixture of liberal and socialist methods by melting it in a protecting policy without being dependent on any certain ideology. Even though Kadro intellectuals are old members of the Turkish Communist Party, they never tend to express their ideologies via Kadro. Kadro was taken as a serious part to establish the new state.

AN ANALYSIS ON THE KADRO JOURNAL IN THE CONTEXT OF MASS COMMUNICATION:

Kadro Journal was published monthly, by a group of intellectuals including Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, İsmail Hüsrev Tökin, Vedat Nedim Tör, Burhan Asaf Belge and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, between January 1932 and January 1935 as 36 issues. It had undertaken as a duty the mission to provide an ideological framework to the existing regime, arguing that the revolution had not ended up yet. It seems that the journal had a serious effect on the formation of the Turkish State ideology as well on the intellectual life of newly constituted Turkey as a Republic.

In 1932, Kadro journal had started to be published with the slogan “Never Ending Revolution”. Unlike others, the journal decided to end its publication after three years. Nevertheless, both liberal and socialist audiences have criticized Kadro movement a lot in left and academic circles. In some critics, it had been argued that Kadro did not have an effective actor. The intellectuals published Kadro were former members of the Turkish Communist Party except Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, and they later became the writers of the journal.

“Turkey is in the midst of a revolution. This revolution has not come to a halt. The massive upheavals we have seen and all the actions we have taken up to this point are only a part of it. We've experienced an uprising. The uprising is the revolution's tool, not its objective. Had we remained at the stage of that insurrection, our revolution would have stagnated. Yet it is expanding and deepening. It has not yet spoken its final word, nor has it delivered its final creation. Our movement must continue toward deeper and growth if the Turkish society of future is to build its own structure—on level ground, appropriate to itself, and loyal to its essence.” (Kadro, 1932, p. 3).

In this sense, it has been found worthy of being examined as an original publication. We should mention that it was chosen because it was probably the most criticized publication during the foundation period. It should be considered as an economic suggestion for a new regime of the Republic of Turkey conferring a “Third Way”. Since it has taken many heavy criticisms from both orthodox Marxists and liberal bourgeois democrats at the same time, it has been found worthy studying and its effect was found worthy to be discussed on different wings. In the context of impact analysis, it should be mentioned that the debate on the regime itself was treated as an effect. It has been taken into consideration as among the most effective elements of a nationalization process and that means it was among the actors of this process.

Their suggestion was economically ‘statism’ as ‘third way’ coming both from a nationalist and a socialist regime, and it reminded the attitudes of the Sultan Galiyev. Kadro movement may be defined neither for the side of liberal social democracy, nor fascistic autocracy but it also criticized Orthodox Marxism mentioning that the motor force of history was the contradiction between developed and underdeveloped countries rather than the classes. The contradiction was between neither the classes nor the employer and employees, but the main contradiction was between the colonies and the colonizing countries. Kadro mentioned that all the other ideologies including Marxism were European-

centered ideologies whereas the hidden unequal economic relationships took place between the West and the East. The analysis of this relationship might be found in the Sultan Galiyev's approach. In this sense, nearly all Kadro intellectuals had the similar idea that the real contradiction should be found out from the dependency relationship between two different versions of working classes, coming from two different versions of countries with different economic circumstances and production systems, which they defined as "metropolitan productive western countries and non-productive eastern colonies". Where the original idea of 'center-periphery dependency' between the imperialist countries and their colonies with raw material warehouse and source of cheap labor was coming from might be another debate. However most of the critical economists defined it as "dependency" like how we mentioned above, arguing that the interest of the metropolitan proletariat should be dependent on disadvantages of the working class of the colonial country. Thus, at the end of the debate, according to the most of the Kadro intellectuals, the motor force of history could never be only the "class". Because there should be different kinds and versions of classes from both different sources and interests of the center and the periphery notion. Firat mentioned that, Kadro reminded of Wallerstein's World's Systems Theory, years before him, and argued that Kadro intellectuals were as important as Furtado, Amin, Frank, Curtaso, Wallerstein, some important and well known critical theoreticians all over the world in economy (2004, ss.34-37).

Kadro was not side either with liberalism or Marxism but it categorized them both as west-oriented perspectives. According to the journal, the new Republic of Turkey should have neither the Marxist nor the liberal infrastructures. On the other hand, although Kadro movement was critical of the Marxist school and rejected the class conflict, it considered fascism as the dark side of imperialism and stood against it. While emphasizing the unequal economic relationship between the West and the East, Kadro became also against liberal democracy and proposed a third way (mixed economy) rather than all the other Eurocentric perspectives. As we mentioned above, it also opposed the internationalism of the working class arguing that there was not any single common interest for the workers all over the world if they came from different sources of production systems of different countries. According to the Kadro 'staff', the revolution strategy they built on the basic conflict could be the 'Eastern Revolution Strategy'. There is no such thing as working-class internationalism, according to them. Since the conditions of production are unequal all over the world's different production systems, particularly between the industrialist West and the agricultural and raw-material countries of the East where the classes have not been formed yet because capitalist production was underdeveloped. It was

difficult to speak of the working class totally as the oppressed class, since capitalist production was not adequate. The Kadro movement proposed a revolution strategy against imperialism, which it called the National Liberation Project for Turkey.

Kadro has at times been effective on CHF, and even some of Şevket Süreyya's thoughts were included in the CHF program. While putting forward this thesis, Yanardağ says "It is not clear who influences whom" and states that the idiosyncratic ideology of the Kadro was actually affected by the statism perspective followed by the government.

Kadro gave us a hint to grasp the circumstances and concrete official ideology of the modern Turkish Republic, with its consensus with the regime on 'economic protectionism' until the contradiction with the chiefs of İşbank. Therefore, this study should be taken as a discussion of mass media through the concepts of political economy within the context of historical power relations, during the phase between the two Limited Media Effects which followed the Strong Effects Phase. Unlike the suggestion of 'one flow communication' within the Strong Effects Phase, in this case, the receivers were also actors of the communication and gave feedback. Therefore, the process of communication maintaining through this medium, may be defined as the 'two-step flow of communication'. Although being media intellectuals, since the Kadro writers were on a mission to convey and carry on the economic policies and ideology to the public, they may even be counted as 'opinion leaders' of their times.

CONCLUSION

The period between the two world wars marks a crucial historical moment in which mass communication theories shifted from the Powerful Effects paradigm toward the emerging Limited Effects perspective. Early models such as the magic bullet and hypodermic needle theories rooted in the assumption that media messages directly shape public attitudes Lasswell 1927 McQuail 2010 dominated the intellectual climate of the 1930s. However the empirical work of Lazarsfeld Berelson and Gaudet followed later by Katz's two step flow model demonstrated that audiences were far from passive; instead they interpreted messages through interpersonal networks and opinion leaders Lazarsfeld and Katz 2005.

Kadro stands precisely at the intersection of these paradigmatic transitions. On one hand the journal functioned as an instrument aligned with the ideological orientation of the early Turkish Republic and can partially be understood through the Powerful Effects model. On the other hand its production by a small but

influential circle of intellectuals positions it within the Limited Effects perspective where media influence is mediated by elite actors who operate as opinion leaders. As such Kadro cannot be fully captured by a single theoretical model; rather it embodies a hybrid communicative structure in which both direct ideological transmission and elite mediated interpretation coexist.

Within this framework mass communication in early Republican Turkey operated not only as a vehicle for disseminating modernization ideology but also as a platform for intellectual deliberation among state elites. Drawing on Habermas's concept of the public sphere Habermas 1989 Kadro can be viewed as a semi public arena in which the principles of national development statism and modern citizenship were articulated debated and refined albeit within a restricted elite driven communicative environment rather than an open participatory sphere. Its communicative practices contributed to the formation of a proto public sphere where political legitimacy economic orientation and national identity were discursively produced. In this respect the journal helped establish what Habermas would describe as the rational critical foundations of the new polity even as these processes unfolded within a hierarchical political culture.

Ultimately Kadro illustrates how the temporal convergence between the emergence of the Turkish Republic as a nation state and the theoretical transition from Powerful to Limited Effects approaches offers a unique analytical lens for understanding the early Republic. This overlap allows the formative years of Turkish modernization to be interpreted not merely as political or institutional developments but as communicative processes through which media shaped supported and at times redefined the ideological foundations of the new state. In this sense the Kadro case demonstrates the value of reading early Republican history through mass communication theories and highlights the central role of media in constructing national identity political legitimacy and modern subjectivity.

Therefore Kadro's significance cannot be confined to either propaganda theory or the limited effects paradigm. It functioned as a strategic node where ideological production elite consensus and communicative power intersected. Its influence operated on two analytically distinct levels: while mass communication projected modernization ideology to broader publics Kadro simultaneously served as an intellectual laboratory in which the ideological and political coordinates of the new nation state were theorized contested and refined. This dual structure reveals that the evolution of the early Republic cannot be

understood without analyzing the communicative symbolic and ideological mechanisms that underpinned its formation.

In conclusion Kadro invites a broader historiographical reflection: the early Turkish Republic can be reinterpreted as a project in which state formation and ideological construction proceeded through intertwined communicative processes. Mass communication theory when integrated with political economy ideology critique and public sphere theory emerges not as a peripheral lens but as an indispensable analytical framework for understanding the socio political trajectory of the Republic. This raises the deeper question of whether the early Republic itself may be conceptualized as an intellectual movement a question whose scope and theoretical implications merit independent scholarly investigation.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. (2007). *Kültür Endüstrisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Althusser, L. (2016). *İdeoloji Ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları*. İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Aydemir, Ş. S. (2016). *Tek Adam: Mustafa Kemal 1881–1919*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Bal, Z. E. (2011). *Debate Of Statism During Construction Of Turkish Modern Republic: The Experience Of Kadro (1932–1934)* (Master's thesis). İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Bal, Z. E. (2017). *Yükseköğretimde Dijitalleşmenin Uzaktan Öğrenime Etkileri* (Doctoral dissertation). İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Belge, B. A. (1933–1934). Bir yılbaşı bilançosu. *Kadro Aylık Fikir Mecmuası*, 3.
- Berger, A. A. (1991). *Media Analysis Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Birdal, A. (2009). Tarihsel bir referans olarak 1929 krizi ve büyük bunalım. *Gelenek*, (103). Retrieved February 14, 2021
- Carr, E. H. (1941). *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939*. Retrieved February 2, 2021
- Durmuş, N., Erdoğan, İ., & Keloğlu-İşler, E. (n.d.). Kitle iletişiminde pozitivist ampirik geleneğin kuruluşu: Lazarsfeld ve yönetsel araştırmalar. Retrieved February 3, 2021

Fırat, G. (2004). (Review of *Kadro Seçmeler*). İstanbul: İleri Yayınları (No. 31), Engin Yayıncılık. ISBN 975-6288-22-1.

Grossberg, L. (1998). Kültürel çalışmalar ekonomi politığe karşı. *Teori ve Politika*, (9).

Güngörmez, B. (2002). Kitle iletişim araçları, siyaset ve propaganda. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(3).

Hall, S. (1999). İdeolojinin yeniden keşfi: Medya çalışmalarında baskı altında tutulmanın geri dönüşü. İçinde *Medya, İktidar, İdeoloji* (pp. 45–67). Ankara: Ark Yayınevi.

Hardt, H. (1992). *Critical Communication Studies: Communication, History, And Theory In America*. New York: Routledge.

Hardt, H. (2001). *Social Theories Of The Press: Constituents Of Communication Research, 1840s To 1920s*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hobsbawm, E. (1996). *Kısa 20. Yüzyıl (1914–1991): Aşırılıklar Çağı*. İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi.

Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1995). *Aydınlanmanın Diyalektiği (Cilt 1)*. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

Jowett, G. S., & O'Donnell, V. (1992). *Propaganda And Persuasion (2nd ed.)*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kadro. (1932). *Kadro*, 1(1), 3. <https://digitale-sammlungen.ulb.uni-bonn.de/ulbbnioa/periodical/pageview/3165941>

Kadro. (1932). *Kadro*, 1(4), 7. <https://digitale-sammlungen.ulb.uni-bonn.de/ulbbnioa/periodical/pageview/>

Katz, E. (1957). The two-step flow of communication: An up-to-date report on an hypothesis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 21(1), 61–78.

Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. (2005). *Personal Influence: The Part Played By People In The Flow Of Mass Communications*. New York: Routledge.

Koloğlu, O. (1986). Osmanlı basını: İçeriği ve rejimi. İçinde *Tanzimattan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Araştırmaları I*. İstanbul.

McLuhan, M. (1967). Now the medium is the message. *The New York Times*. Retrieved August 4, 2018.

McLuhan, M., & Powers, B. R. (2001). *Global Köy: 21. Yüzyılda Yeryüzü Yaşamında Ve Medyada Meydana Gelecek Dönüşümler*. İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık.

Paçacı, İ. (2013). *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Yönetim Ve Medyanın Dönüşümü*. Ankara: Akademi Titiz Yayınları.

Polanyi, K. (2003). *Büyük Dönüşüm: Çağımızın Sosyal Ve Ekonomik Kökenleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Somel, A. (2010). Devletçilik ve planlama tartışmalarına damga vuran Forum dergisi. *Yazılama*.

Şahin, E., & Acar Şentürk, Z. (2018). Gündem oluşturma teorisi bağlamında özel günleri konu alan reklamların analizi. *International Journal Of Social Sciences And Education Research*, 4, 698–720.

Timisi, N. (2003). *Yeni İletişim Teknolojileri Ve Demokrasi*. Ankara: Dost Yayınları.

Toprak, S. (2020). İletişim kuramları üzerine. *Teori Ve Politika*, (11). Retrieved February 3, 2021

Tümertekin, A. (1976). *Idéologie Et Appareils Idéologiques D'État (Notes Pour Une Recherche)*. Paris: Éditions Sociales.

Wayne, M. (2006). *Marksizm ve Medya Araştırmaları: Anahtar Kavramlar, Çağdaş Eğilimler*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Atıf İçin: Bal, Z. E. (2026). A Debate On Mass Communication Theories: Kadro Journal As An Example, *Yeni Medya Elektronik Dergisi*, 10 (2), 402-418.