

The intellectual legacy of the *Kadro* movement in retrospect

Eyüp Özveren

Middle East Technical University, 06531 Ankara, Turkey.

Abstract

This paper starts with a brief account of the main tenets of transformation as of the 1960s in the social sciences with specific reference to Latin American Studies and the Middle East Studies. Whereas the former witnessed the emergence of the Dependency School, the latter was characterized by an interdisciplinary civilisational approach. It is argued that the Turkish *Kadro* movement developing in response to the Great Depression had already progressed along these lines and had successfully linked the two approaches as early as in the 1930s. The theoretical originality of the *Kadro* is attributed to its re-reading of Marxism in the light of the turn-of-the-century German social science. *Kadro's* political meaning as an intellectual movement of the elite is reassessed. It is argued that *Kadro* deviated radically from the basic commitments of the Kemalist regime only within the realm of international relations.

1. An overview of the academic landscape

The 1960s witnessed not only a worldwide wave of social unrest but also a concomitant renewal in the social sciences. The New Left brought about a rejuvenation of Marxism that was bound to affect the institutional parameters of the social sciences. Attempts to accommodate the various Marxian approaches within academia necessitated the further renegotiation of disciplinary boundaries. Having found for themselves an hospitable environment, novel interdisciplinary approaches changed the academic

landscape. The orthodoxies of the post-War era came to face outright challenges. In the midst of all, modernization theory was confronted by the *Dependencia* School within the context of Latin American studies (Bernstein, 1973; Kay, 1989). Cross fertilization of a rejuvenated Marxian approach with a diversity of traditions characterized this new perspective. The *Dependencia* School comprised figures such as Furtado (1964), Frank (1969), together with Cardoso and Faletto (1979). This school saw peripheral underdevelopment as an inevitable structural consequence of development in the core zones of the world economy. According to the *Dependencia* theorists, as long as the phenomenon of unequal exchange favoring exporters of manufactured goods over exporters of raw materials persisted, thanks to their already distorted class structures within which the interests of the large landowners coincided with those of a *comprador* bourgeoisie, Latin American states could only expect to remain trapped within their peripheral position in the global system. While the *Dependencia* approach had deep roots within the Marxist tradition linking it back to the legacy of influential figures such as Luxemburg (1971), it certainly represented a radical break with "official" Marxism.

During the same period, within the realm of Middle Eastern scholarship, there emerged a number of scholars who were inspired by, yet did not fail to part ways with the orthodoxies of, the Marxist approach. The most prominent such names were Abdel-Malek (1963), Laroui (1974), Said (1978), and Amin (1970, 1988). Unlike their Latin American counterparts who focused on underdevelopment with the notable exception of Paz (1961), their concerns were much more diversified and culturally oriented¹. This could be explained with the lesser colonial heritage of the Middle East and its persistently greater cultural hiatus with the West. Abdel-Malek addressed himself to the discursive and institutional limitations of orientalism (Abdel-Malek, 1981), only to proceed to his conception of civilisational projects by way of a focus on stateness and nationality (Abdel-Malek, 1981), the latter a much neglected theme in Marxism. Laroui sought to trespass the limitations of the so-called scientific Marxism by revitalizing a historical materialism in dialogue with the specificities of the Arab world (Laroui, 1974). Amin, the most prolific of all, contributed to the development of a comprehensive world-system approach built upon the premises of the *Dependencia* theory (Amin, 1970).

¹ The developments within the fields of study of Latin America and the Middle East were parallel, part and parcel of the same global context, but with a difference of emphasis and scope largely to be explained by the regional specificities of each. Even when Paz (1961) raised the questions of identity, he differed from his Middle Eastern counterparts who approached this question as a political and not merely a philosophical problem.

He came to single out the policy of de-linking as the alternative course to be taken up by the newly independent revolutionary states. He eventually ventured into the realm of Eurocentrism as an historical and cultural context, a research area that had already been opened up by Abdel-Malek and Said (Amin, 1988). All of this was new to the Middle East Studies.

The overall move from cultural specificity, by way of a critique of orientalism, to the paradigm of civilisational projects characterized a contribution which the unconventional social scientists working within the domain of Middle East Studies were to make to contemporary interdisciplinary social theory. The original emphasis on cultural specificity was the result of an impulse to explain why the modernization-minded economic theories of development failed to account for the Middle Eastern transformation. By bringing back in the cultural factors, the groundwork was prepared for an interdisciplinary approach. In the second stage, a further reflection on the dominant perceptions of Middle Eastern culture shed light on the numerous assumptions stemming from the orientalist bias of the academic establishment. Hence, a critique of orientalism as envisaged by Said served to reject the particular ways in which Middle Eastern culture were characterized as a negative image of the West. With Samir Amin, Said's orientalism was converted into the localized effect of the dominant Eurocentrism of the Western world. Whereas within the domain of the *Dependencia*, underdevelopment in the Third World was the effect of development in the core zones of the world economy, within Amin's perspective, orientalism in the Middle East happened to become the effect of Eurocentrism systematically exercised by the West on a world-scale. It is only with the further crystallization of Abdel-Malek's work that the theme of cultural specificity has been re-worked into a positive mould. The idea of a world historically composed of geographical zones characterized by different and competing civilisational thrusts has harvested the legacy of not only Arnold Toynbee, and Joseph Needham, but also Fernand Braudel. The critical idea is that our world is not only a compendium of economies absorbed into a presumably single division of labor but also a host to civilisational thrusts of differential power endowments. Historical civilisational attributes can be revitalized as positive projects of reconstruction that will serve to re-dress the inequalities of power in the global system. Linking cultural specificity to power struggle on a world-scale in the above sense serves to politicize the otherwise "anthropological" notion of culture. It is because of such linkages that the paradigm of civilisational projects is necessarily interdisciplinary in the academic sense (Abdel-Malek, 1977).

A further attribute of these new intellectual challenges need to be mentioned. By and large, this intellectual renewal came about within the context of diaspora scholarship as far as the Middle East Studies is concerned. This encouraged free intellectual borrowing especially within the conducive Western environment. It also meant that this scholarship, devoid of an immediate realm where its policy prescriptions could be put into effect, in other words by being excluded from the circles exercising state power, could concentrate less on specific pressing problems and more on broader issues. To this day, the various works of the above-mentioned authors represent the best of the original tradition invented in response to the crisis of the 1968-1973, that came to usher an era of major structural changes in the modern world.

2. A developmentalist response to the Great Depression

Within the context of the previous global crisis, namely during the era of the Great Depression, a small number of Turkish intellectuals had pressed for an original interpretation of Marxist approach in order to better understand the circumstances they found themselves in, and to prescribe developmental economic and social policies to the newly created Turkish nation-state. Unlike the diaspora Middle Eastern scholars of the 1960s, they worked within the confines of their nation-state, but also within reach of state power, hence they could not avoid being practically oriented. Nevertheless, there exists a close resemblance between their approach and that of their successors to follow many decades later. It is the contention of this paper that the *Kadro* movement deserves credit as one of the earliest instances of a Marxian-inspired authentic intellectual movement in the Middle East and therefore has to be given its due place in future intellectual histories which will hopefully take as their field of vision the entire region. The reason why the *Kadro* movement has not been given due attention has to do with the fact that, because of their defection to the ranks of the Kemalist regime, they had been censored as renegades by the orthodox Marxist circles while at the same time remaining suspect in the eyes of the establishment given their leftist leanings. Hopefully the new global context will prove itself more favorable to a reassessment of theoretical positions independently of ideological rigidities.

Kadro was a monthly journal thirty-six issues of which were regularly published between January 1932 and January 1935 (Alpar, 1978, 1979, 1980). It was put out by a handful of intellectuals organized under the leadership of Şevket Süreyya (Aydemir). The hard core membership consisted of Yakup Kadri (Karaosmanoğlu), Vedat Nedim (Tör), İsmail Hüsrev (Tökin) and

Burhan Asaf (Belge). In addition to the periodical, the *Kadro* published two books, namely, *İnkılap ve Kadro* (The Revolution and the Cadre, 1932) by Şevket Süreyya, the revised text of a lecture that had set out the principles for the journal and the movement, and *Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatı* (The Rural Economy of Turkey, 1934), an exemplary analysis of the Turkish countryside. During the same period, Yakup Kadri published his novel, *Ankara* (1934) which occupies a unique place in Turkish literature as the manifestation of the *Kadro* approach to literary aesthetics as well as for its depiction of the utopia that motivated the movement. This text also provided an indirect critique of the social and political system as it existed then.

On the whole, the *Kadro* intellectuals were distinguished by their self-discipline and consistency. The journal abounds in cross-references among the works of participants. As such, the authors conceived their works as parts of a whole that would manifest itself gradually in the nature of the journal and the movement thereof. This was so despite the fact that *Kadro* authors came to converge within the sphere of influence of Kemalism from varied backgrounds. Whereas Şevket Süreyya proceeded by way of Panturkism and Bolshevism, and shared with Ismail Hüsrev the experience of having lived in post-revolutionary Moscow, Vedat Nedim and Burhan Asaf had studied in Germany during the most lively era of political struggles. Unlike the above names who had been involved in or influenced by the revolutionary movements of their time, Yakup Kadri belonged to the literary *avant-garde* and later formed the link between the *Kadro* and the presidential circles that sanctioned its publication.

Had it not been for the specificity of Turkey as a newly-formed nation-state under the throes of the Great Depression, the intersection of such diverse biographies could have hardly come about, let alone amounting to a rigorous movement distinguished by theoretical originality. Conscious of this fact, the *Kadro* authors proceeded with a comprehensive analysis of the Great Depression that demonstrates a synthesis of the state-of-the-art literature in major European languages on crisis as a structural and not as merely a conjunctural phenomenon (1932, I: 17-18).

3. The originality of the theoretical achievement

Having noted that the *Dependencia* succeeded the *Kadro* by several decades, a contemporary re-presentation of the *Kadro* theses poses the probable problem of anachronism. In other words, retrospectively, any re-presentation as we intend that seeks to emphasize the parallel among the two approaches may resort for the sake of simplicity and better illustration to the categories and concepts deployed by the *Dependencia*. Hence, not only that the conceptual originality of the *Kadro* may be lost, but also its theoretical content may even be affected. Truly, for example, whereas the *Kadro* spoke of a metropolises-colonies conflict, the *Dependencia* referred to the core-periphery conflict. Obviously, not all peripheries are, by definition, colonies. The latter category emphasizes the attribute of a political domination absent from the former. However, some consolation can be found in the fact that given the historical parameters of the period when the *Kadro* theses were advanced, bulk of the periphery consisted of colonies. More importantly, the key concepts of the *Dependencia* were clarified only in the course of time. As a matter of fact, conceptual pluralism among the *Dependencia* ranks survived right to the point of maturity of the school in the early 1970s. So much so, that conceptual rigour was only enforced with the arrival on scene of post-*Dependencia* approaches such as the world-system analysis. Hence, what characterized the *Dependencia* was not the persistence through time of a body of analytical concepts. Quite the contrary, the *Dependencia*'s insistence on staying away from the vocabulary of orthodox Marxism and its reluctance to deploy systematically a rigorously-defined set of concepts deserve emphasis (Kay, 1989).

In much the same way, the *Kadro* authors sought to stay away from the classical *concepticon* of orthodox Marxism and work with a loose body of concepts they compiled or created which they thought would serve their interests best. Hence, both schools emphasized the priority of relations over conceptual categories. According to both, concepts could only be of use if they could capture the spirit of the social relationships within which they were embedded. Hence, today, a standard presentation of the *Dependencia* seemingly does as much injustice to previous works conceived within the same paradigm as would do a re-presentation of the *Kadro* theses in terms of the standardized concepts of the dependency literature. However, when the emphasis is shifted, as it should be, from a narrow focus on the concepts to the specific relations the two schools sought to explain, the parallelism becomes imminent. For this reason, we can legitimately proceed with a standard summary of the *Kadro* theses by recourse to the dependency

concepticon.

Of the numerous writings of the *Kadro* authors one can surmise the following general line of argument. They rejected both free-tradist *laissez-faire* economics and multi-party democracy as institutional expressions of the disintegrating world order. This order, in their view, was characterized by unequal exchange between the metropolises and the colonies. Consequential asymmetry between the two zones had made the West the sole beneficiary of that order which could host exclusively industry and democracy. According to the *Kadro*, the center-periphery contradiction was more important than class contradiction that had shaped Marxist thinking. Marxism, by applying historical materialism to class-divided European societies had arrived at the conclusion of the necessity of a proletarian revolution. However this was a localized version of historical materialist analysis. A rejuvenated historical materialism as they advocated, when applied to the global contradiction would lead to radically different conclusions and thereby explain the primacy of national liberation movements of which Turkey constituted the first historical example of worldwide significance.

The above approach echoes the influence of Mir Sait Sultan-Galiyev, the Tartar national communist of the early Soviet era. Suspicious of the prospects of a European revolution, Sultan-Galiyev insisted that even if the revolutionary wave were to spread in the West, it would still fall short of resolving the conflict between the industrialized core and the agrarian periphery inscribed in a global division of labor. However, if the social momentum were channeled to the underdeveloped world, the outcome would be very different:

"Deprived of the East, and torn away from India, Afghanistan, Persia and the other of its Asian and African colonies, Western European imperialism will be obliged to wither and die its own natural death." (Sultan-Galiyev, 1982: 11)

As early as 1918, Sultan-Galiyev had argued that the national awakening in the periphery was tantamount to a socialist revolution:

"Since almost all classes in Muslim society have been oppressed formerly by the colonialists, all are entitled to be called proletarian. . . It is therefore legitimate to affirm that the national movement in the Muslim countries is, in character, a socialist revolution" (quoted in Bennigsen and Lemerrier-Quelquejay, 1967: 112).

Given the striking parallelism of analysis and the fact that some prominent *Kadro* members had been in Bakü and Moscow where Sultan-Galiyev's views circulated, it is hard to believe that at least indirectly they had not come under the influence of this so-called "Tartar communism".

In the view of the *Kadro* authors, the Great Depression which crippled the Western economies and international trade, offered a golden opportunity for Turkey to appropriate Western technology and institute it within the context of an autarchic planned economy. With this conclusion they prefigured an argument of *Dependencia* in favor of de-linking many decades earlier. Hence within a new social system that they characterized as *étatisme*, Turkey could achieve economic development and set an example for other colonies to follow by appropriating Western technology without the class contradiction with which it had historically coincided. In their view, the nation-state meant an economic space characterized by a single division of labor, and the eventual interaction of such nation-states would provide the building blocks of a new world order. From *étatisme*, *Kadro* understood something more than mere economic planning. It was a comprehensive organic social and political system that formed an alternative to capitalist liberalism or fascism on the one hand, and Soviet-style communism on the other. Far from being a distant echo of the Soviet example, *Kadro's étatisme* was very much shaped by the Weberian and Sombartian theories of the tendency towards the rational organization of society. We could say that whereas the Russians had once discussed the possibility of skipping the stage of capitalism in transition from an agrarian to a communist society, *Kadro* raised the possibility of skipping class-divided capitalism by transition from a primarily agrarian to an industrial rational society.

It would have been sufficient for *Kadro* to gain recognition for the originality of their thought, even if they did not go beyond the above conclusion at which they had arrived by way of a rejuvenated historical materialism informed by turn-of-the-century German scholarship. However, Şevket Süreyya went a step further when he wrote an article on the theme of the liquidation of Eurocentrism (Aydemir, 1932). He argued in this article that the then globally dominant vision of history sought to fit the rest of the world into the straightjacket of the European past². Hence policy prescriptions derived from social sciences infused with Eurocentrism were bound to fail when applied elsewhere precisely because they were localized in their very scope, that is, they were, paraphrasing Amin and Abdel-Malek, civilization-

² This emphasis on the vision of history coincided with the debates over the formulation of an 'official' Turkish thesis on history (Behar, 1992). The *Kadro* authors welcomed this re-thinking of history without necessarily taking part in it. Unlike the ideologically-distorted 'official' thesis that has not stood the test of time and has sometimes become an object of ridicule because of its extremities, the *Kadro* argument embedding a vision of history within the framework of historical materialism remains to this day a strong and sound theoretical position.

specific. Therefore, the vision of history of the coming age had to reverse the role of Europe and the world, and demonstrate the European history as a province of a broader and much more diversified world history. This linking of the global contradiction of world capitalism with a distorted vision of history prefigured what Amin would eventually seek to achieve in his impressive work, *Eurocentrisme* (1988). Hence *Kadro* had the ingredients of both the *Dependencia* approach characteristic of Latin America, and the civilisational approach characteristic of the Middle East. Moreover, *Kadro* fused the two together as early as in the 1930s. This, I believe, is the crowning achievement of the *Kadro* movement in the theoretical realm.

4. The impasse of politics: National or international?

Politically speaking, *Kadro* argued that a vanguard was needed to work out the theoretical significance of the Turkish Revolution and to generate the enthusiasm for the proposed path of state-centered development. Obviously, the participants of the *Kadro* movement saw themselves as the intellectual core of this vanguard. Given the existence of a single political party, no one was willing to surrender such a critical role to a group of outsiders such as the *Kadro* authors, especially to those many of whom as former communists had not taken an active part in the War of Independence. In any case, *Kadro's* above political proposal as a reiteration of the mainstream tendency of its time towards authoritarian regimes deserves no credit for originality. Nor could *Kadro* be too harshly blamed for being only as at fault as other anti-systemic movements including the *Dependencia* to come many decades later.

More significantly, *Kadro's* position serves to bring up the question of the role of intelligentsia in society and in relation to the state. *Kadro* argued that Turkish society had not yet entered into the path of class polarization as a consequence of industrial development. Hence, the state could still become a developmental instrument of entire society and the intellectuals could readily enter into its service. The traditional Gramscian distinction between traditional and organic intellectuals would not hold true for the *Kadro* case (Tekeli and İlkin, 1984: 44). Paraphrasing their position, the intelligentsia could be as independent of social classes as the traditional intellectuals but still be organic to the state process that ought to penetrate deep into society.

As an intellectual movement, *Kadro* sought itself a leading position within the intelligentsia. The priority given to the media by choosing to organize around a journal within the context of a differentiated press (1932, I, 9: 3) together with an article touching on the role of the national radio (1932, I, 3: 5-10) reflect the *Kadro's* consciousness of the importance of

institutions for the intelligentsia. Furthermore, *Kadro* brought into debate major power outlets for the intelligentsia such as universities. At a time when *Kadro* provided a lively platform for the debate of pressing social and economic problems, the universities were characterized by the hegemony of outdated theories and inertia. Hence *Kadro* took part in an attack on universities leading to their eventual reform. *Kadro's* critique of university professors as 'economists of the chair' semantically resounds the once German criticisms by also the Left of reform-minded historicists as *Kathedersozialisten*, 'socialists of the (professorial) chair' (Ashley, 1899), a phenomenon to which the German-educated contributors of *Kadro* were no strangers³. On the whole, while failing to win over institutional settings, the *Kadro* nevertheless did have impact on the reshuffling of the intelligentsia.

Kadro stopped its publication under the instructions of the higher circles of the state that had once authorized it. Some have argued that the private sector lobby was disturbed by *Kadro's* extreme *etatisme* while others cite the disaffection of political cadres to the formation of a rival ideological nucleus outside their control (Ertan, 1994: 65-73). On the whole, neither of these factors, nor their combined effect, would have necessarily sufficed sooner or later to bring the *Kadro* movement to an end. *Kadro* did not deviate radically from the official policy of the Kemalist regime except in one respect that has so far been overlooked. *Kadro* insisted that Turkey play a leadership role for the national liberation movements and help bring about the final resolution of the center-periphery conflict that would give way to a new international order⁴. To put it differently, *Kadro* sought Turkey to assume the leadership of the Third World at a time when the Third World had not yet emerged in the international scene. The Kemalist regime was determined to pursue *Realpolitik* rather than engage itself in risky adventures. Having fully taken the lessons of the First World War, the Kemalist regime was prepared to embark upon an experimentation of small-sized state politics that would eventually attain its mature form in the highly successful international politics of 'active neutrality' during the Second World War (Weisband, 1973; Deringil, 1989). The conception of international relations constituted the one instance in which *Kadro* and the Kemalist regime genuinely parted ways.

³ While several articles addressed the problem of academic economics, the most substantive critique was presented by a German-educated author from the academia (Etem, 1933).

⁴ *Kadro's* enthusiasm in this respect is most manifest in an imaginary scenario of a 592th international conference designed to come to terms with the global crisis of 1929, disrupted by the irreconcilable and hence revolutionary proclamation of the Turkish representative (Asaf, 1932).

With the world rolling towards another war, as was obvious to both the regime in power and the *Kadro* writers, this difference would inevitably prove to be of vital importance.

References

- ABDEL-MALEK, A. (1963), "Orientalism in Crisis", *Diogenes*, 44: 102-140.
- (1977), "East Wind: The Historical Position of the Civilizational Project", *Review*, 1: 57-64.
- (1981), *Social Dialectics*, London: Macmillan (first published in 1972).
- ALPAR, C. (1978, 1979, 1980), *Kadro*, Tıpkıbasım, Üç Cilt, Ankara: Ankara İktisadi ve Ticari İlimler Akademisi, 1932, 1933, 1934.
- AMİN, S. (1970), *L'accumulation a l'echelle mondiale: Critique de la teorie du sous développement*, Dakar-Paris: IFAN-Anthropos.
- (1988), *L'Eurocentrisme: Critique d'une idéologie*, Paris: Anthropos-Economica.
- ASAF, B. (1932), "Cihan İçinde Türkiye: 592'nci Konferans'ın Zabıtlarından Çıkarılmış Bir Parçadır", *Kadro*, I, 8: 18-29.
- ASHLEY, W. J. (1899), "Socialists of the Chair", reprinted in John Eatwell, Murray Milgate, and Peter Newman (eds.), *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*, vol. IV, London: Macmillan, 1987.
- AYDEMİR, Ş. S. (1932), "'Europacentrisme'in Tasfiyesi", *Kadro*, I, 7: 5-15.
- (1990), *İnkılap ve Kadro*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi (first published in 1932).
- BEHAR, B. E. (1992), *İktidar ve Tarih: Türkiye'de "Resmi Tarih" Tezinin Oluşumu (1929-1937)*, İstanbul: AFA Yayınları.
- BENNINGSEN, A. and LEMERCIER-QUELQUEJAY, C. (1967), *Islam in the Soviet Union*, New York: Praeger.
- BERNSTEIN, Henry, ed., (1973), *Underdevelopment and Development: The Third World Today*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- CARDOSO, F. H. and FALETTO, E. (1979), *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- DERİNGİL, S. (1989), *Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War: an 'Active' Neutrality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ERTAN, T. F. (1994), *Kadrocular ve Kadro Hareketi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Milli Kütüphane Basımevi.
- ETEM, M. (1933), "Bizde Kürsü İktisatçıları ve İktisat İlmi", *Kadro*, II, 23: 45-51.

- FRANK, A. G. (1969), *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, New York: Monthly Review (first published in 1967).
- FURTADO, C. (1964), *Development and Underdevelopment*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- KARAOŞMANOĞLU, Y. K. (1983), *Ankara*, Ankara: İletişim Yayınları (first published in 1934).
- KAY, C. (1989), *Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment*, London: Routledge.
- LAROUİ, A. (1974), *La crise des intellectuelles arabes: traditionalisme ou historicisme?* Paris: François Maspero.
- LUXEMBURG, R. (1971), *The Accumulation of Capital*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. (first published in 1913).
- PAZ, O. (1961), *The Labyrinth of Solitude*, New York: Grove Press.
- SAID, E. (1978), *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- SULTAN-GALİYEV, M. S. (1982), "The Social Revolution and the East", *Review*, VI (1), 3-11.
- TEKELİ, İ. and İLKİN, S. (1984), "Bir Aydın Hareketi: Kadro", *Toplum ve Bilim*, (24), 35-67.
- TÖKİN, İ. H. (1934), *Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatı: Bir Milli İktisat Tetkiki*, Ankara: Kadro Mecmuası Neşriyatı.
- WEISBAND, E. (1973), *Turkish Foreign Policy: 1943-1945*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Özet

Bugünün ışığında *Kadro* hareketi'nin düşünsel kalıtının yeniden değerlendirilmesi

Bu çalışma 1960'lı yıllardan başlayarak toplumsal bilimlerde ortaya çıkan dönüşümü özellikle Latin Amerika Çalışmaları ve Orta Doğu Çalışmaları alanlarında irdeleyerek başlamaktadır. İlk alanda bağımlılık kuramı öne çıkarken ikinci alanda disiplinlerarası uygarlık ağırlıklı bir yaklaşım gözlemlenmektedir. Büyük Bunalım'a bir tepki olarak doğan Türk *Kadro* Hareketi'nin bu yaklaşımlara koşut bir çizgiyi çok daha önce, daha 1930'larda yakaladığı ve her iki yaklaşımı bağdaştırdığı savı ileri sürülmektedir. *Kadro*'nun kuramsal özgünlüğü Marksizmi Yüzyıl başı Alman toplumsal biliminin ışığında yeniden yorumlamış olmasına bağlanmaktadır. Bir seçkin aydın hareketi olarak *Kadro*'nun siyasal anlamı yeniden değerlendirilmektedir. *Kadro*'nun Kemalist rejimden uzlaşmaz farkının uluslararası ilişkilere yaklaşımında ortaya çıktığı görüşü ortaya konulmaktadır.